

**Interagency Global WASH Cluster Review of
the Watsan Cluster in the Java Earthquake
Response**

August 2006

Central Java WASH Cluster Review

20 September 2006

Table of contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
A/ INTRODUCTION	1
B/ LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY	1
COUNTRY LEVEL CLUSTER LEADERSHIP.....	1
ACCOUNTABILITY.....	3
GLOBAL WASH CLUSTER SUPPORT.....	3
RECOMMENDATIONS	3
C/ KEY PARTNERS	4
UNDERSTANDING OF THE CLUSTER LEADERSHIP APPROACH	4
PERCEIVED VALUE OF THE CLUSTER.....	5
PARTICIPATION OF HUMANITARIAN ORGANISATIONS AND CIVIL SOCIETY.....	6
INVOLVEMENT OF GOVERNMENT.....	8
DONORS	9
EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF COORDINATION PROCESSES.....	9
RECOMMENDATIONS	11
D/ ASSESSMENT, GAPS ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC PLANNING	13
NEEDS ASSESSMENT	13
ANALYSIS OF GAPS.....	14
STRATEGIES AND PLANS	15
EXIT / TRANSITION STRATEGY	15
INFORMATION MANAGEMENT	16
APPLICATION OF LESSONS PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED	16
RECOMMENDATIONS	17
E/ PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION	18
OVERALL	18
SAFE WATER SUPPLY ACTIVITIES.....	18
SANITATION ACTIVITIES	19
HYGIENE PROMOTION ACTIVITIES	19
RECOMMENDATIONS	20
F/ STANDARDS AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES.....	20
RECOMMENDATIONS	21
G/ MONITORING AND REPORTING	21
RECOMMENDATION	22
H/ ADVOCACY AND RESOURCE MOBILISATION	22
I/ TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING.....	22
J/ FUTURE APPLICATION OF THE CLUSTER LEADERSHIP APPROACH.....	23
NEED FOR CLARITY	23
UNIVERSAL APPLICATION	23
RECOMMENDATIONS	24
ANNEX 1 DRAFT TERMS OF REFERENCE	25

Executive Summary

A review was undertaken by the Global WASH cluster of the Java Watsan cluster in the Yogyakarta earthquake response, on the second rapid-onset emergency to use the cluster approach. The objective is to review WASH Cluster performance against country level and generic terms of reference in order to develop learning for the WASH Cluster and Cluster Lead at both the country and global level.

The team was comprised of an independent consultant, recruited to bring together the opinions of the different organisations involved, ACF (Executive Director of ACFUK), a member of the Global WASH Cluster Support Team (CST, UNICEF), along with participation of the Regional WES Adviser for UNICEF, Oxfam and UNEP for part of the review.

The review took the form of bilateral interviews with the WASH cluster lead and cluster lead agency, many of the WASH cluster participants, both national and international organisations, including consortium of NGOs, government – both technical and regional planning, the Area Co-ordinator and his team in OCHA. There was also a half-day workshop with all WASH cluster participants and field visits with participants of the WASH cluster.

The terms of reference was based mainly on the ‘Generic ToR for Cluster Leads at Country Level’ and can be found in Annex 1

The review took place 8-14 August in Yogyakarta, culminating with a presentation to the IASC Country Team in Jakarta on 15 August. The overall review process in-country was hosted by UNICEF and the review team wish to thank both the teams in Jakarta and Yogyakarta for all of their time and effort made before, during and after the review.

The Yogyakarta Watsan Cluster was seen to have made significant efforts in order to meet the responsibility set out in the terms of reference for the cluster lead as well as many of the participants of the sector as a whole, showing the potential benefit of the cluster leadership approach. Many lessons were gathered during the review for both country-level and particularly for the global cluster. These lessons are described below and in greater detail in the fuller report. Many of the recommendations are geared towards the greater definition of the cluster approach in general and are highlighted because of the experience in Yogyakarta, and not because this was necessarily a specific gap.

Leadership and Accountability

1. The application of the ‘cluster leadership approach’ to the Central Java earthquake had the benefit of clearly assigning responsibility for coordination and leadership of the sector to UNICEF.
2. From the outside the designation of clusters appeared to provide better coordination, but organisations involved in Yogyakarta were unsure of the differences with the previous lead agency concept
3. A small number of key INGOs played a critical role in bringing technical competencies to the working groups and leading a number of them. The performance of the cluster was therefore not just about commitment from one lead agency, but the involvement and participation of the wider cluster participant group. The involvement of cluster participants, however big or small have the opportunity to influence the strategy and direction of the sector

4. One of the challenges faced in implementing the reforms is separating the cluster lead function from the agency's program function and ensuring that one does not compromise the other. UNICEF took the decision of not appointing a dedicated person, making the separation between agency mandate/programme and representation of the sector as a whole a significant challenge.
5. UNICEF organised and facilitated coordination meetings, liaised with the provincial government on behalf of the cluster, and represented the cluster at cluster lead meetings, all of which was appreciated. UNICEF did provide information on needs and gaps and progress in implementation, but, due to limited information provided by participants, was unable to provide sufficient information to effectively guide cluster participants.
6. There was little attention to advocacy and resource mobilisation on behalf of the cluster, although UNICEF did represent the cluster to donors. Indeed all organisations had many difficulties, particularly at the beginning of the emergency to gain access to funds in a timely manner from donors. It was thought outside of the cluster that there seem to have been missed opportunities, possibly due to the challenge of representing both the sector's and the agency's financial requirements
7. Many actors interviewed agreed that it would have been preferable if the cluster leads had provided a dedicated cluster lead to focus solely on the leadership role.
8. There were no links between the global and the country level clusters during the emergency phase and therefore no support given. This sort of support is crucial and should be automatic when a cluster is declared, including field support

Key Partners

9. There is very little written or understood about the roles and responsibilities of cluster participants.
10. There is little understanding of the cluster approach by cluster participants, although many organisations participate at the global WASH cluster level. If not addressed these gaps may impair the effectiveness of the cluster leadership approach

Participation of Humanitarian Organisations and Civil Society

11. INGOs that are fully engaged do so at a cost in terms of the time their staff allocate to meetings and other processes (including working groups). Some INGOs assigned a staff member to attend and/or contribute to coordination meetings/mechanisms. One pointed out that being engaged underpins its advocacy strategy. Some NGOs participate in clusters with the purpose of benefiting others e.g. technical expertise, capacity building remit, and (in the case of local NGOs) local knowledge and experience. Others stressed that their engagement in the cluster was very time consuming and clashed with the implementation of their activities. One INGO said they need two positions – cluster liaison and operational – and would explore this in future with their donors.
12. A relatively small number of INGOs involved themselves intensely in priority setting within the cluster. Participants need to be convinced of the added value of engagement, and the potential influence of their input in order to have greater and effective participation.
13. The benefit to non-UN actors to participate in the Flash Appeal is not evident. Participation was limited, undermining its value beyond the UN system. Whilst

the receipt of funds by non-UN actors through the Earthquake Response Plan (equivalent to a Flash Appeal) was not monitored, it is thought few benefited

14. Some INGOs signed MoUs with beneficiaries. This is a positive step towards accountability but we were unaware of any examples of communities utilising the MoUs (e.g. as a complaints mechanism). Unlike the Aceh response, it seems that beneficiary accountability has not been a particular emphasis in Java

Involvement of Government

15. As presented in the Guidance Notes, the 'cluster leadership approach' emphasises the responsibility of the cluster lead and to a lesser extent the cluster participants, but not the primary responsibility of government to respond to humanitarian needs
16. An argument presented at the beginning of the emergency for not declaring a cluster approach was the strength of the government. However, a functioning government does not necessarily translate into a well-organised and resourced emergency response and effective coordination of international actors. The government (relevant to watsan) in fact felt that they did not have the capacity, experience or mandate to co-ordinate the international response

Effectiveness and Efficiency of Co-ordination Processes

17. There were many complaints about too many meetings across the clusters, exacerbated for those working in several sectors
18. Much time was taken agreeing inter-cluster reporting and appeal formats. Formats and guidelines for reports and appeals exist already at a global level, but these don't seem to have been shared locally, resulting in wasted cluster lead time
19. The role of cluster leads within the cluster approach is defined in the guidance note, however, the role that OCHA should play in supporting the cluster leads (and therefore what the cluster leads can expect) is not defined
20. Roles, responsibilities of and relationship between UNICEF/Cluster leads and OCHA for information management have not been clear

Planning and Strategy Development

Needs Assessment

1. The initial multi-sectoral assessment was not followed by a detailed overall WASH assessment until the AusAID survey presented to the cluster in mid July, by which time most organisations had already defined their programming. Thus, humanitarian actors did not have the benefit of a timely overview of needs before making planning decisions. It seems there was also a lack of interest amongst cluster participants to carry out a joint assessment
2. A number of NGOs conducted individual assessments in the early weeks. Individual NGO assessments and plans were not made available quickly enough to others or at all. UNICEF posted the few NGO assessments submitted to the yahoo group website together with a consolidation of the information available (the different approaches and formats used by NGOs impeded collation). The various assessments conducted did not follow a standard and it was difficult to transform this disparate information into an overview
3. There is currently no predictability in ensuring adequate assessments. The generic ToR for cluster leads is not clear about responsibility for needs assessments

Analysis of Gaps

4. The 'who-what-where' matrix compiled by the Cluster Lead was noted to be very useful although implementing agencies did not keep the Cluster Lead informed of updates and therefore actual progress was very difficult to monitor
5. A strategy for addressing needs through response was agreed, and was supported through the working groups and the development of common approaches, but little discussion on the gaps themselves. The cluster lead was however also constrained by:-
 - the absence of a follow up needs assessment,
 - poor reporting by organisations for who what where and the monitoring of implementation plans
 - limited cluster lead agency capacity and tools to support gap analysis

Strategies and Plans

6. The Earthquake Response Plan (ERP) and revised ERP are essentially appeal documents and are not adequate as strategies or planning documents for the WASH sector
7. The original watsan emergency activities and targets were not reviewed when the ERP was revised or thereafter. However, there was only a short time in between the first and the revised ERP, largely related to donor demands. As a result it seems that it was largely due to the short timeframe imposed to the Cluster leader and participants to revise the ERP (few days). The relevance of the original problem statement, the strategy to address this and thus the continued appropriateness of original activities all need to be reviewed and this was agreed.

Exit/Transition Strategy

8. The discussion about 'closure of the cluster' has given the impression to many that co-ordination will no longer continue, or at least are unclear on its future. . Therefore the terminology 'closure of the cluster' is unhelpful and confusing

Programme Implementation

Overall

1. Targets for water, sanitation and hygiene promotion that was originally to have been undertaken in the first 12 weeks were not met. The gaps in achievement are large, although under-reporting by NGOs makes it difficult to be precise
2. Although some interventions may have been appropriate and successful (e.g. water tankering) the overall public health impact of WASH cluster interventions seems to have been limited.

Water, Sanitation Hygiene and Health Care Waste Management

3. Of particular interest to the global WASH cluster is the follow-up of water, sanitation, hygiene and health care waste management (HCWM) activities for health structures. It seems this was not a subject of discussion in either the WASH or Health clusters. Nor did either cluster address HCWM, typically a key problem in the first weeks of an earthquake. It is unclear at a global level where HCWM sits as a responsibility i.e. the Health or WASH cluster
4. Whilst a separate hygiene promotion working group shows its importance, the challenge remains to ensure that it remains an integrated part of the water and sanitation activities
5. The practice of some key hygiene behaviours as part of cultural norms eg boiling water, many agencies assessed that a hygiene promotion programme in the context of the emergency (with the exception of distribution of hygiene materials) was not necessary as there were minimum public health risks

Standards and Cross-Cutting Issues

1. Sphere standards and indicators have been promoted and have been relied on in setting targets for the WASH sector, although indicators were not later verified and amended as the most appropriate in the given context
2. Cross-cutting issues (human rights, HIV/AIDS, age, gender and environment, utilizing participatory and community based approaches) have not been fully integrated across the WASH response and WASH approach although this was continually on a long list of priorities of the cluster. If organisations do not already have a comprehension of such issues before the emergency it is likely to be extremely difficult to discuss in detail at its on-set and therefore also needs to be dealt with at the global level.
3. Guidelines exist on mainstreaming specific cross-cutting issues eg IASC Guidelines for Mainstreaming Gender in Emergencies, but these have not been integrated fully yet into the various sector documentation prior to an emergency

Monitoring and Reporting

4. Attempts have been made to monitor needs, activity implementation and gaps through basic reporting matrices, but reporting by NGOs has been poor overall which has impeded the usefulness of the monitoring products produced
5. Monitoring has been limited to outputs and without clear indicators at the outset, it is difficult to move closer to the monitoring of outcomes and the effectiveness of WASH activities
6. It remains ill-defined what role the cluster lead should play in developing and managing monitoring systems for the cluster, stated only simply as 'monitoring' in the generic ToR.

Advocacy and Resource Mobilisation

7. There have perhaps been missed opportunities for resource mobilisation for cluster participants. The resources raised by implementing agencies have not been monitored, so it is difficult to know exactly where resource gaps exist. The dual role of cluster lead and UNICEF WASH programme manager and the lack of clarity about the role of the cluster leader have made this more difficult.

Training and Capacity Building

8. Training and capacity building were intentionally not included in ToR for the country level cluster, it was not seen as feasible given the anticipated short duration of the response

Future Application of the Cluster Leadership Approach

9. Criteria need to be developed to make clear when a cluster approach needs to be applied. It should be a needs-based decision taking into consideration the acuteness of the needs, the number of actors and the quality of existing coordination mechanisms
10. The cluster approach should not be allowed to become a label of quality or urgency used to get access to funds
11. Dedicated cluster leaders are required in the first days and weeks of an emergency. Funding for dedicated cluster leads should be a high priority and must be agreed in advance

12. There is a need to develop criteria to decide, when a cluster approach is agreed, which sectors/issues need to be ‘clusterised’ in order to ensure only where special measures are needed are applied
13. There is an need to carry out an impact pathways for all global clusters to ensure the logic of their workplans in achieving predictability, effectiveness and timeliness and to trace the path between the achievement of these issues and their impact

Recommendations

Leadership and Accountability

14. Whenever the cluster leadership approach is invoked for the WASH sector, UNICEF should immediately provide a dedicated Cluster Lead, regardless of the scale because initial demands are high (minimum 1 month). This should be closely linked to the need and therefore the decision to call for a cluster approach (refer point 40).
15. There should be more systematic and automatic inter-action between the country level Cluster Lead and the Global WASH Cluster Support Team

Key Partners

Understanding of the Cluster Leadership Approach

16. Where there is a generic ToR for cluster leads at the country level, there is very little written or understood about the roles and responsibilities of cluster participants. If not addressed this gap may impair the effectiveness of the cluster leadership approach
17. The Global WASH Cluster lead and each participant should initiate a campaign of information and dialogue within their agencies/organisations on the cluster leadership approach and their agency/organisation’s precise roles and responsibilities with an explanation as to how their responsibilities differ from previous coordinated approaches. This should be considered urgent

Participation of Humanitarian Organisations

18. The engagement of cluster participants is important but great care must be taken not to overburden participants with an unnecessary or ineffective schedule of meetings. Coordination mechanisms should be innovative and take into consideration the balance between coordination and implementation of programmes
19. The global IASC level needs to consider ways of addressing the perennial problem of poor reporting by participants in ensuring accurate gap analysis
20. The timing of the 2nd phase revision of the Flash Appeals in representing the sector needs to be reviewed in order to give sufficient time to make more detailed assessments. A review should be made of the funds raised as a result of the appeal in verifying its usefulness to non-UN actors. Donors should be made aware of the time needed for cluster participants to be fairly involved in the process. A right balance is to be found between quick reaction and effective participation.
21. Consideration needs to be made to consider language in encouraging the participation of national actors in the cluster. Bilingual meetings and minutes in both languages should be considered; translators perhaps should be integral in clusters; although this of course comes with a financial cost.’

Involvement of Government

22. The revised Guidance Notes on the Implementation of the Cluster Leadership Approach should recognise the legal and primary responsibility of the government for disaster response (the Sphere Humanitarian Charter)
23. The revised generic ToR should specify that it is a cluster lead responsibility to facilitate the development of a strategy and SoPs in the early days of an emergency to define and secure the engagement of government

Efficiency and Effectiveness of Co-ordination Processes

24. At the global level, a cluster lead tool kit, including formats and guidelines for appeals and reporting inter alia to standardise and rationalise reporting demands should be developed
25. Roles, responsibilities between cluster leads and OCHA to be clarified in terms of co-ordination and information management. Level of support available (not just information-gathering) should be clear and disseminated externally

Planning and Strategy Development

Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis

26. The role and responsibility of the cluster leads in relation to needs assessment and gap analysis needs to be more clearly detailed in the Cluster Guidance notes recognising that initial needs assessment and analysis, timely follow up, and the dissemination of coverage and gaps maps are critical in ensuring a coherent and effective response

Strategies and Plans

27. The country cluster lead to ensure the review of the current Watsan cluster problem statement, the relevance of its strategies and continued appropriateness of current and planned activities

Exit/Transition Strategy

28. The revised Guidance Note should address the issue of the ‘transition’ or ‘transformation’ of the cluster. The terminology ‘closure of the cluster’ should not be used as this has already led to considerable confusion regarding the future amongst cluster participants in Yogyakarta, especially among local NGOs, which will continue activities after the emergency phase is over.

Information Management

29. The global WASH cluster should accelerate the definition of what field level IM tools are needed and develop them (with support from OCHA as appropriate)
30. The respective information management roles of OCHA and cluster leads should be defined at a global level by cluster leads and OCHA. This should be treated as urgent
31. Dedicated information management personnel are needed as a consistent core part of the cluster co-ordination cell for the cluster approach in emergencies

Application of Lessons

32. The IASC in consultation with global cluster lead should determine how lessons from the review of the cluster approach in different countries should be identified, disseminated and institutionalised

33. The Global WASH cluster should continue its policy of systematically reviewing the cluster approach and note and monitor the implementation of the recommendations being made

Programme Implementation

Overall

34. The cluster lead needs to facilitate a decision in the cluster on whether to affirm or amend the targets for cleaning wells, and clarify the timeframe

Water, Sanitation, Hygiene and Health care waste management

35. The global WASH and Health clusters should clarify where the responsibility for health care waste management (HCWM) lies. Guidelines should be developed by the responsible cluster on how to deal with HCWM in an emergency
36. The global WASH cluster should examine how best to support and co-ordinate hygiene promotion activities whilst ensuring its continued integration with water and sanitation activities

Standards and Cross-Cutting Issues

37. The Global WASH cluster needs to give early and clear guidance on how to better integrate cross-cutting issues into WASH programming so that they are incorporated into the early planning of all cluster participants in an emergency

Monitoring and Reporting

38. M&E roles and responsibilities need to be clarified and explained in a revised Guidance Note and Generic ToR for Cluster Leads at the Country Level
39. The Global WASH cluster needs accelerate its planned work to address monitoring tools at a global level as part of its information management strategy

Future Application of the Cluster Leadership Approach

- a. Criteria need to be developed to make clear when a cluster approach needs to be applied. .
 - b. Global clusters should develop guidelines to support country teams decide if a particular sector needs to be 'clusterised'.
 - c. It should be made clear to donors that cluster status, as opposed to sector status, should not be a pre-requisite for funding.
40. An impact pathways should be carried out for all global clusters to ensure the logic of their workplans in achieving predictability, effectiveness and timeliness and to trace the path between the achievement of these issues and their impact

A/ INTRODUCTION

A review was undertaken by the Global WASH cluster of the Java Watsan cluster in the Yogyakarta earthquake response, on the second rapid-onset emergency to use the cluster approach. The objective is to review WASH Cluster performance against country level and generic terms of reference in order to develop learning for the WASH Cluster and Cluster Lead at both the country and global level.

The team was comprised of an independent consultant, recruited to bring together the opinions of the different organisations involved, ACF (Executive Director of ACFUK), a member of the Global WASH Cluster Support Team (CST, UNICEF), along with participation of the Regional WES Adviser for UNICEF, Oxfam and UNEP for part of the review.

The review took the form of bilateral interviews with the WASH cluster lead and cluster lead agency, many of the WASH cluster participants, both national and international organisations, including consortium of NGOs, government – both technical and regional planning, the Area Co-ordinator and his team in OCHA. There was also a half-day workshop with all WASH cluster participants and field visits with participants of the WASH cluster.

The terms of reference was based mainly on the ‘Generic ToR for Cluster Leads at Country Level’ and can be found in Annex 1

The review took place 8-14 August in Yogyakarta, culminating with a presentation to the IASC Country Team in Jakarta on 15 August. The overall review process in-country was hosted by UNICEF and the review team wish to thank both the teams in Jakarta and Yogyakarta for all of their time and effort made before, during and after the review.

The Yogyakarta Watsan Cluster was seen to have made significant efforts in order to meet the responsibility set out in the terms of reference for the cluster lead as well as many of the participants of the sector as a whole, showing the potential benefit of the cluster leadership approach. Many lessons were gathered during the review for both country-level and particularly for the global cluster. These lessons are described below and in greater detail in the fuller report. Many of the recommendations are geared towards the greater definition of the cluster approach in general and are highlighted because of the experience in Yogyakarta, and not because this was necessarily a specific gap.

B/ LEADERSHIP AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Country level cluster leadership

1. The application of the ‘cluster leadership approach’ to the Central Java earthquake had the benefit of clearly assigning responsibility for coordination and leadership of the sector to UNICEF. This was reflected in part in the development of ToR for the country level cluster which specified UNICEF’s responsibilities and the systematic approach to coordination undertaken by UNICEF.
2. From the outside the designation of clusters appeared to provide better coordination, but organisations involved in Yogyakarta were unsure of the differences with the previous lead agency concept.

3. UNICEF's leadership was recognised by participants. A key INGO in the sector told the reviewers that participants in the cluster need and want UNICEF to play more of a leadership role in the sector and that this goes beyond coordination and involves the difficult task of "facilitating decision-making".
4. Declaring oneself as cluster lead creates higher expectations, and although cluster participants were unsure precisely what to expect, they appear to have been generally satisfied with UNICEF's performance in the role of Cluster Lead.
5. A small number of key INGOs played a critical role in bringing technical competencies to the working groups and leading a number of them. The performance of the cluster was therefore not just about commitment from one lead agency, but the involvement and participation of the wider cluster participant group. The involvement of cluster participants, however big or small have the opportunity to influence the strategy and direction of the sector¹
6. UNICEF organised and facilitated coordination meetings, liaised with the provincial government on behalf of the cluster, and represented the cluster at cluster lead meetings, all of which was appreciated. UNICEF did provide information on needs and gaps and progress in implementation, but, due to information gaps, was unable to provide sufficient information to effectively guide cluster participants.
7. There was little attention to advocacy and resource mobilisation on behalf of the cluster, although UNICEF did represent the cluster to donors. There seem to have been missed opportunities due to the challenge of representing both the sector's and the agency's financial requirements.
8. One of the challenges faced in implementing the reforms is separating the cluster lead function from the agency's program function and ensuring that one does not compromise the other. Gaining the trust of participants is crucial. UNICEF needs to be cognisant of the risk that cluster leadership could be perceived by participants as an opportunity for UNICEF to promote only its own interests. The credibility of the Cluster Lead may be challenged if he/she makes decisions that are seen to be more responsive to the needs and imperatives of the cluster lead agency than the interests of the cluster as a whole. This requires that an experienced, strong person be appointed as Cluster Lead and that he/she be given space to represent the sector through the separation of UNICEF's cluster role from that of its programme.
9. Significantly, UNICEF did not appoint a *dedicated* Cluster Lead and one person had to play the Cluster Lead role and attend to the UNICEF WASH sector programme. This is likely to have impacted on both components and make the ability to separate agency mandate from overall sector responsibility difficult.
10. Many actors interviewed agreed that it would have been preferable if the cluster leads had provided a dedicated cluster lead to focus solely on the leadership role. Only the IFRC did so for the Central Java earthquake. However it is recognised that UNICEF was leading three clusters (none of which had dedicated clusters) which put a particular strain on the team. UNICEF globally perhaps should examine the challenge in leading several clusters at the same time (as is the experience worldwide on the demands being made of UNICEF) and their ability to

¹ demonstrated particularly in the Shelter Cluster

provide dedicated staff to each in any given disaster/emergency. It raises the question of the need of having cluster approach applied systematically to every sector during a crisis.

Accountability

11. The specific responsibilities assumed by UNICEF in the county level cluster ToRs were:

- organising and facilitating coordination meetings open to all actors in the sector
- monitoring and reporting on sector needs, gaps and implementation progress
- advocacy and resource mobilisation

The statement of cluster lead responsibilities in the ToR does not include all that is specified in the generic ToR included in the Guidance Notes and it is unclear if this was questioned. Predictability and accountability maybe undermined if a selective approach to country cluster lead responsibilities is taken into subsequent operations.

12. 'Doing all that the lead possibly can to ensure there are no gaps' it is not specific enough and leaves the provider of last resort responsibility open to interpretation and the need for the HC and cluster participants to hold the cluster lead accountable.

Global WASH Cluster support

13. There were no links between the global and the country level clusters during the emergency phase and therefore no support given. This sort of support is crucial and should be automatic when a cluster is declared, including field support.

14. As with most clusters, many of the tools required to enhance effectiveness (and timeliness), though planned, are yet to be developed at the global level, impeding the effectiveness of the cluster leadership approach.

Recommendations

Country level cluster leadership

- a. The Generic Terms of Reference for Cluster Leads at the Country Level should be revised to clearly specify that:
 - ToR for country level clusters should be proposed and agreed within a few days of an emergency/disaster
 - any departure from the generic ToR, including the responsibilities of the cluster lead, should be noted and justified at the end of the ToR
 - ToR should be reviewed and updated periodically to ensure they continue to reflect agreed roles and responsibilities.
- b. Whenever the cluster leadership approach is invoked (meaning that there is a common agreement on the need to put it in place) for the WASH sector, UNICEF should immediately provide a dedicated Cluster Lead, regardless of the scale because initial demands are high (minimum 1 month). UNICEF should provide additional WASH support for the first 2-3 weeks – using in order - Regional WES Advisers, HQ support, and consultants.

- c. UNICEF should formalise its verbal policy of appointing a dedicated Cluster Lead and announce this policy immediately. The actions necessary to meet the commitment should be discussed within the global WASH cluster as a matter of urgency. This might include accelerating existing plans to identifying and train a cadre of people capable of taking on cluster lead responsibilities, and develop a ‘coordination in a box’ tool to deploy with them, eg formats for flash appeals and reporting (in co-ordination with OCHA) and providing initial support in the field and making clear their technical expertise backstop

Global WASH Cluster support

- d. There should be more systematic and automatic inter-action between the country level Cluster Lead and the Global WASH Cluster Support Team. The country level WASH Cluster Lead should be made fully aware of the support team’s existence and what he/she can expect as support from it.

C/ KEY PARTNERS

Understanding of the cluster leadership approach

1. All humanitarian actors in Yogyakarta knew about the ‘cluster’ as a name applied to the sector and its participants, but most had a very limited understanding about the principles of the cluster leadership approach and its application at the country level. They expressed uncertainty as to how the ‘cluster approach’ differed from the previous lead agency concept and usual coordination. Specifically, NGO/IO participants were uncertain when asked:
 - what they could expect from the Cluster Lead (and how they could hold the cluster lead to account), and
 - what additional responsibilities they may have
2. Where there is a generic ToR for cluster leads at the country level, There is very little written or understood about the roles and responsibilities of cluster participants.
3. There is little understanding of the cluster approach by cluster participants, although many organisations participate at the global WASH cluster level. If not addressed these gaps may impair the effectiveness of the cluster leadership approach.
4. Country level cluster ToR is a tool which can make real the roles and responsibilities of the cluster participants and lead. However, the limited engagement by participants in its drafting, and restricted dissemination/promotion meant that this potential was not realised
5. NGO/IO HQ do not appear to have briefed their staff in Yogyakarta about their role within the cluster, or if they did, the information was perhaps lost with the turnover of staff.
6. Some of the key differences between the cluster leadership approach and the previous sectoral co-ordination may not be obvious to country level cluster participants because many operate at a global level e.g. greater predictability about agency leadership.

Perceived value of the cluster

7. NGOs were asked in a workshop by the review team about (a) the value of the watsan cluster mechanism applied in Central Java and (b) what could be improved. They tended to interpret this to mean the cluster meetings. The following list includes all points mentioned. It is significant that the points relate to good coordination in general.

Value:

- Access to information on damage and needs (initial assessments)
- Identify where to work; avoiding/resolving overlaps (who-what-where information)
- Clarify coordination mechanisms and roles and responsibilities of participants
- Meetings provided opportunity to network with other humanitarian agencies/organisations and present oneself to the provincial authorities
- Sharing ideas, experiences and information (including technical information within sub-groups); finding solution to problems; agreeing common approaches (e.g. to well cleaning, screening latrines for privacy); agreeing/confirming standards
- Information collection, aggregation and dissemination (lead should act as secretariat and manage information for the cluster)
- Provide a bridge between international, provincial and local agencies/organisations
- Provide a forum to raise awareness (like the internet based yahoo groups established to access Watsan cluster documents etc)
- Provide a central point for inquiries
- Contribute to a more effective programme particularly through contribution towards planning
- Establish partnership between clusters
- Provide a forum to identify and access resources (funds) and technical expertise.

Potential Improvements:

- A faster system for sharing information (through internet, e-mails, contact lists)
- Faster development of the who-what-where matrix
- Identify areas where needs are not covered
- Dissemination of information from participating organisations to outside stakeholders, (very specific group of NGOs, local governmental agencies, local communities through leaders of communities)
- Increased participation of local NGOs, including access to funds (including from other participants of WASH cluster - through partnerships)
- Promoting stronger links between local and International NGO and thus increasing contact with communities

- Give more consideration to local NGOs capacity building
- Address cross cutting issues better (gender, disability, etc)
- Systematically follow-up on issues raised during meeting (e.g. the information given in yahoo group is not systematically consolidated for the next meeting)
- Provide more comprehensive graphical visual, maps (a long Excel list is not very useful)
- Reduce the number of meetings and use meeting to address issues rather than routine information sharing
- ‘Socialise’ the cluster work through media (explain the work of the clusters)
- Increase the collaboration between government and local/international NGOs
- Clarify the definition of emergency response with clearer parameters
- Evaluate each cluster participant’s performance.

Participation of humanitarian organisations and civil society²

8. Most INGOs were involved in the cluster and some provided key input into working groups and the development of common approaches.
9. The biggest local and national NGOs were involved and made a valuable contribution. Nevertheless perhaps more could have been done to facilitate the effective engagement of local and national NGOs. It is recognised however that the large number of local and national NGOs made it difficult for international actors to know if key groups were missing.
10. The country level cluster ToR state that cluster participants “are expected to be proactive partners in the elaboration and implementation of the cluster’s priorities” and lists the following specific responsibilities:
 - providing all information that can be relevant for the cluster as a whole or other cluster participants
 - keeping the cluster informed about project plans and progress
 - considering overall cluster and sector benefits in decision making processes.

A relatively small number of experienced INGOs involved themselves intensely in priority setting within the cluster, consistently provided information about their activities and giving consideration to overall sector benefits. The critical role played by these INGOs perhaps needs to be recognised by the global WASH cluster. Some INGOs were far less engaged, some only attending early meetings and only reporting sporadically if at all.

It would seem that some participants are yet to be convinced of the added value of engagement and the influence of their input to the overall cluster plan, as well in this Yogyakarta, the amount of extra meetings and input which are required.

11. A number of local NGOs and one or two INGOs did not to participate at all. Reasons given for non-attendance included ‘not aware’, ‘no capacity’ (staff numbers), ‘too busy’ and ‘too many meetings’.

² Cluster TOR - were strengths, weaknesses and capacities of the different agencies taken into account? How was a deputy cluster lead identified and how well has this role been recognised in the field? What implications does this have for the future role of cluster participants and can a model be proposed?

12. Attendance at meetings (including technical sub-groups) had dropped off by the time of the review visit (although to some extent this is to be expected). Reporting is a perennial problem and does not appear to have improved with the declaration of a cluster approach and needs to be tackled globally.
13. INGOs that are fully engaged do so at a cost in terms of the time their staff allocate to meetings and other processes (including working groups). Some INGOs assigned a staff member to attend and/or contribute to coordination meetings/mechanisms. One pointed out that being engaged underpins its advocacy strategy. Some NGOs participate in clusters with the purpose of benefiting others e.g. technical expertise, capacity building remit, and (in the case of local NGOs) local knowledge and experience. Others stressed that their engagement in the cluster was very time consuming and clashed with the implementation of their activities. One INGO said they need two positions – cluster liaison and operational – and would explore this in future with their donors.
14. The Earthquake Response Plan (ERP) was put together in a few days and participation was very limited, undermining its value beyond the UN system. The revised ERP was similarly rushed (the field were only given a few days over a weekend to produce it).
15. Participation in a Flash Appeal is a related issue. The benefit to non-UN actors is not evident. Whilst the receipt of funds by non-UN actors through the Earthquake Response Plan (equivalent to a Flash Appeal) was not monitored, it is thought few benefited
16. Less engaged participants need to be convinced of the value of their input to the cluster and of their responsibility to contribute. To facilitate a stronger across the board commitment from cluster participants, the cluster lead needs to ensure participants really are offered a role and given opportunities to influence outcomes e.g. in determining the sector strategy. It is recognized in the Guidance Note that a key issue in the implementation of the cluster approach is sustaining the meaningful engagement of the cluster participants.³
17. A challenge for cluster leads is assigning the appropriate time and energy to engaging the key actors willing to play a critical role versus other participants. All actors need to have a voice but it is pragmatic to focus on the key contributors.
18. Local and national NGOs (hereafter LNGOs) were able to reflect community interests. For example, they influenced the thinking of international actors on paying the community cash for work (which they successfully discouraged). However, there was no real overarching platform for LNGOs to express their concerns to the humanitarian community. Umbrella organisations were perhaps not used to their maximum potential for spreading messages, understanding concerns.
19. It was not clear for some LNGOs how to tap into funds through international actors. There was some confusion amongst LNGOs about the relationship between cluster leads and the funding available from UN agencies. Some international actors used LNGOs for initial programme implementation without timely and/or adequate provision for their operational costs/outgoings.

³ p 9

20. A number of LNGOs said in a workshop that they expected a more detailed response plan (a 'master plan'). One LNGO said INGOs had a poor understanding of what LNGOs had been doing before they arrived. It would seem that LNGOs had an expectation of the continuum between relief and development, although the ToR suggests only a response for the relief phase. This expectation has created frustration and could have been perhaps managed better.
21. Some INGOs signed MoUs with beneficiaries. This is a positive step towards accountability but we were unaware of any examples of communities utilising the MoUs (e.g. as a complaints mechanism). Unlike the Aceh response, it seems that beneficiary accountability has not been a particular emphasis in Java.
22. Communities have little awareness of how to communicate their needs to humanitarian actors. The responsibility of the cluster lead is to be aware of the need for effective communication with communities and where necessary bring deficiencies to the attention of the cluster. Development of this communication link should be accorded high priority and support for clusters/leads to implement or facilitate group to implement assessment, needs identification, resources, capacities at this micro level, should be provided (e.g. external assessors, IT/ data specialists). This could be cross-sectoral.
23. The local and regional response to the disaster was significant even if extremely difficult to measure as many actors did not refer to the coordination mechanisms (provincial government or cluster). Local private companies, relatives, religious organisations and communities provided support in various forms. It is very important to emphasis the role of the communities themselves, which have been extremely active in trying to find solutions to their problems.

Involvement of government

24. As presented in the Guidance Notes, the 'cluster leadership approach' emphasises the responsibility of the cluster lead and to a lesser extent the cluster participants, but not the primary responsibility of government to respond to humanitarian needs.
25. There were good attempts at the start of the emergency by the WASH cluster to engage the Central Java provincial government. Within days co-chaired meetings were held in Public Works offices and the UNICEF office was located in PDAM for the first two weeks. The role of the Public Works department was addressed in the cluster ToR. However, this good start was not built upon and perhaps there were missed opportunities to reinforce government's integration. Overall within the response, there were no bilateral meetings bringing senior provincial government officials and cluster leads or OCHA together on a regular basis. There was a sense that more support on this could have been given by the IASC Country Team
26. If governments are not more integrated into the response co-ordination there is the potential to generate unintended impacts by disempowering governments that are not assertive or proactive in their emergency co-ordination responsibilities.
27. Information from the WASH cluster was largely disseminated via a Yahoo Group website. This however was not practical for parts of government and additional means of access to information were required e.g. more direct means of disseminating information. The Provincial Health authorities met by the team

asserted they are having trouble getting data on how many latrines had been repaired.

28. OCHA performs an outreach/liaison role to government on behalf of humanitarian agencies (cluster liaison officers and district liaison officers). This is useful and takes some pressure off the cluster leads. Even if their contribution was limited due to long delays in their deployment to the affected area.
29. An argument presented at the beginning of the emergency for not declaring a cluster approach was the strength of the government. However, a functioning government does not necessarily translate into a well-organised and resourced emergency response and effective coordination of international actors. The government (relevant to watsan) in fact felt that they did not have the capacity, experience or mandate to co-ordinate the international response. A degree of community distrust is also a factor that has to be taken into account. The provincial government reportedly appreciated UNICEF leading the international watsan response and reporting back.

Donors

30. Most of the NGOs relied initially on their own institutional funds as donor funds were reportedly not immediately forthcoming, slowing the overall response. The donors' initial response to the first ERP was poor and the revised ERP (apparently done at the request of donors) done in the middle of June in the field but was only launched at the beginning of July.

Effectiveness and efficiency of coordination processes

31. Coordination was effective in providing a forum for participants to discuss their activities, common approaches, etc. however it was not particularly effective in terms of filling gaps and improving geographical coverage and equity.
32. Whilst there have been regular cluster lead meetings, there has been little effective co-ordination with other relevant clusters, most notably health and shelter. Opportunities were not possible to take to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the response. The failure to timely monitor trends in diarrhoeal disease in the health cluster, reflected in weaknesses in needs analysis, prioritisation of areas.
33. Communities and many local NGOs view needs and interventions in a holistic fashion - sectoral/ thematic division an alien concept. Ideally clusters should collaborate far more closely on needs assessment and analysis, reporting, etc. however the framework for doing so needs to be established pre-emergency.
34. There were many complaints about too many meetings, exacerbated for those working in several sectors. Some meetings at least are merely information sharing with no decisions being taken (this was the case for the meeting team members attended in Klaten on 9 August). Some watsan meetings attempted to consider field needs by holding some meetings in the early evening.
35. The cluster approach does not specifically demand a heavier process (meetings, reports, etc) but it does demand more rigour and consultation/ participation which could well demand more time and attention to process. The challenge is to achieve rigour and consultation in an efficient manner, recognising the time demands on implementing organisations. This requires that the Cluster Lead recognise when to

scale back meetings and be creative about alternative means of sharing information. It is recognised in the Guidance Note that a key issue in the implementation of the cluster approach is the need to rationalize meetings.⁴

36. Country level cluster leadership involved a heavy reporting burden, including reports required by OCHA. For those involved in Yogyakarta the reporting burden appeared to be greater than for 'normal coordination' and they questioned the utility of the information generated for higher levels in the UN system. The demand for multi sector reports has been increasing in recent years and should not be solely attributed to the introduction of the cluster leadership approach. Nevertheless a clearer rationale is needed for the information required by OCHA of cluster leads. However, it is interesting to note that complaints about the reporting burden have not been repeated in subsequent emergencies eg Lebanon.
37. Time was taken agreeing on reporting and appeal formats. Formats and guidelines for reports and appeals exist already at a global level, but these don't seem to have been shared locally, resulting in wasted cluster lead time.
38. Early on it was agreed that Oxfam would take on co-ordination at the Klaten level as cluster lead in the province. It seemed this worked well although Oxfam were not engaged in cluster lead co-ordination meetings.
39. The role of cluster leads within the cluster approach is defined in the guidance note, however, the role that OCHA should play in supporting the cluster leads (and therefore what the cluster leads can expect) is not defined
40. Roles, responsibilities of and relationship between UNICEF/Cluster leads and OCHA for information management have not been clear. For some clusters, assistance from OCHA has been invaluable (e.g. GIS information), for others and possibly outside clusters, insignificant. Poor dissemination of resources and information available may have led to duplication of activities (including data collection) and delay in gap identification.
41. Three working groups were formed - technical, hygiene promotion, and school sanitation. It was said that this is where much of the actual co-ordination was conducted. The need for these groups declined over time (as could be expected), and their usefulness was not reassessed and they were not reorientated or closed, giving a feeling of meeting for little purpose after some time.
42. Oxfam co-chaired the hygiene promotion working group with provincial health. Oxfam was unclear of its role and responsibilities as chair of the working group reflecting uncertainty about roles and responsibilities between Oxfam and UNICEF as cluster lead. It was felt that this meant that the working group perhaps did not perform as well as it could have.
43. The health cluster had a working group called 'Health Promotion' which initially caused confusion. The framework in which the two work was however quite different eg health promotion covered the rehabilitation of injured people. The title of 'health promotion' caused confusion and wasted a lot of time.

⁴ p 8

Recommendations

Understanding of the cluster leadership approach

- a. The Global WASH Cluster lead and each participant should initiate a campaign of information and dialogue within their agencies/organisations on the cluster leadership approach and their agency/organisation's precise roles and responsibilities with an explanation as to how their responsibilities differ from previous coordinated approaches. This should be considered urgent.

Participation of humanitarian organisations

- b. Participants at the country level should be effectively (but expeditiously) engaged in applying generic ToR to the country level cluster, with an emphasis on clearly stating roles and responsibilities. The agreed ToR should be continuously disseminated, including to newcomers (agencies and their new staff). They should be translated into the most appropriate local language(s).
- c. To facilitate a stronger across the board commitment from cluster participants, there needs to be greater communication between the cluster lead and cluster participants in defining roles and responsibilities of each. The cluster lead to facilitate a process where all involved are given opportunities to influence outcomes e.g. in determining the sector strategy. At the same time NGOs should be clearer on their expectations from the cluster leadership.
- d. The global IASC level needs to consider ways of addressing the perennial problem of poor reporting by participants in ensuring accurate gap analysis. At the country level, the Cluster Lead should ensure as complete an information base as possible by anticipating the need to be proactive and reach out to NGOs which do not participate at all or only sporadically. This should be reflected as a cluster lead responsibility in the revised generic ToR for Country Leads.
- e. The engagement of cluster participants is important but great care must be taken not to overburden participants with an unnecessary or ineffective schedule of meetings. Coordination mechanisms should be innovative and take into consideration the balance between coordination and implementation of programmes.
- f. The timing of the 2nd phase revision of the Flash Appeals in representing the sector needs to be reviewed in order to give sufficient time to make more detailed assessments. Donors should accept the time constraint of having several organisations engaged in a common joined process. It is important to get the right balance between time and quality. A review should be made of the funds raised as a result of the appeal in verifying its usefulness to non-UN actors.
- g. Consider a local liaison officer inside OCHA to facilitate effective communication and co-ordination with local and national actors as well as funding posts in umbrella organisations to enable effective local participation.
- h. Consideration needs to be made to consider language in encouraging the participation of national actors in the cluster. Bilingual meetings and minutes in both languages should be considered; translators perhaps should be integral in clusters.
- i. The participants of the Cluster WASH coordination have to take into consideration the long term LNGOs approach and remit. The Cluster approach

needs to be clearly explained to LNGOs as the intense activity and resources available due to an emergency situation can create high expectations and subsequent frustrations for LNGOs.

Involvement of government

- j. The revised Guidance Notes on the Implementation of the Cluster Leadership Approach should recognise the legal and primary responsibility of the government for disaster response (the Sphere Humanitarian Charter).
- k. Governmental agencies should be closely involved and engaged in coordination mechanisms; however their capacities and willingness to take over the role of leading the coordination mechanisms should be properly assessed before handing over to them these tasks. Effective coordination should be the main consideration in making such decisions. Cluster leads should ensure time is available to actively seek, encourage and support govt. in effective participation/capacity-building aiming for equality in cluster leadership role and /or govt. becoming lead (whilst at the same time maintaining accountability). A clear distribution of roles between OCHA and the cluster leader is required, in order to clarify the inter-action between both agencies and to get an effective approach with the government.
- l. The revised generic ToR should specify that it is a cluster lead responsibility to facilitate the development of a strategy and SoPs in the early days of an emergency to define and secure the engagement of government.
- m. Cluster leads and cluster participants need to be proactive in providing information to government agencies. Cluster leads should if necessary offer regular briefings to lead government agencies (in their offices) to convey information and queries from the cluster group.

Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination processes

- n. At the global level, a cluster lead tool kit, including formats and guidelines for appeals and reporting inter alia to standardise and rationalise reporting demands should be developed.
- o. The Global WASH Cluster should takes advice on good coordination methods and translate this into a set of core competencies for cluster leads (including meeting facilitation skills) and training for potential cluster leaders.
- p. IT capacities should be optimized (maps, data analysis...) and specific tools designed with the objective to improve the Who-What-Where and gaps coverage.
- q. Roles, responsibilities between cluster leads and OCHA to be clarified in terms of co-ordination and information management. Level of support available (not just information-gathering) should be clear and disseminated externally.
- r. The roles and responsibilities of NGOs chairing or co-chairing working groups need to be agreed by the cluster and clearly stated. This statement should be reviewed periodically to ensure they remain relevant and thus provide effective guidance.
- s. A framework and tools for improved collaboration across country level clusters needs to be developed at a global level.

D/ ASSESSMENT, GAPS ANALYSIS AND STRATEGIC PLANNING

Needs assessment

1. One of the three objectives specified in the country level ToR for the cluster is “coordination of assessments, identification of needs and gaps.” Planned activities included:
 - Work with all relief partners (government, UN, IO, NGOs, CBOs) to direct, compile, analyse and disseminate assessment information
 - Compile who-does-what-where matrices/maps (government, UN, IO, NGOs, CBOs)
 - Analyse gaps and resources required to bridge them.
2. A rapid multi-sectoral assessment was conducted on 30-31 May by several UN agencies (including UNICEF) and an INGO. This formed the basis for the Earthquake Response Plan (effectively the Flash Appeal) and WASH programming by UNICEF and IOM. Provincial government agencies were also involved in the initial assessment and provided basic demographic and housing damage information.
3. This initial multi-sectoral assessment was however not followed by a detailed overall WASH assessment until the AusAID survey presented to the cluster in mid July, by which time most organisations had already defined their programming. Thus, humanitarian actors did not have the benefit of a timely overview of needs before making planning decisions, although this seems to have been the same for most clusters and not unique to the Watsan cluster. It seems there was also a lack of interest amongst cluster participants to carry out a joint assessment.
4. A number of NGOs conducted individual assessments in the early weeks. One INGO stated that apart from referring to information in early OCHA SitReps, they relied on their own assessment.
5. Individual NGO assessments and plans were not made available quickly enough to others or at all. UNICEF posted the few NGO assessments submitted to the yahoo group website together with a consolidation of the information available (the different approaches and formats used by NGOs impeded collation). The various assessments conducted did not follow a standard and it was difficult to transform this disparate information into an overview.
6. Since the assessments were largely carried out on an individual basis, there was no comprehensive overview of needs and little was included about the response of others, including government plans
7. There was little attempt at inter-sectoral assessment although the shelter cluster did attempt to collect information for other sectors.
8. There is currently no predictability in ensuring adequate assessments. The generic ToR for cluster leads is not clear about responsibility for needs assessments. The role of the cluster lead should be to ensure rather than be directly responsible for carrying out assessments, but the reality will be that there will be circumstances where the cluster lead will need to provide a backstop and fill critical gaps in information.
9. The difficulties of assuming this responsibility are compounded by a lack of agreed standards and tools for assessment and (gaps) analysis. There are plans to

rectify this at the global level, particularly in the WASH cluster, and will be key in bringing standardisation to assessments.

Analysis of Gaps

10. Developing and planning appropriate responses for gap-filling was one of the three objectives specified in the country level cluster ToR. A strategy for addressing needs through response was agreed, and was supported through the working groups and the development of common approaches, but little discussion on the gaps themselves. The cluster lead was however also constrained by:-

- the absence of a follow up needs assessment,
- poor reporting by organisations for who what where and the monitoring of implementation plans
- limited cluster lead agency capacity and tools to support gap analysis

This calls for a clearer recognition at of everyone's responsibilities to contribute to needs assessments and who-what-where information in order to provide accurate gap analysis. Those participating in the cluster have to recognise their share of responsibility for providing information reasonably requested in return for gap analysis products.

11. UNICEF adapted information on assessed housing damage (as a proxy for watsan needs) and prepared a table showing which agencies/organisations were engaged in WASH activities in each of the 25 worst affected sub-districts, although with no information on the type or scale of these activities which reduced the value of the information. UNICEF presented this information to a cluster meeting on 9 June asking if any NGOs could extend their programs to the areas not well covered. It is understood that this information directed newcomers and reorientated others to some degree.

12. Although it was understandable that UNICEF would use housing damage as a proxy, it assumed a relationship that needed to be tested, including in relation to public health risk and poverty/vulnerability. Although there was some information on public health risks, including open defecation/hygiene behaviour, there was little coordination between the Health and Watsan cluster to map areas at greatest risk; although the health cluster were unable to provide such epidemiological information in a timely manner

13. The 'who-what-where' matrix compiled by the Cluster Lead was noted to be very useful although implementing agencies did not keep the Cluster Lead informed of updates and therefore actual progress was very difficult to monitor.

14. A decision was made by OCHA not to field a HIC. OCHA developed some mapping capacity but it was not well utilised to indicate gaps in coverage, in large part due to incomplete reporting. The information initially gathered was belatedly mapped - by OCHA with UNICEF input – but it did not indicate the type or scale of WASH activity. Greatly improved maps were subsequently developed for the cluster by OCHA, but this was two months after the earthquake and thus of limited value.

15. Much of the damage in water and sanitation occurred at a household level (wells and toilets), beyond the responsibility of the involved government bodies (public

works, water company) and therefore there was little ability or interest of government to ensure such information was available.

Strategies and plans⁵

16. The Earthquake Response Plan (ERP) and revised ERP are essentially appeal documents and are not adequate as strategies or planning documents for the WASH sector. The ERP, written under pressure within a few days of the disaster, commits resources for up to 6 months based on little assessment. The ERP was revised within only 3 weeks of the earthquake, but little time had elapsed to reassess needs, although no overall plan was in place to do so. This was a significant omission.
17. Common approaches were developed within the WASH cluster, including in relation to:
 - well cleaning
 - shared ideas on latrine design
 - level of support for latrines (screening for privacy)
 - no cash for work within communities (community work contribution).
18. The original watsan emergency activities and targets were not reviewed when the ERP was revised or thereafter. Progress reports indicate a general under-achievement of the original targets for cluster activities (see next part). The reviewers recommended to the cluster lead and participants attending debriefings in Yogyakarta and Jakarta that the cluster needed to examine:
 - the accuracy of information on progress to date given the poor reporting of agencies,
 - what is the problem that is currently being addressed (initially documented as public health risks), the relevance of the strategy address the problem and thus the continued appropriateness of the original emergency activities,
 - the revised targets and timeframe that should be specified for any ongoing emergency activities, bearing in mind the interest and capacity of agencies.
19. The cluster lead took this recommendation on board and took responsibility for promoting and facilitating such a review. It is noted in relation to public health risk that a survey presented by Australian Aid International suggested that rates of diarrhoea increased for a short period rates after the earthquake but then returned to pre-disaster levels.

Exit / transition strategy

20. The revised Watsan ERP differentiated between the *emergency phase* (June to July) and the *'transition to recovery phase'* (August to November) and specified different goals for each; however the objectives and activities are the same for both phases – indeed it appears the original emergency activities have simply been carried forward into the transition phase. Thus although a transition was anticipated, no early recovery strategy or activities were developed.

⁵ What was the role of the OCHA WASH/health cluster support focal point (see organigram Annex 2) Was LL information available to the cluster – who responsible for ensuring sharing of such lessons? What was missed and what new lessons should be taken forward?

21. In an emergency, the cluster leadership approach is invoked to address significant gaps in the response and enhance quality of humanitarian action. The need to maintain arrangements made to address these gaps will usually be finite e.g. the need for UNICEF to continue to provide a dedicated cluster lead person. However, the discussion about 'closure of the cluster' has given the impression to many that co-ordination will not continue after the emergency phase. Therefore the terminology 'closure of the cluster' is unhelpful and proved to be particularly confusing for local NGOs with longer term approach and programmes.
22. It would be more helpful to address the country level cluster's ToR to reflect changes in the nature of the emergency and its requirements. This should include a review of roles, responsibilities and resourcing needs, resulting in revised ToR for the continuing coordination of sectoral activities (whether for ongoing emergency needs or in a transitional mode, and whether or not those involved continue to describe themselves as a 'cluster'). Before amending the ToR for the cluster to reflect a transition, the original plan and its targets need to be reviewed as recommended above.
23. A heavy country level process seems to have been developed for transitioning the cluster. This has resulted for example, in the logistics cluster, which completed its purpose within the first weeks of the emergency, still not being closed more than two months later.

Information Management

24. In OCHA's view no sector other than shelter has adequate information collection system, although this was also disputed. The basic 'who is doing what where' information is generally good, including for the WASH cluster. It is acknowledged that no specific IM tools in needs assessment, gap analysis or monitoring are yet available for country level WASH clusters, although it is also acknowledged that the global WASH cluster is planning to develop such tools.
25. The respective information management roles of OCHA and cluster leads have not been defined at a global or country level. This basic division of labour needs to be addressed by the global clusters in consultation with OCHA. In principle the clusters should define their information management needs, although OCHA needs to provide a cross-sectoral perspective in the interests of cohesion and efficiency. Dedicated information management personnel are needed as a core part of the cluster co-ordination cell at least until systems are in place

Application of lessons previously identified

26. Experience from previous disasters (particularly Pakistan and Aceh) have been brought and applied in the earthquake response (e.g. ground water pollution issues that arose in Aceh). But this would appear to represent the personal experience of those involved rather than the systematic application of lessons documented by agencies/organisations.
27. The need for a dedicated WASH cluster co-ordinator (as part of a dedicated co-ordination cell) was highlighted in Pakistan but not applied in Central Java.

Recommendations

Needs Assessment and Gap Analysis

- a. The role and responsibility of the cluster leads in relation to needs assessment and gap analysis needs to be more clearly detailed in the Cluster Guidance notes recognising that initial needs assessment and analysis, timely follow up, and the dissemination of coverage and gaps maps are critical in ensuring a coherent and effective response.
- b. The Global WASH Cluster should consider standby arrangements to ensure the cluster lead is able to fulfil its defined responsibilities in relation to needs assessment and gaps analysis
- c. Encourage the Global WASH Cluster to accelerate its plans to develop standard assessment and gaps analysis tools for field use, recognising that different tools are required for different conditions and phases.
- d. The Flash Appeal process should be reviewed (with the involvement of donors)
 - i) *with respect to the duration of response (currently 6 months) of the initial Flash Appeal*
 - ii) *to ensure adequate time is provided to conduct an adequate, coordinated needs assessment before putting together the revised appeal.*

Strategies and plans

- e. The country cluster lead to ensure the review of the current Watsan cluster problem statement, the relevance of its strategies and continued appropriateness of current and planned activities.

Exit / transition strategy

- f. The revised Guidance Note should address the issue of the ‘transition’ or ‘transformation’ of the cluster. The terminology ‘closure of the cluster’ should not be used as this has already led to considerable confusion amongst cluster participants in Yogyakarta.
- g. Sufficient time needs to be given in order to develop transition strategies and OCHA should provide comprehensive but simple guidance on this to the cluster leads.

Information management

- h. The global WASH cluster should accelerate the definition of what field level IM tools are needed and develop them (with support from OCHA as appropriate).
- i. The respective information management roles of OCHA and cluster leads should be defined at a global level by cluster leads and OCHA. This should be treated as urgent.
- j. Dedicated information management personnel are needed as a core part of the cluster co-ordination cell, particularly until comprehensive information management tools (needs assessment, gap analysis, monitoring etc) are fully developed

Application of lessons

- k. The IASC in consultation with global cluster lead should determine how lessons from the review of the cluster approach in different countries should be identified, disseminated and institutionalised.
- l. The Global WASH cluster should continue its policy of systematically reviewing the cluster approach and note and monitor the implementation of the recommendations being made

E/ PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION⁶

Overall

1. One of the objectives specified in the ToR for the WASH cluster was ensuring the timely implementation of the response plan. Planned activities included the ongoing monitoring and evaluation of progress measured implementation timetables, including for both relief and transition phase outputs. The timetable for implementation in the ToR is simply a statement of priority interventions for the first phase (first 2 weeks) and the second phase (weeks 3 to 12). It is noted that the revised ERP substantially extended both phases (June to July and August to November respectively).
2. Targets for water, sanitation and hygiene promotion that was originally to have been undertaken in the first 12 weeks (i.e. by end August) were not met. The gaps in achievement are large, although under-reporting by NGOs makes it difficult to be precise. As noted above, the cluster lead agreed with the review team that the targets need to be reviewed by the cluster and this is underway.
3. Although some interventions may have been appropriate and successful (e.g. water tankering) the overall public health impact of WASH cluster interventions seems limited, particularly in relation to latrine screening/repair and well cleaning which evolved as key elements of the watsan response.
4. Of particular interest to the global WASH cluster is the follow-up of water, sanitation, hygiene and health care waste management (HCWM) activities for health structures. It seems this was not a subject of discussion in either the WASH or Health clusters. Nor did either cluster address HCWM, typically a key problem in the first weeks of an earthquake. It is unclear at a global level where HCWM sits as a responsibility i.e. the Health or WASH cluster.

Safe water supply activities

5. There were three water related activities - water tankering, distribution of jerry cans and well cleaning. Water trucking was a key activity in the first weeks and has continued to a much lesser degree. Well cleaning was thought necessary to clear out bits of masonry and other debris that fell into the wells, and to pump out

⁶ How has the WASH cluster lead represented the cluster externally? How have early recovery issues been incorporated into the WASH cluster response? How have various stakeholders eg NGOs, RC/RC, donors, government utilised the cluster lead as a focal point for the sector? How effective has the co-ordination of logistical matters been eg organisations not outbidding each other for resources eg water tankering pricing; negotiation of prices for items used by all? Are there any technical or guidance gaps in this area of the sector?

water to clear turbidity. However, the public health impact of this activity is questionable because the majority of wells in the area have faecal contamination from the close proximity to household latrines (they are often side by side) and well cleaning does not address this.

6. The target was to clean 10,000 wells out of an estimated emergency need of 16,000. The reported progress was 2,397 wells by 10 August. Apart from the unclear continuing public health risk, many homes have apparently carried out their own well cleaning and the need to provide this service over time is unclear. However it has to be mentioned that the level of data provided by cluster participants was low and often not up to date, therefore these remarks are based on information available at the time of the review only.

Sanitation activities

7. Emergency sanitation in crowded areas was not necessary as most people stayed next to their homes and did not go into camps. This was also the policy promoted by the provincial authorities to avoid the encampment of affected families. Activities did include some communal toilets and bathrooms, MCKs, and latrines for schools, but the main attention turned to household latrines, of which it was originally estimated 154,000 latrines had been damaged (based on household damage).
8. The ERP estimated that 30,000 latrines would meet emergency needs assuming 20 people could share one latrine (thus meeting the Sphere standard indicator). That is, five families could share one household latrine. The actual ERP target was set at 15,000 given the limited capacity of cluster members and assuming that some latrines would be repaired by families themselves. The progress as at 10 August was 3,123 latrines, the majority being household toilets. Progress against the original target thus stood at a little over 20%, although some data almost certainly remained unreported.
9. The damage to latrines has principally been to superstructures and the repair work has in most cases consisted of providing plastic sheeting and bamboo to enable households to screen latrines to provide privacy. Distributing materials to make latrines private is a direct response to earthquake damage, helpful to those affected, and can be presumed to have reduced open defecation by those with easy access to these latrines. However, it would be hard to claim a significant overall impact on public health given that only about 2% of the total number of latrines believed to have been damaged had been screened at that point.
10. Some locations (particularly near rivers) had less coverage of latrines pre-earthquake, than others. Some response programmes were attempting to address these without a clear behavioural analysis of the reasons for such differences

Hygiene promotion activities ⁷

11. The target specified in the ERP was for NGOs to train 4,500 people in hygiene promotion, to reach 500,000 with hygiene information and distribute 150,000 hygiene kits. As at 27 July, 394 people had been trained, 41,260 had received hygiene information and 49,877 kits had been distributed. Progress two months

⁷ What additional support could be made to ensure that HP is better integrated in the future?

into the emergency was thus substantial but not tracking very well against targets. The current situation is uncertain due to incomplete reporting.

12. It seems the cluster lead asked cluster participants to wait for common health promotion guidelines to be developed by JHU and not develop their own. One of the INGOs said they believe they could have adapted their Aceh materials, but have held off on hygiene promotion awaiting a CD-ROM which includes posters expected from John Hopkins University, although these had not yet been developed at the time of the review.
13. Whilst there was a hygiene promotion working group, Oxfam's role as chair was unclear and how it they related to the cluster lead (and therefore UNICEF's role in hygiene promotion too). It was felt that this meant that the working group perhaps did not perform as well as it could have
14. It seems UNICEF announced a hygiene promotion strategy but it was not discussed with the members of the Hygiene Promotion working group. The strategy apparently did not propose to work with the existing system within the government, which surprised many participants
15. Whilst a separate hygiene promotion working group shows its importance, the challenge remains to ensure that it remains an integrated part of the water and sanitation activities
16. The practice of some key hygiene behaviours as part of cultural norms eg boiling water, many agencies assessed that a hygiene promotion programme in the context of the emergency (with the exception of distribution of hygiene materials) was not necessary as there were minimum public health risks

Recommendations

Overall

- a. The cluster lead needs to facilitate a decision in the cluster on whether to affirm or amend the targets for cleaning wells, and clarify the timeframe

Health care waste management

- b. The global WASH and Health clusters should clarify where the responsibility for health care waste management (HCWM) lies. Guidelines should be developed by the responsible cluster on how to deal with HCWM in an emergency.

Hygiene promotion

- c. The global WASH cluster should examine how best to support and co-ordinate hygiene promotion activities whilst ensuring its continued integration with water and sanitation activities.

F/ STANDARDS AND CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES

1. Sphere standards and indicators have been promoted and have been relied on in setting targets for the watsan sector. Both implementing agencies and government were aware of Sphere. Although indicators related to quantities of water and numbers of latrines etc were used in planning, they were not later verified and

amended as the most appropriate in the given context. Also see reference to common approaches in ‘Strategies and Plans’.

2. Cross-cutting issues (human rights, HIV/AIDS, age, gender and environment, utilizing participatory and community based approaches) have not been fully integrated across the WASH response and WASH approach.
3. Demographic data has not generally been disaggregated between adults and children, although it has been generally been for gender.
4. Participation as a key cultural behaviour was highlighted by local NGOs in terms of utilising and not destroying this key community coping strategy.
5. Assumptions were made by the protection cluster that cross cutting issues would automatically be mainstreamed into sector programming and therefore were not emphasised as a responsibility within Protection. This has been highlighted as a gap within all clusters, including Watsan.
6. Guidelines exist on mainstreaming specific cross-cutting issues eg IASC Guidelines for Mainstreaming Gender in Emergencies, but these have not been integrated fully yet, into the various sectors. In WASH as in other sectors, there is a challenge to bring the cross-cutting issues out from these separate policies into the mainstream text of those used by water, sanitation and hygiene specialists and programme managers.
7. Cluster leads need to be conversant with cross-cutting issues and how best to practically incorporate and promote these within the Watsan sector.

Recommendations

- a. The Global WASH cluster needs to give early and clear guidance on how to better integrate cross-cutting issues into WASH programming so that they are incorporated into the early planning of all cluster participants.

G/ MONITORING AND REPORTING⁸

1. UNICEF took responsibility for “monitoring and reporting on sector needs, gaps and implementation progress” (ToR for the country level cluster).
2. Attempts have been made to monitor needs, activity implementation and gaps through basic reporting matrices, e.g. the consolidation of needs assessment data (where given), aggregating organisation’s planned and actual activities versus progress into summary tables, as well as the matrix of priority locations (using shelter damage as a proxy) versus the area of each organisation’s operations.
3. As mentioned above, reporting by NGOs has been poor overall which has impeded monitoring which has impeded the usefulness of the monitoring products produced.

⁸ What support has been given to implementing agencies in terms of standards eg training, dissemination of standards policy? In relation to the indicators database mentioned in cluster TOR – how were these followed?

4. Monitoring has been limited to outputs and has not addressed outcomes and the effectiveness of WASH activities. No framework was developed for outcome level monitoring.
5. It remains unclear what role the cluster lead should play in developing and managing monitoring systems for the cluster. OCHA asked all cluster leads for impact indicators. A request was made by the WASH cluster lead for participants to develop impact indicators in the 27 July WASH cluster meeting. This was still ongoing during the review.

Recommendation

- a. M&E roles and responsibilities need to be clarified and explained in a revised Guidance Note and Generic ToR for Cluster Leads at the Country Level, including responsibility for developing and managing a monitoring system for the cluster and analysing and disseminating the information
- b. The Global WASH cluster needs accelerate its planned work to address monitoring tools at a global level as part of its information management strategy

H/ ADVOCACY AND RESOURCE MOBILISATION⁹

1. UNICEF took responsibility for “advocacy and resource mobilisation” (ToR for the country level cluster). There have perhaps been missed opportunities for resource mobilisation for cluster participants. The resources raised by implementing agencies have not been monitored, so it is difficult to know exactly where resource gaps exist.
2. As mentioned previously, cluster leads need to balance the cluster’s needs and imperatives and those of their agency, made more difficult in this context as there was no separation of the two posts.

I/ TRAINING AND CAPACITY BUILDING

1. Training and capacity building were intentionally not included in ToR for the country level cluster; it was not seen as feasible given the anticipated short duration of the response.
2. Some INGOs reported that local and national NGOs were capable and principled and did not obviously need short term capacity building.
3. The opportunity for providing capacity support for the provincial government in order to take on a greater co-ordination role could have been further explored e.g. seconding of human resources to support the government’s co-ordination role. However, of course this requires additional resources.
4. Technical support has largely been given by INGOs not the cluster lead. Whilst this is common in many emergencies, this deserves to be given due recognition.

⁹ how have the needs and views of the WASH cluster been communicated externally eg donors, HC, media?

J/ FUTURE APPLICATION OF THE CLUSTER LEADERSHIP APPROACH

Need for clarity

1. The IASC Country Team for Indonesia stated that although they were encouraged by Geneva to apply the cluster approach to the Central Java earthquake, it was difficult to decide if they should because it was not made plain to the country team upon inquiry what this meant/involved.

Universal application

2. It has been described that the cluster approach will be applied to all future emergencies. However clearer criteria needs to be developed to make this more clear. It is certain that in not all new emergencies will a cluster approach be required. It should be a needs-based decision taking into consideration the acuteness of the needs, the number of actors and the quality of existing coordination mechanisms.
3. The cluster approach should not be allowed to become a label of quality or urgency used to get access to funds. Donors must not regard the application of the cluster leadership approach as a necessary condition for the allocation of funds. The cluster approach is an expensive mechanism and should only be applied when required.
4. Dedicated cluster leaders are required in the first days and weeks of an emergency, not later, as this period is most important in terms of needs assessment, gaps analysis, agreement on standards, etc. Funding for dedicated cluster leads should be a high priority and must be agreed in advance. If the decision to send a dedicated person is subject to donor approval, it may take several weeks. In the case of short emergencies such as the Central Java earthquake it would have been meaningless to send somebody after two weeks.
5. There is a need to develop criteria to decide, when a cluster approach is agreed, which sectors/issues need to be 'clusterised'. It was proposed that in the Java earthquake response, only shelter, health and watsan were required
6. There is a need to carry out an impact pathway analysis to examine specifically what brings about timeliness, predictability and effectiveness and impact in a response in order to be clear which actions affect which aspect.¹⁰ Implementing agencies at a country level are looking for how the cluster approach improves the impact of the response. Perhaps the cluster approach only provides the (maximum) potential conditions for impact; but key in the realisation of this potential for impact is 'how' agencies implement their programmes and whether they have considered accountability, participation and all other cross-cutting issues. Whilst cluster leads can provide effective, timely and predictable working conditions for implementing agencies, it is questionable about how much they can 'control' how programmes are implemented

¹⁰ ie is timeliness and predictability objectives which are only/mainly affected by a prior preparedness and therefore only greater effectiveness is realistically achievable during an emergency?

Recommendations

Need for clarity

- d. The IASC needs to be receptive to criticism from the country level that it is not clear what the application of the cluster leadership approach means and involves and provide the clarity demanded.

Application of the approach

- e. Criteria need to be developed to make clear when a cluster approach needs to be applied. .
- f. Global clusters should develop guidelines to support country teams decide if a particular sector needs to be 'clusterised'.
- g. It should be made clear to donors that cluster status, as opposed to sector status should not be a pre-requisite for funding.
- h. An impact pathway should be carried out for all global clusters to ensure the logic of their workplans in achieving predictability, effectiveness and timeliness and to trace the path between the achievement of these issues and their impact.

ANNEX 1 Draft Terms of Reference

WASH Global Cluster Review – Java WASH Cluster Approach

Background

The global WASH cluster has an overall responsibility to strengthen system-wide preparedness and technical capacity to respond to WASH humanitarian emergencies.

In this respect, the Global WASH Cluster group has developed a workplan which sets out activities in order to address this overall preparedness and capacity building nature of its responsibility for the sector as a whole.

Whilst there are no direct links between the global and country level clusters during an emergency, the workplan of the global cluster should, when completed, provide the necessary systems and support in order to facilitate the operation of the cluster at a country level, increasing the predictability, timeliness and effectiveness of the (WASH) humanitarian response in an emergency.

Part of the workplan of the cluster under Outcome 3, ‘Emergency Preparedness and Learning’, sets out the framework to review the WASH cluster approach in emergency settings in order to provide learning to support improved performance in future emergencies.

Part of the approach to learning (although still to be fully defined) is to carry out joint inter-agency reviews of the WASH Cluster approach in emergencies. At the last WASH cluster meeting in June 2006 such a joint inter-agency review was proposed to look at the WASH cluster approach in the Java Earthquake emergency.

Introduction

The May 27 earthquake that struck central Java caused considerable damage to houses and water and sanitation infrastructure of five affected districts within Central Java and Yogyakarta Provinces. With over 200,000 houses destroyed or badly damaged, hundreds of thousands of people are living in temporary shelter, made out of tarpaulin/ plastic sheeting or tents. In most cases people camp nearby their former house; not many camps have formed.

It is expected that it will take at least one year for the situation to return more or less to normal. In the short term (3 to 6 months), key water and sanitation related problems faced by the affected population are collapsed latrine superstructures (and sub-structures to a much lesser extent) and broken or contaminated shallow wells. To reduce risk of water and sanitation related diseases, hygiene promotion will be required for the affected population. Significant capacity lies within the Provincial

Government (Public Works and Water Authorities), local foundations (Yayasans) and within communities themselves. Coordinating the relief and transition efforts of the many international and local NGOs with the government's longer-term plans will be difficult.

A Terms of Reference for the Java country level WASH Cluster was developed in order to define the role and responsibilities of the group – both of cluster lead level as well as of the participants of the cluster (Annex 1).

Proposed dates for the Review:- 8-14 August, 2006

Review Aim and Objectives

Aim – to review the WASH Cluster performance against country and generic level terms of reference in order to develop learning for both the WASH Cluster and Cluster Lead at both country and global level.

Specific Issues for review

For the purposes of organising the objectives, the headings from the Terms of Reference for the Country Cluster Lead have been used

Key Partners

1. What has been the involvement of government? When there is a strong national government as is the case in Indonesia, how appropriate is the cluster approach?
2. How have local organisations been incorporated into the cluster? What has been their level of participation?
3. How has multi-stakeholder involvement been balanced with the need for practical co-ordination ie large inclusive co-ordination meetings vs smaller key implementing agencies only meetings
4. What are the defined roles and responsibilities of the cluster participants? Are these in line with those outlined in the original cluster TOR? Were these clearly defined and were all participants clear on these? Were strengths, weaknesses and capacities of the different agencies taken into account? How has the participation in the cluster affected the overall WASH response? How was a deputy cluster lead identified and how well has this role been practically recognised in the field? What implications does this have for the future role of cluster participants and can a model be proposed?

Programme Implementation

1. How has the WASH cluster lead represented the cluster externally? How effective has inter-cluster co-ordination been? What have been the challenges, successes and missed opportunities of such co-ordination
2. How effective have the 3 working groups established by the cluster been?

3. How have cross-cutting issues (human rights, HIV/AIDS, age, gender and environment, utilizing participatory and community based approaches) been integrated across the WASH response and WASH approach? What has been the role of the cluster participants and lead in ensuring and promoting such issues?
4. How have early recovery issues been incorporated into the WASH cluster response?
5. How have various stakeholders eg NGOs, RC/RC, donors, government utilised the cluster lead as a focal point for the sector

Planning/Strategy Development

6. How have assessments been co-ordinated? How is information analysed from assessments? Can we say anything about what key information is needed for gap identification?
7. What means/tools have been used to identify gaps? Were tools used by the cluster standardised? Was good quality information about gaps in coverage of needs available, and how have implementing agencies responded to gap information?
8. What strategies or common approaches/designs were agreed upon? Were these followed by cluster participants? What effect has this had
9. What support was and should have been available for information management eg OCHA? What was the role of the OCHA WASH/health cluster support focal point (see organigram Annex 2)
10. What lessons from previous disasters were applied? Was such information available to the cluster – who responsible for ensuring sharing of such lessons? What was missed and what new lessons should be taken forward
11. How appropriate is the current exit strategy? What recommendations would be made for refining this? What can be learned about exit strategies which may inform future emergencies
12. How have cluster participants been involved in the defining of sector strategies for the emergency (and recovery) response?
13. Was information on ‘who-does-what-where’ readily available? What mechanisms were in place for this?

Application of Standards

14. What standards and policies have been promoted by the cluster? What standards have actually been used and what has been the role of the government and cluster in ensuring the dissemination and application of the relevant policies and standards. How has national policy been integrated into the response – who was responsible for following this?

Monitoring and Reporting

15. What monitoring systems are in place? How useful are these systems to the various stakeholders and what have been the constraints?
16. How are the various monitoring systems used to identify needs/gaps?

17. What indicators have been used to determine an effective, predictable and timely WASH response? What support has been given to implementing agencies in terms of standards eg training, dissemination of standards policy
18. In relation to the indicators database mentioned in cluster TOR – how were these followed? How was monitoring done against the timetable of implementation? What actions were taken on the basis of monitoring information, by the cluster as a whole / by individual agencies?

Advocacy and Resource Mobilisation

19. What advocacy concerns have been identified, how were these identified and how have the needs and views of the WASH cluster been communicated externally eg donors, HC, media

Training and Capacity Building

20. What training needs were identified by the cluster to support a more effective humanitarian response? What training has taken place and what other training would be useful for this (and perhaps other) response(s).
21. Had there been any emergency preparedness training carried out – what impact did this have on the response
22. Capacity building of national NGOs. Were there any specific strategies put in place for this? How has participation in the cluster by national partners helped to build national response capacity?

Provider of Last Resort

23. How has ‘provider of last resort’ (see guidance note of 15 June) been interpreted practically during the response?

Additional

24. What additional support could have been given by the Global WASH Cluster
25. As one of the main priorities for the Global WASH cluster, how has Hygiene/Health Promotion been actively promoted, approached in the emergency? What additional support could be made to ensure that HP is better integrated in the future?
26. How effective has the co-ordination of logistical matters been eg organisations not outbidding each other for resources eg water tankering pricing; negotiation of prices for items used by all?
27. How has water, sanitation and hygiene in health structures been approached? Are there any technical or guidance gaps in this area of the sector?
28. Recommendations for how inter-agency reviews and cluster learning can be best carried out in the future
29. Timeliness; how has the initial timeframe of the response plan been followed in terms of implementation of planned activities? Were the first and second phase priority interventions carried out as planned in the cluster TOR?
30. How do cluster members feel the cluster approach has improved / made a difference to ‘normal’ levels of coordination in emergency response of this type? Is it possible to say what impact has there been on coordination levels and quality of response

31. Has the cluster approach in any way had an unintended or negative effect on the individual agency / combined response capacity?

Methodology

Exact methods proposed can be finalised when the team meets in Java. However, it is proposed that the evaluation includes:-

1. individual agency interviews – international and national groups
2. interviews with various parts of government – emergency, WASH related (Yogyakarta and field level)
3. WASH cluster workshop (half or full day depending on feasibility)
4. Meeting with other cluster leads; meeting with OCHA/HC (if still there)
5. discussions with affected populations (men, women, children) in key areas
6. Meetings with key informants in affected areas, e.g. health workers, health centres, community leaders, extension workers, public works staff, etc.
7. field visits to affected areas to review needs assessment planning/gap identification
8. Document review – a list of available documents is not yet available, but will be compiled before the review. Documents will be requested from all cluster agencies (participating and otherwise) as well as OCHA

Outputs

1. Feedback meeting to Java WASH cluster. Depending on the location of various co-ordination groups, it will be decided once in the field the best way of feeding back to the cluster
2. **All review participants must be prepared to contribute to the final report with the independent consultant responsible for compiling the final report**
3. Report, Max 25 pages – field and WASH cluster
 - Executive Summary (no more than four A4 sides)
 - Introduction / Background
 - Methodology
 - For each of the specific objectives outlined in the ToR
 - Findings
 - Analysis/Conclusions
 - Specific actionable recommendations for:-
 - (a) country level cluster and cluster lead
 - (b) global cluster and cluster lead
 - (c) others eg OCHA’s Humanitarian Reform Support Unit, HC
 - Feedback and recommendations to the WASH Cluster Meeting tentatively planned for November 2006

The Review Team

The team will be made up of a number of agencies represented at the Global WASH cluster level. Currently these would be:-

Agencies
1. Independent
2. ACF

3. IFRC
4. Oxfam (field based)
5. UNEP (field based)
6. UNICEF, Global WASH Cluster Support Team and Regional WES Adviser

Management of the Team

An independent consultant has been recruited to facilitate and manage the review, give input to methodology and participate as a team member where appropriate. UNICEF's global cluster representative will act as contact and focal point for the review team. Assistance in organising eg accommodation, translators, vehicles etc in different areas however may be requested to other agencies depending on the practicalities of operating in the area.

Security Guidelines – to be discussed but would propose that since all agencies are working in the area that each team member would follow their own security guidelines where this is practical. It is the responsibility of each agency to ensure they are aware and follow their own security guidelines. Vehicles will be hired by UNICEF; any differences in security regulations should be highlighted to the review team focal point

Funding of the Review

Funds will be available for the review to cover the reviewer's costs - flights, accommodation, food. Discussions are underway within UNICEF as to how best to organise this. If agencies have a specific requirements eg reimbursement or direct covering of costs, please let us know.

Funds will be coming from those funds given by donors for the WASH Cluster Appeal. Eventually this would be covered by the DfID proposal when and if the funding proposal is successful.