

Report

WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme for water supply and sanitation

Task Force on Monitoring Inequalities for the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda

Contents

Executive Summary	2
Meeting summary	3
Session 1: From the END working group results towards a systematic approach to monitoring inequalities in access to WASH services for the SDGs.....	3
Session 2: Priority areas for inequality monitoring, including issues related to wealth quintiles	3
Session 3: Progressive realization of human rights to water and sanitation.....	4
Session 4: A household survey perspective.....	5
Session 5: Applying various approaches at the national level in monitoring inequalities .	6
Session 6: Monitoring WASH affordability	6
Session 7: Looking through the lens of other forms of deprivation	7
Session 8: Monitoring disability and gender issues and small population groups	7
Session 9: Use of novel and new approaches of data collection	8
Recommendations and way forward	9
Annex 1 List of Participants	12
Annex 2 Agenda.....	13
Annex 3 Meeting concept note.....	16

Executive Summary

The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) post2015 works with the backdrop of UN General Assembly resolution on universal human rights to water and sanitation (<http://www.un.org/es/comun/docs/?symbol=A/RES/64/292&lang=E>), followed by a UN Human Rights Council resolution explaining these rights and the WHO resolution on water and health. The work that followed throughout 2012 and the period until 2015 with the UN resolution adopting the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development laid the foundation for a solid political framework for monitoring the human rights to WASH services, culminating the WASH targets for the SDGs on universal WASH services and drawing special attention to key human rights elements, such as affordability, needs of women/girls and people in vulnerable situations. This necessitated the need to think through the practicalities of monitoring these issues and tackling the many challenges that they pose.

With the above in view, JMP convened a group of monitoring experts of various elements of human rights within and outside of the WASH sector, to lay out systematically the challenges of monitoring the various elements of the SDG WASH targets as well as prioritizing these in the coming months and years. The main objective was to review and identify potential new metrics for the JMP to monitor inequalities in access to WASH within the 2030 Development Agenda, as well as to formulate recommendations for further targeted research to inform future monitoring of inequality for the SDGs, specifically to:

1. Develop a conceptual framework for systematic monitoring of inequalities in access to drinking water, sanitation and hygiene.
2. Provide recommendations to address current shortcomings of JMP metrics.
3. Identify focus areas and potential metrics for monitoring WASH inequality for the SDGs.

Experts at the meeting reviewed various elements of monitoring inequalities in WASH access within the SDG framework, ranging from affordability, intra-household disparities, gender and disability, subnational going beyond urban-rural and wealth quintiles including ethnic minority groups, multiple deprivations such as neglected tropical diseases, as well as how to use other types of data including data from geospatial information to effectively monitor inequalities, especially those related to subnational monitoring.

The Task Force, gave a clear set of recommendations, reviewed priority areas and suggested the a series of work streams to facilitate the important work on inequality monitoring:

- Survey harmonization
- Affordability
- Intra-household disparities, in particular: gender and disability
- Subnational monitoring, including monitoring of intra-urban inequalities
- Multidimensional deprivation/poverty
- Integration of data from different sources, as well as data collected with human rights angle

The Task Force recommended that work should be carried out with other UN and non-UN partners, as well as academia as appropriate. The group also suggested work on visualization tools to show various types of inequalities and work towards reporting on the progressive realization of human rights with one number per country. It was however well recognized the challenges of such an approach and difficulty in capturing in one number the various aspects and specificities of inequalities, and potentially diluting the message.

Meeting summary

This report provides a concise summary of the discussions, focusing primarily on recommendations and way forward. Due to the cross-cutting nature of inequality monitoring the Task Force is likely to be of interest to a wide range of groups. Further information including background notes and presentations can be accessed from the JMP website.

Session 1: From the END working group results towards a systematic approach to monitoring inequalities in access to WASH services for the SDGs

In addition to outlining the expectations and expected outcomes of the meeting, the opening session had the presentation from the Special Rapporteur on Human Right to Water and Sanitation (based on the background note he and his team prepared for this meeting¹), highlighted the importance of measuring progressive realization of the human rights to WASH services, having one number per indicator and country² to decide whether a particular country is on or off track, including the need to capture these both within and outside of household setting. He also stressed the importance to show the links between policy framework and WASH outcomes. In other works, explore correlations between GLAAS³ data on WASH policies, human resources, and financing are correlated with JMP data on what types of WASH access people have, and how the former is influencing the latter.

The Task Force agreed on the agenda, and reiterated the importance of examining inequality issues within and outside household, review various forms of inequalities as shown through various types of disaggregation. The expert group agreed on the importance of going beyond the averages, and even beyond urban-rural or wealth quintiles, to go much more into subnational level, as well as to explore ways of monitoring gender, disability and other issues of situations of vulnerability and marginalization. This presentation set the scene of the discussions to come, and described how the discussions evolved from those that took place in 2012 during the yearlong consultation within the Equity and Non-discrimination working group.

Policy relevance of monitoring should be a key driver for WASH inequality monitoring during the SDG period, and lessons should be drawn from what worked during the MDG period. How JMP's monitoring influenced policy making in the past can be a guiding principle.

Session 2: Priority areas for inequality monitoring, including issues related to wealth quintiles Continuing from the opening session the expert group appreciated the importance of various forms of disaggregation in future JMP reports, but recognized that data limitation will be a challenge in the short to medium term for effective inequality monitoring for safely-managed WASH services. Therefore disaggregation of basic WASH services will continue to be a high priority for JMP in the immediate term, while building monitoring database for SDG indicators. Additionally people who don't have access to services at all are more concerned about basic access in the short-term rather than access at the level of safely-managed services which are much higher level of access.

The TF considered how to set up participatory processes to identify disadvantaged groups in a given country within the context of monitoring inequalities. Suggestion were made that in the country consultation and

¹ <https://www.dropbox.com/s/7gzxb2fn9op0n0/HRWS%2020160201%20Inequalities%20Background%20paper%20-%20FINAL.pdf?dl=0>

² There were several issues raised during the discussion on the difficulty of coming up with just one number for cross-country comparison. The concept of progressive realization of human rights is too complex that this will not be easy to conceptualize. It might also be not desirable for promoting the realization of rights, especially if absolute standards of human rights that all countries must strive towards are diluted by creating relative performance benchmarks. It was also raised that for the SDGs, progressive realization means that all targets should be met in 2030, without leaving no one behind and by reaching those who are furthest behind first. This kind of analysis will not require one number per country but more a traffic light system.

³ Global Analysis and Assessment on sanitation and drinking water: http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaas/en/

sensitization exercise in a country, the NSOs could play the role of an honest broker between sector and human rights institutions⁴ based on an inclusive participatory process that includes civil society organizations, academia and most importantly disadvantaged groups themselves. This discussion could also be linked to discussions around Goal 10. It was agreed that it is not the JMP's role to define disadvantaged groups, or various other issues like what is the definition of slums. But once these are defined, JMP will endeavour to obtain robust data from various sources and set up appropriate monitoring frameworks.

While the JMP has historically been doing far more than what was required for MDG monitoring, SDG monitoring and their underlying principles should be the first priority. The JMP is closely engaged with global monitoring framework discussions of the Inter Agency and Expert Group on SDG indicators (IAEG-SDGs), and will continue to seek guidance on inequalities and disaggregation and base its analysis on fundamental principles of official statistics⁵. As a leader for WASH sector monitoring, the JMP will continue to pursue other types of sector-specific inequalities monitoring such as menstrual hygiene management, the burden of collecting water and the practice of open defecation.

While the importance of intra-household disparities including gender and disability is well recognized, a lack of effective tools will limit the ability to assess differential access at a national level and track progress in eliminating inequalities. In the short-term, Priority therefore should be given to work on access for people with disabilities without ignoring monitoring possibilities of inequalities experienced by women⁶. On the latter, it would be easier to monitor the gender aspects in extra-household settings, especially sanitation access issues for women and girls in schools and health centres, as the SDG target calls for. The Task Force however recognized the paramount importance of looking at gender issues and urged JMP to look into other groups and works to address these. Links with Inter Agency Experts Group on Gender Statistics (IAEG-GS) will be a key. Members from this group were invited to this meeting, but couldn't attend.

Certain forms of disaggregation like access to WASH services by ethnic, linguistic or religious groups will be more meaningful in particular countries, especially where these have been identified as defining disadvantaged groups. The same holds true for indigenous peoples or inequalities based on caste. Disaggregation by socio-economic status, such as by wealth or education would have more universal appeal for global monitoring. With all forms of disaggregation, care needs to be taken in interpreting the patterns due to potential for confounding and overlapping inequalities.

To maximize change for effective policies on inequalities, one has to attempt to understand why some people are disadvantaged. It is therefore important to continue to engage with other groups, such as those dealing with Goal 10 and those dealing with inequalities in other sectors such as health and education.

Session 3: Progressive realization of human rights to water and sanitation

In addition to reporting on coverage and rates of change, the taskforce considered the possibility of benchmarking progress by comparing countries with similar levels of water and sanitation coverage. The 'frontier analysis' to assess relative rates of progress developed by University of North Carolina can be a useful

⁴ For more examples of how different stakeholders could ensure participation of disadvantaged groups, see OHCHR guidance note on 'Human Rights-Based Approach to Data – Leaving No One Behind in the 2030 Development Agenda', available at: <http://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/HRIndicators/GuidanceNoteonApproachtoData.pdf>.

⁵ As stipulated in the decisions of the 47th Statistical Commission, IAEG-SDGs will have a dedicated work stream on disaggregation, and JP will be involved in that discussion.

⁶ Water Aid, WEDC, UCL and LSHTM have developed nine data collection tools to understand individual related inequalities (disability, ageing, chronic illness, gender, MHM) in the household and public spaces. Some questions from these data collection tools could feed into these discussions. All the tools are online (see section - Mixed-method data collection tools that can measure inter- and intra-household inequalities in WASH access and use): <http://www.wateraid.org/uk/what-we-do/policy-practice-and-advocacy/research-and-publications/view-publication?id=25633f29-8f85-4f0e-9a54-ffe2ca085fce>.

tool for regional benchmarking. The tool was developed using JMP data from MDG monitoring. It can be applied to basic services at the start of the SDG period but we will likely need to wait until there is sufficient data for many countries before this could be applied for safely-managed services.

The discussion on the progressive realization can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Progressive realization is a core principle of the Human Rights to Water and Sanitation
- (2) Comprehensive monitoring of the human rights requires indicators that go well beyond coverage of services and includes several that are not easily measurable in the development context or cannot be compared between countries in quantitative terms.
- (3) The JMP has an important role in monitoring HRWS but cannot monitor progressive realization in full. It should focus on progressive realization of universal coverage.
- (4) The SDG agenda call for no target met unless met for all. Therefore, targets have not been met if they have not been met for disadvantaged groups.
- (5) However, monitoring progress towards universal access alone is insufficient for monitoring the reduction and ultimately elimination of inequalities. Reducing inequalities requires faster progress for disadvantaged groups that have to be prioritized in the process of achieving universal coverage.
- (6) This is not necessarily penalizing countries on the violation of human rights but reflects the country situation vis-à-vis the ambition of the SDG agenda

Session 4: A household survey perspective

Over the last 30 years multi-topic household surveys have been an effective monitoring tool and they have been the main source of information on water and sanitation used by the JMP for MDG monitoring.

The sector stakeholders can consider proposing new and revised questions for SDG monitoring but must be aware of the limitations especially as the SDG agenda places many other demands on these surveys. One of the major challenges is the duration of interview and number of questions but it is also important to consider whether questions are tried and tested and if they ask for information that it is reasonable to expect a householder to know. Given the demands placed on household surveys it is unlikely that questions related to extra household settings and intra-household disparities in access would be included as core questions. Testing new elements through household surveys, such as water quality testing, or asking questions of household members about their perception of discrimination or women's views on marginalization, such as lack of menstrual hygiene management in schools, is promising but one has to be realistic as to how much we could get out of these surveys for SDG WASH monitoring. Survey authorities are however committed to having instruments most adapted for supporting SDG indicators and monitoring including addressing inequalities.

The JMP should urgently consider revising its core questions for SDG monitoring for use by household surveys⁷. The harmonization of surveys between DHS, MICS and LSMS, now gives an opportunity immediately have a WASH data harmonization across these three major international household survey programmes. This standardized set of WASH questions could also be used in many other national surveys conducted regularly outside of the international household survey network.

The Chief Statistician from South Africa, emphasized that SDG framework gives us a unique opportunity to strengthen national statistical systems by putting national statistical offices at the centre of household surveys, as well as national statistics in general. The various SDG monitoring priorities could be aligned with National Strategies for the Development of Statistics (NSDS), and when this is done promotion of appropriate survey

⁷ Findings from action research in Uganda and Zambia show that a person vulnerable to exclusion should be asked questions directly. Relying on responses from the household head on their behalf is not representative. For more information see this paper, and specifically the conclusion: <https://www.dropbox.com/s/super8ln8jc6xs2/Danquah%26Wilbur2016.pdf?dl=0>

questions could be used in all household surveys conducted in a given country. The SDGs also offer the possibility of making national statistical systems more accountable rather than using them as a simple tool for data collection for ad hoc purposes. Recognizing the various limitations of household surveys, such as not being able to capture discrimination and inequalities in extra-household setting, as well as difficulty to capture intra-household disparities, national statistical systems overseen by national statistical offices, could also strengthen data collection for non-household setting, as well as define standards of data collection by administrative and other non-statistical sources.

Session 5: Applying various approaches at the national level in monitoring inequalities

As discussed in the preceding session, household surveys have matured over the last three decades and the capacity of national statistical offices to conduct such surveys has also improved immensely. Online data dissemination by the NSOs has also developed considerably.

However NSOs play much bigger role than conducting household surveys. They regularly conduct other types of surveys, including surveys in extra-household settings, perception surveys, and consumer price index surveys. Therefore tapping into the vast resources of NSOs for SDG WASH monitoring, including use of best practices of data collection through administrative sources can be highly beneficial. The Modernization of Official Statistics (MOS) also includes the role of Statistical Offices in the use of data from novel sources, such as earth observations, geospatial information and other Big Data. South Africa volunteered to be a case study for this, as well can help facilitate discussions across Statistical Offices in Africa.

Session 6: Monitoring WASH affordability

Affordability of WASH services is a new area for the JMP and it is explicitly mentioned in the SDG indicator for drinking water. The JMP will attempt to monitor affordability both for water and sanitation, as well as hygiene, but priority will be given to water affordability to align with the target. In its proposals for SDG monitoring, the JMP decided not to incorporate affordability as part of its definition of safely managed WASH services. Affordability is complex to measure, unaffordable services affect people who are accessing unimproved and basic services as well as safely managed services. It may be more pertinent to focus on poor households who are struggling to access basic WASH services. Data scarcity is likely to mean that affordability analysis may be limited to basic services.

The taskforce considered different definitions of affordability, data availability and metrics that could be used to track progress. The definition used by the UN Special Rapporteur is based on the idea that water and sanitation are unaffordable if payments for water and/or sanitation prevent households from meeting other basic needs (food, health). Whilst affordability also refers to people who do not use services because they cannot afford them this is challenging to monitor. It is easier to monitor what people are spending. Affordability is a relative concept and depends on income. Therefore it is not just a question of much people spend, but how much compared to their total expenditure or income. The rich may be able to spend 10% without impacting their abilities to meet other basic needs whereas the poorest may not be able to afford anything, as food consumption, for example. Data comparability and scarcity of household expenditure on WASH services are immediate challenges for efforts to monitor the affordability of services. The taskforce discussed the need to improve information collected on the numerator (% spent on WASH services) through providing guidance to household surveys and to clearly define the denominator used to benchmark expenditure. One promising approach is to use a household's total consumption but removing some of the elements that are known to vary considerably in their treatment between countries (e.g. imputed rents). It was also suggested that the JMP examine how much people are spending on different services. Whether or not someone says if that is affordable or not it is difficult for JMP to assess.

The discussions raised a lot of question to guide further work. What will be the process of collecting data on affordability? To what extent is capital expenditure captured – should surveys collect information on connection

fees or also capital costs such as latrine construction? How can affordability be reported for households where services are part of a rental cost? Other complexities include capturing opportunity cost, for example time spent collecting water. The work on WASH affordability has implications beyond satisfying the need for SDG monitoring and might be used to target subsidies and other investments. As affordability or use of expenditure data is used by other groups, like the health financing people in WHO, joining forces in addressing the challenges across various sectors is a worthwhile exercise.

Session 7: Looking through the lens of other forms of deprivation

Two distinct topics were presented in this session: mapping of Neglected Tropical Disease and WASH and looking at WASH inequality through the lens of policy analysis. The former was to explore the ways in which inequality analysis can bring together information from multiple sectors, in this case WASH and NTDs. The latter was with to explore to what extent JMP and GLAAS data can be combined to understand how WASH policies impact on reducing inequalities in access to WASH. Additionally a new tool for monitoring health inequalities across countries and within the national boundaries on a range of indicators was presented.

WASH-NTD mapping: disaggregation and mapping of WASH coverage by NTD endemicity could potentially help the WASH sector achieve universal access by targeting investments at the most disadvantaged and marginalized and it may help the NTD sector accelerate and sustain progress towards control and elimination targets. This analysis provides additional geographical element. How can NTDs be used as a dimension of WASH coverage? NTDs tend to affect poorest and most marginalized. NTDs are closely linked to lack of WASH, and it is also part of the SDG framework – an opportunity for interlinked study. Suggested to continue with more case studies with the goal of producing a global NTD-WASH mapping exercise in late 2017. While simple correlations between WASH and NTD data is a good start we also need to incrementally overlay other geospatial data, like population density, landuse, landcover etc. This exercise would likely benefit from the integration of survey, administrative and novel data sources.

Assessing the impact of WASH policies on inequalities by using GLAAS and JMP data to complement each other: an initial assessment was made on the ability to combine GLAAS inequality policy data and JMP wealth quintile data. It showed an analysis framework that could be followed to evaluate how WASH inequality policies have impacted inequalities in WASH access, such as reducing the gap between the rich and the poor quintiles. It was however noted that inequalities in access is a complex issue to which WASH policies play a role but other factors need to be considered as well for a more meaningful inferences to be drawn.

Health Equity Assessment Toolkit (HEAT): a new tool developed by WHO, HEAT⁸ allows for assessing health inequalities within a country through disaggregation by equity stratifiers such as rural vs. urban absolute difference, richest to poorest quintile ratio etc. It is an exciting communication and data dissemination tool for inequalities monitoring with can be used to report on trends over time, latest status, benchmarking and provides audience-conscious reporting through interactive visualizations. Future iterations of the tool should include available WASH data and could consider adding data from sources other than DHS and MICS surveys, including other possible disaggregations as they become available.

Session 8: Monitoring disability and gender issues and small population groups

Three issues were presented at this session, monitoring access for persons with disabilities, gender issues and how to use rapid tools for eliciting information on hidden population.

Disability: Building on WHO's past work on disability through World Health Surveys a standard module for collecting information on access to WASH services for persons with disabilities is being developed. This tool once

⁸ http://www.who.int/gho/health_equity/assessment_toolkit/en/.

developed could have wide ranging use, including use in other survey platforms. This tool could also be used as a module in the WHO and World Bank Model Disability Survey, which currently is a household survey, where a randomly selected household is interviewed with and without people with disabilities. To tease out intra-household disparities between access for people with and without disabilities the above mentioned module will need to be administered to persons with and without disabilities. Monitoring in institutional settings, such as health care facilities and schools, may also provide an opportunity to capture consideration of access for persons with disabilities.

Time didn't allow to have a discussion on the Washington Group questions⁹ that consist of six questions aimed at identifying those who are at risk of restricted participation. However the use of these questions has not been extensive and have limitations in capturing disability in all its forms.

Gender: While the SDG sanitation target clearly states the need for particular attention to the needs of women and girls, eliciting information on differential access by gender (goes beyond the traditional binary focus on men and women) in a household setting is a challenge. Testing specialized questions in household surveys with modules for interviewing women and girls, such as a reproductive health module in DHS surveys, could be an approach or the use of questions on barriers to MHM recently evaluated in a MICS pilot in Belize. Additionally soliciting information on possible inequalities and difficulties in accessing facilities faced by women and girls in extra-household settings (e.g. health care facilities, schools), including lack of proper facilities for menstrual hygiene management and sex-segregated toilets could be one way to address the specific elements of the SDG targets focused on women and girls. Needless to say that more dedicated discussions on these issues, involving gender (statistics) experts, will yield a more targeted way forward.

Use of rapid tools: ILO's rapid assessment tool based on a capture-recapture method has been used to estimate unconditional worst forms of child labour. It can be considered for use to get information on access for hidden populations such as homeless people or other discriminated population groups.

Session 9: Use of novel and new approaches of data collection

Use of novel data sources has a lot of promise, but they are a means to the end. They should be considered whenever appropriate and in order to support other proven data for SDG monitoring, and to alleviate the monitoring burden on countries. Integration of various sources of data for effective monitoring of WASH inequalities for the SDGs is the key, rather than simply thinking of use of novel data sources in isolation of more traditional forms of data currently collected by countries. In many cases novel data are indeed a fusion of novel and traditional data sources. Recognition of complementarities of novel sources, along with household surveys and data from administrative sources and regulatory frameworks is the key to a successful data framework for SDG monitoring. In this context, care must be taken to guarantee human rights in data collection, in particular ensuring privacy. Reference was also made to the JMP's work on cost-effective monitoring frameworks where various data sources are considered, including the use of novel data sources.

⁹ Annex 1 of the report for the countries using the questions: <http://www.un.org/disabilities/documents/egm2014/WG.doc>.

Recommendations and way forward

The Task Force recommendations are captured below session by session and in the following section work streams are identified to take these recommendations forward.

A systematic approach to monitoring inequalities and priority setting.

- JMP reports should go far beyond the limited reporting for SDG purposes building on the work during the MDG period addressed many issues beyond the strict mandate of the MDGs.
- To prioritize activities the JMP should focus on easy/difficult rather than short/long term priorities. Some forms of disaggregation may be easier – for example religion and education – but more relevant for national level analysis or thematic reports.
- Higher priority should be given to more sub-national monitoring than during the MDGs.
- Attempts should be made to obtain WASH information on people in vulnerable situations such as refugee situations, for example, but migratory situations could be more difficult to capture.
- The JMP should focus on WASH specific issues like menstrual hygiene management, water collection and risk of assault, and identify ways to monitor them effectively.

Progressive realization of human rights to water and sanitation.

- The JMP core focus should be reporting numbers and outcomes and not inferring causality.
- Recognizing the limitation of such analysis, the JMP should support efforts to assess links between WASH inputs (GLAAS) and outcomes (JMP) and how these relate to progressive realization through case studies in selected countries.

A household survey perspective.

- The JMP should support the development of harmonised questions and indicators for inclusion in national surveys and censuses
- Guidance provided by the JMP in the core questions should be extended to address issues of disaggregation and sampling

Applying various approaches at the national level in monitoring inequalities.

- The JMP and other international monitoring tools should strengthen existing country systems and support alignment of data collection with national statistical systems.
- JMP should consider using various national data sources such as, surveys capturing perceptions of people on their realization of human rights, time use surveys, as well as data from administrative records or regulatory frameworks,

Monitoring WASH affordability.

- First priority should be given to improving estimates of expenditure on WASH, particularly on capital costs, through defining the expenditure questions and harmonizing response categories
- Different approaches to monitoring affordability should be evaluated using a small number of pilot countries rather than a global study. One potential option is to define a “water basket” and augment poverty lines accordingly.
- Approaches used by other groups dealing with affordability targets should be investigated, such as the work on health financing for universal health coverage.

Looking through lens of other forms of deprivation.

- The JMP should engage with IER/WHO on data visualisation tools and the possibility of including WASH in the HEAT tool.
- Subnational level monitoring is one of the key elements of SDG monitoring, and several dimensions are to be explored for this, including the WASH-NTD mapping exercise.

Monitoring disability and gender issues and small population groups.

- The JMP should support a pilot to collect data for elusive populations, e.g. homeless, using sampling methods from ILO specialized child labour surveys.
- The JMP should engage with the WHO disability team to develop a specialised module on WASH including special needs/disability, MHM, gender and age for MDS
- The JMP should collaborate with other UN Agencies and disability community to identify opportunities for data collection.
- The JMP should explore opportunities to capture information on WASH services that meet the needs of women and girls in non-household settings (e.g. schools and health care facilities)
- The JMP should engage with gender data specialists in other fields to look into possibilities of strengthening sex-disaggregated data

Use of novel and new approaches of data collection.

- The JMP should continue to explore non-traditional data sources including geospatial, earth observation and other big data sources.
- The JMP should establish a working group on slums, as well as data integration.

The following table summarizes the various disaggregation discussed, their priority considerations and possible internal and external collaborators to take the work forward.

Disaggregation	Priority for WASH SDG	Priority for JMP	In collaboration with
Permanent income(wealth quintile)	Yes	Yes	Household surveys programmes
Affordability	Yes	Yes	World Bank, Household survey programmes
Sex	Yes	Yes	UNWOMEN, IAEG-GS
Race, ethnicity, religion, education, etc.	Yes	Thematic	WHO IER, Academia
Migratory status	Yes	Possibly thematic	To be decided, Academia
Disability (including age)	Yes	Yes	Disability com
Subnational (NTD, nutrition), informal urban	Yes	Yes	UNHABITAT
Extra household	Yes	Yes	WHO, UNICEF, Academia

Work streams

The Task Force agreed that dedicated efforts were needed to respond to the recommendations and the establishment of a number of task teams was proposed as follows. Discussions have already started for most of the disaggregation topics listed above. Several collaborative partners have also been identified, including a few academic institutions.

- **Core questions.** Review JMP core questions and prepare a revised set of core questions to harmonize data collection through household surveys for SDG monitoring. This group will also look into questions for income and expenditure surveys for WASH affordability. This is done with major survey authorities as well as International Household Survey Network (IHSN).

- **Sub-national monitoring.** Review aspects of subnational monitoring, including monitoring intra-urban inequalities. This work stream will also cover multidimensional deprivation or non-WASH tracers like NTDs, nutrition etc. as well as monitoring group-related inequalities based on ethnicity, language, religion, caste, indigenous status and similar factors.
- **Data visualisation.** Review various forms of data visualization to show various types of inequalities. This is connected to the work JMP is undertaking to have an expanded online presence, and various tools of data visualization will be part of this project
- WASH policies and how they have an effect on outcomes etc. (collaboration with GLAAS, UNC etc.)
- **Data integration.** Review probable use of geospatial and other types of data like specialized surveys to collect WASH access info for elusive population for WASH SDG monitoring. This group is also to consider how they could be integrated with household surveys and admin/regulatory data.
- **Intra-household disparities.** Review intra-household disparities, in particular gender and disability issues, and see how they could be captured through household or extra-household setting.

Annex 1 List of Participants (experts not able to participate in person)

1. Human Rights experts/monitors
 - a. Léo Heller, UNSG Special Rapporteur, HRWS, Brazil,
 - b. HRWS team : Madoka Saji, Switzerland; Inga Winkler, USA, Virginia Roaf, Germany
 - c. Nicolas Fasel, Grace Sanico Stefan, OHCHR, Geneva, Switzerland
2. Representative from national statistical offices:
 - a. Pali Lehohla, Statistician General, South Africa
 - b. Enrique Ordaz, INEGI Mexico, Co-Chair IAEG-SDGs
3. Statistics offices for UN and related agencies
 - a. Hakki Ozel, ILO (expert on Rapid Assessments methods to capture discrimination)
 - b. Steven Vale, Taeke Gjaltema, UNECE (Global Working Group on Big Data)
4. Household surveys experts/inequality monitoring expert
 - a. Shea Rutstein, DHS, USA
 - b. Olivier Dupriez (Coordinator, IHSN, World Bank, USA)
 - c. Ahmad Hosseinpoor, HIS, WHO
 - d. Turgay Unalan, UNICEF MICS
 - e. Gero Carletto, LSMS Manager, World Bank
 - f. Luis Andres , Dominick de Waal, WB WASH Poverty Diagnostics
 - g. Gareth Jones, survey expert, formerly Chief Statistician, UNICEF
 - h. Louisa Gosling, Jane Wilbur, Tim Brewer, Water Aid
 - i. Helen Hamilton, Sight Savers International
 - j. Juan Muñoz, sampling expert, Chile
5. Experts on new ways of data gathering : Big Data, and geospatial data
 - a. Ronald Jansen, UNSD, Global Working Group on Big Data
 - b. Bob Chen, Columbia University
6. Sector and other experts
 - a. Jamie Bartram, Jeannie Luh UNC, USA
 - b. Alacros Cieza, WHO
 - c. Maria Martinho, UNDESA/DSPS/Secretariat for the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, New York, USA
 - d. François Muenger, Geneva Water Hub, Switzerland
 - e. Archana Patkar, WSSCC, Geneva, Switzerland
 - f. Eugenio Villars, Frank Pega, Social Determinants of Health, WHO
7. NTD, Nutrition expert
 - a. Christopher Fitzpatrick, Neglected Tropical Diseases, WHO
 - b. Julia Krasevec, UNICEF Nutrition
8. Other monitoring partners
 - a. Graham Alabaster, GEMI
 - b. Fiona Gore, GLAAS

WHO participants:

1. Bruce Gordon, Coordinator WSH
2. Rifat Hossain, WSH, JMP/WHO
3. Rick Johnston, WSH, JMP/WHO
4. Francesco Mitis, WSH JMP/WHO
5. Susanne Nakalembe, WSH, JMP/WHO

UNICEF participants:

1. Tom Slaymaker, Data & Analytics Section, JMP/UNICEF
2. Rob Bain, Data & Analytics Section, JMP/UNICEF

Annex 2 Agenda

8 February	Agenda item	Chair/facilitator
08:30-09:00	Breakfast, morning coffee	
09:00-09:30	Welcome – followed by self-introduction of task force participants	<i>Bruce Gordon</i>
09:30-10:00	Issues, challenges and expected outcomes of the TF – Rifat Hossain	
Session 1: From the END working group results towards a systematic approach to monitoring inequalities in access to WASH services for the SDGs		<i>Tom Slaymaker</i>
10:00-10:30	Lessons learned from the MDGs to build an effective framework for monitoring inequalities for the SDGs – Léo Heller	
10:30-11:00	Discussion: Conceptual framework, guiding principles, dimensions of inequality, priorities for disaggregation, identification of marginalised groups, lessons from other sectors.	
11:00-11:30	Coffee break	
Session 2: Priority areas for inequality monitoring, including issues related to wealth quintiles		<i>Rick Johnston</i>
11:30-12:00	Introduction –Tom Slaymaker	
12:00-13:00	Group discussion: specific ideas for enhanced monitoring in priority areas (urban vs rural, rich vs poor, slum vs formal settlement, other disadvantaged groups vs general population).	
13:00-14:00	Lunch	
Session 3: Progressive realization of human right to water and sanitation		<i>Nicolas Fasel</i>
14:00-14:30	Assessing relative rates of progress – Jeanne Luh	
14:30-15:00	Discussion: how can we define and assess progressive realization of human right to water and sanitation, and to what extent should the various elements discussed earlier be taken into consideration?	
15:00-15:30	Coffee break	
Session 4: A household survey perspective, what can and cannot be done		<i>Olivier Dupriez</i>
16:00-16:30	Introduction – Shea Rutstein with inputs from survey experts from MICS, LSMS	
16:30-17:30	Discussion: based on the experiences of running household surveys for 30 years, what can be done by household surveys today as well as planned for tomorrow (and what information is likely to be more cost effectively collected from other sources).	
19:00	Group dinner (venue to be decided)	
9 February		

08:30-09:00	Morning coffee	
09:00-09:30	Recapitulation of day 1	<i>Rob Bain</i>
Session 5: National perspectives from measuring and monitoring inequalities in various sectors including WASH:		<i>Shea Rutstein</i>
09:30-10:00	Perspectives from South Africa – Pali Lehohla	
10:00-10:30	Discussion points/questions to answer with a clear way forward and recommendations: How the different elements on inequalities discussed earlier were handled by South Africa? How can we apply the lessons from South Africa to enhance national monitoring of inequalities in WASH for the SDGs?	
10:30-11:00	Coffee break	
Session 6: Monitoring WASH affordability		<i>Turgay Unalan</i>
11:00-12:00	Introduction – Olivier Dupriez/Rob Bain	
	Discussion: How can we use consumption based data to inform WASH affordability? What are the lessons learnt from the analysis done for non-food consumption analysis done by IFC/World Bank? What are the recommendations for improving consumption modules in consumption and budget surveys? How, if at all, can we use results of food-consumption based analysis done by the World Bank, along with other data be used for WASH affordability monitoring?	
12:00-13:00	Lunch break	
Session 7: Combining data on inequalities in WASH with data on other forms of deprivation		<i>Luis Andres</i>
13:00-13:30	How can NTD-WASH mapping help us monitor deprivations linked to inequalities in WASH? – Christopher Fitzpatrick	
13:30-14:00	Sub-national monitoring: WHO’s work on health equity monitoring?– Ahmad Hosseinpoor	
14:00-14:30	Assessing the effects of policies on inequalities in WASH from a social determinants of health perspective – Frank Pega.	
14:30-15:30	Group discussion: How might data on inequalities in WASH be combined with data on other forms of deprivation in future?	
15:30-16:00	Coffee break	
Session 8: Tackling intra-household disparities with a focus on disability and gender issues		<i>Archana Patkar</i>
16:00-16:30	Monitoring disability – Alacros Cieza , also interventions from Water Aid and SightSavers Rapid Assessment to measure inequalities– Hakki Ozel	
16:30-17:30	Discussion: what is most effective way of monitoring	

	intra-household disparities in access to WASH services? How can Rapid Assessment tools used in gathering information for unconditional worst forms of child labour could be applied to getting information on access to WASH by discriminated and socially excluded population groups?	
10 February		
08:30	Morning coffee	
Session 9: Use of geospatial and other related data in monitoring inequalities		<i>Léo Heller</i>
08:30-09:30	Introduction – Rifat Hossain (inputs from geospatial UNGGIM, GEO etc.) Work of Task Team on Big Data for SDGs – Taeke Gjaltema How geospatial data complements other data for slum monitoring? – Graham Alabaster	
	Discussion points/questions to answer with a clear way forward and recommendations: what are the roles of geospatial and other forms of Big Data for monitoring inequalities in general and for WASH in particular? How can these be applied to various areas of monitoring inequalities, including WASH in slums?	
09:30-10:00	Consolidated recommendations, followed by Q&A	<i>Francesco Mitis</i>
10:00-10:30	Coffee	
Session 10: Next steps for enhanced monitoring of inequalities in WASH.		<i>Rifat Hossain/all</i>
10:30-12:30	Plenary discussion on target audiences for different types of analysis Plenary discussion to group issues into short, medium and long term priorities for global monitoring Participants identify concrete actions to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Improve analysis of existing data - Improve the availability and/or quality of data Participants express an interest to provide technical and other resources to support work in various areas	
12:30-13:00	Summary recommendations and follow-up	
13:00	Adjournment and Lunch	

Annex 3 Meeting concept note

Introduction

The 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, also known as post2015 agenda, is universal - it has been agreed by all countries and is applicable to all countries. The overarching objective is to end poverty in all its forms by 2030 and to leave no one behind. As such no target shall be considered met unless it is achieved for all people. The 17 Sustainable Development Goals, adopted by the world leaders in September, include a dedicated goal on water and sanitation which includes the following targets relating to drinking water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH):

- 6.1 By 2030, achieve universal and equitable access to safe and affordable drinking water for all
- 6.2 By 2030, achieve access to adequate and equitable sanitation and hygiene for all and end open defecation, paying special attention to the needs of women and girls and those in vulnerable situations.

These targets not only call for universal and equitable access, but also underscore the issue of affordability and the importance of access for people in vulnerable situations, including specific mentions of women and girls.

WASH is also important to the realization of other goals and targets. Adequate water, sanitation and hygiene have indirect links with many targets, and are explicitly part of the following targets and indicators:

- 1.4 Access to basic services for all, in particular the poor and vulnerable
- 3.8 Universal health coverage (WASH may be one of several tracer interventions)
- 3.9 Deaths and DALYs attributable to unsafe WASH
- 4.a Basic drinking-water, sanitation and handwashing facilities in schools
- 6.3 Percentage of wastewater safely treated
- 6.a ODA for water and sanitation related activities that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan
- 6.b Participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management
- 11.1 Safe and affordable housing and basic services for all (urban population)

Background

The first JMP international consultation on post2015 WASH monitoring was held in 2011 in the wake of landmark UN resolutions on the Human Rights to Water and Sanitation. The subsequent development of technical proposals for post-2015 targets and indicators was guided by human rights principles and criteria including the accessibility, quality, availability and affordability of WASH services and whether discrimination against individuals or groups of people prevents them enjoying these services. In addition to working groups on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene, a cross cutting group on Equity and Non Discrimination (END) was established. This group not only focused on specific dimensions of inequality to be addressed in future definitions

of access to water, sanitation and hygiene (such as menstrual hygiene management, time to collect water, and affordability of services), but also on specific metrics for monitoring the progressive reduction of inequality and assessing the achievement of targets for universal access.

The END working group presented its proposals at the second JMP international consultation on post2015 monitoring in 2012. The group recommended that: “Data will be **disaggregated by the four population groups** (rich and poor, urban and rural, slums and formal urban settlements, disadvantaged groups and the general population)” and submitted specific proposals on how progress could be assessed based on various types of disaggregation¹⁰.

How to measure human rights to water and sanitation

The JMP has a long track record of highlighting inequalities in access to drinking water and sanitation in its flagship reports. The JMP uses water and sanitation ‘ladders’ to report both access and service levels for rural and urban and total populations at the subnational, country, regional and global levels. The JMP has also increasingly been able to show disparities in access and service levels across wealth quintiles. The JMP has periodically highlighted gender issues (including the higher burden carried by women and girls in collecting water and the relatively lower levels of access among female headed households) and showcased various other disparities in access including in informal settlements and other specific geographic areas and among specific groups who are marginalized or excluded on the basis of ethnicity, language, religion or education (see 2014 report).

The MDG framework required only urban-rural disaggregation, while 2030 Agenda calls for “SDG indicators to be disaggregated where relevant by income, sex, age, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geographic location, or other characteristics”. The JMP and others involved in SDG monitoring are therefore challenged to come up with a more systematic approach to collecting and disaggregating indicators which can be used to track the progressive reduction of inequalities and ensure that no one is left behind. This is likely to involve both the augmentation of instruments already used by the JMP such as household survey and censuses, and the exploration of potential new instruments and data sources such as administrative and regulatory data, earth observation and crowd sourced data, etc. More information on JMP’s proposed method for monitoring WASH for the SDGs can be found here:

http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/Methodological-note-on-monitoring-SDG-targets-for-WASH-and-wastewater_WHO-UNICEF_8October2015_Final.pdf.

The JMP Task Force on Inequalities has been established to provide strategic key issues to be addressed and technical guidance on possible ways forward. Concept notes will be developed by one or more experts to start off the discussion. Four key questions or priority areas of discussion are highlighted below as well as suggested expert(s) to develop the related background note with support from the JMP team

1. **What should be the overall framework for inequality monitoring by the JMP for the SDGs?** The question in particular is what systematic disaggregation other than urban-

¹⁰ http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/A-proposal-for-consolidated-WASH-goal-targets-definitions-and-indicators_version7_Nov22_final.pdf

- rural the JMP should pursue in monitoring access? What are the most important stratifiers of inequality in access to WASH in different contexts and settings? How should the JMP balance snapshots of gaps at a point in time with trend analysis and rates of change over time? Additionally the Task Force needs to consider how we can operationalize disaggregation by ‘disadvantaged groups’ in the context of global monitoring of human right to water and sanitation. The Special Rapporteur on the Human Right to Water and Sanitation (+ the OHCHR team) has kindly agreed to develop a background paper on this issue.
2. **What approach should be taken to address WASH affordability?** What definition or threshold of affordability should the JMP use for the purpose of global monitoring? How can the JMP use the work done by the World Bank for the International Finance Corporation on affordability of water services as part of the non-food consumption work? What additional work is needed to come up with a meaningful reporting framework for monitoring WASH affordability? The JMP work on wealth quintile analysis will be presented and discussed as part of this topic. A concept note will be developed by Rob Bain, Rifat Hossain and Olivier Dupriez from the World Bank.
 3. **How can we measure intra-household and extra-household disparities?** Can evidence of disparities in extra-household settings provide insights into intra-household disparities? Which kinds of data sources could be considered for such cases? Crowd-sourced data? From a monitoring point of view, how to highlight possible (even if unintended) discrimination against women and persons with disabilities? Are these accentuated in extra-household settings, and can they be captured in an appropriate data collection measure, to be able to report in a global framework? Or can specific questions in household surveys or selective and purposive sampling of household selection help us measure intra-household disparities like access by disabled people or discrimination against women and girls? A concept note to be developed by expert(s) on monitoring disability.
 4. **How might data on inequalities in WASH be combined with other forms of deprivation?** Marginalised and excluded groups often experience multiple overlapping deprivations. For example, discussions with the WHO Department of Neglected Tropic Diseases (NTD) have shown that mapping of NTD interventions and lack of access to water, sanitation and hygiene at sub-national level could be a useful tool to shed light on pockets of neglect or discrimination. There is also growing interest in the linkages between WASH and nutrition outcomes. Future work in this area could use innovative approaches such as geospatial data. What data products are the most important to be considered for monitoring inequality in access to water and sanitation? Discussions on this topic could lead to further exploration of geospatial analyses that is related to monitoring the full sanitation chain, and therefore is linked to GEMI – Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation Related SDG Targets. A concept note will be developed by the WHO NTD expert.

In each case, we must consider how household surveys, if at all, could be redesigned or adapted for us to directly measure inequalities in access to water and sanitation? How can we maximize

the use of household surveys in inequality monitoring? To have an informed discussion about these questions, a concept note will be developed by appropriate survey expert with assistance from the JMP team. Should we also consider how data from administrative records or regulatory frameworks could perhaps complement information from household surveys to better inform monitoring inequalities in access? And finally what other data sources or instruments we could use to effectively monitor inequalities? Therefore in addition to input from human rights community, the above background papers should also have inputs from data and monitoring community, including experts of household surveys or other data collection measures. JMP team is to ensure this is done.

Expected outcomes

The main aim of this meeting is to review and identify potential new metrics for the JMP to monitor inequalities in access to WASH within the 2030 Development Agenda. It will also formulate recommendations for further targeted research to inform future monitoring of inequality for the SDGs, specifically:

4. Develop a conceptual framework for systematic monitoring of inequalities in access to drinking water, sanitation and hygiene.
5. Identify shortcomings of existing JMP metrics for monitoring inequalities and provide recommendations for addressing these.
6. Identify new areas of focus for the JMP and potential metrics for monitoring WASH inequality for the SDGs.