Reporting progress on Human Right to Water and Sanitation through JMP & GLAAS

O. Flores Baquero*,**¹, A. Jiménez Fdez. de Palencia*,***², A. Pérez Foguet *,**³

* Research Group on Cooperation and Human Development (GRECDH), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya, Barcelona (UPC), Spain

** University Research Institute for Sustainability Science and Technology (IS.UPC), Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya (UPC), Spain

*** Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Sweden

Email1: oscar.flores.baquero@upc.edu

Email2: alejandro.jimenez@siwi.org

Email3: agusti.perez@upc.edu

Abstract

International institutions have the authority to monitor States compliance with the Human Right to Water and Sanitation (HRWS) but the necessary tools for this task are not ready yet. Human development sector has a wider experience on using information about progress which provides a perfect opportunity to develop this further. Due to WHO/UNICEF JMP and UN Water GLAAS mechanisms are well positioned to address this challenge, the information they offer has been analysed through a human rights lens. A matrix has been constructed to specifically identify in which extend these two international platforms can be combined to monitoring HRWS in a broad sense. JMP post 2015 proposal considerably contributes with outcome indicators to measure right holders' enjoyment of the right and GLAAS adds structural and process ones to measure duty bearers' conduct. However, there are still some critical gaps if both UN water platforms will be used to report progress on HRWS. Finally the article forwards some ideas concerning the way these shortcomings could be rectified.

Keywords

GLAAS; global monitoring; Human right; JMP; sanitation; water

Introduction

Although international institutions have the supranational political authority to monitor state compliance with Human Rights (HR) norms, tools are not sufficiently articulated yet. Monitoring the extent to which States are implementing a HR is not a simple issue, mainly due to deficient States reporting practices (Riedel, 2006) or the necessity to create appropriate indicators (United Nations, 2012). Among different approaches for monitoring Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ESCRs), using information on progress towards development goals is identified as a useful one (United Nations, 2011).

The Human Right to Water (HRW) gained international legal recognition in 2010, as an ESCR. Different authors suggest that the same recognition is necessary for the Human Right to Sanitation (HRS) (Langford, 2014). Monitoring these HR is something else than counting facilities and UN institutions dealing with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) monitoring at international level have been evolving in this sense during last years. Three relevant UN water mechanisms offer WASH-related information. Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP), Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) and the World Water Development Report (WWDR). However, only JMP and GLAAS platforms are considered in this study as WWDR focuses on different strategic water issues each year and it is not useful for comparing different countries. Other cross-national data sets that have been proposed elsewhere (Meier, Kestenbaum, Kayser, Amjad, & Bartram, 2014) for monitoring the HRWS, have not been considered as they are not WASH-specific, periodic, country based, and/or are not commonly used in the sector.

Since 2000, JMP has been in charge of monitoring the target of the Millennium Development Goal (MDG) specifically related to water and sanitation issues. During 2010–2015, JMP has provided the platform through which debate around post-2015 goals, targets and indicators definition for the WASH sector. It is not the only ongoing consultation process about the way water-related issues should be included in post-2015 agenda but, due to their relevant role in the sector, it is likely to significantly influence the technical design of the final proposal. JMP was not created for monitoring HR although it is well placed to provide indicators that may be used to assess population's enjoyment of the rights. In this sense, it can be evaluated to assess whether it contribute enough to monitor HRWS elements that could be measured through outcome indicators. While this set of indicators is highly relevant for HR monitoring, they are not enough to determine the actual state of these rights in a given country. In 2008 GLAAS emerges to monitor the inputs required to extend and sustain WASH systems and services via a country led-process. This relatively young initiative provides information about States as duty bearers based on a different type of indicators: those called structural and process taking into account HR jargon. Similarly, GLAAS indicators could be evaluated as mentioned before in relation to JMP ones.

No research has been developed to identify the specific potential contributions of those data sets to General Comment 15 (GC15) monitoring. The objective of this paper is to analyse more closely in which extend these two international sources of information can be combined to monitoring HRWS in a broad sense. The article also highlights those elements of the HR content that are still lacking when using the present JMP post-2015 and GLAAS proposals together.

Measuring the HRWS

Different researchers point out the important role that indicators play for evaluating progress or reporting on performance both in human development (HD) and HR fields. Fukuda-Parr (2011) highlights that HD and HR indicators should differ because they relate to two distinct concepts and are used in different ways. One of the main differences is related to where their attention is focused. HD indicators are mainly focus on individual enjoyment or human outcomes while HR indicators add the value to focus on State obligations. For that reason, the measurement tools used to assess HR compliance and HD outcomes cannot necessarily be the same. Nevertheless, measures specifically designed to evaluate HR are not usually available and conventional outcome indicators can be used to fill this gap. Accordingly, we have adopted this approach as different academics have suggested elsewhere (Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, Lawson-Remer, & and Randolph, 2008).

In this sense, the approach based on three types of indicators proposed by Hunt (United Nations, 2003) is normally considered: structural, process, and outcome indicators (SIN, PIN, and OIN respectively) where each one addresses a different part of the framework necessary to monitor the realization of HR. SINS consider issues about the policy environment for the delivery of the HR and typically “reflect the ratification and adoption of legal instruments and the existence of basic institutional mechanisms deemed necessary for facilitating realization of a HR”(United Nations, 2008). PINs deal about the policy environment too but they monitor State effort through the measure of programmes. It is assumed that these indicators can help to predict outcomes and it is considered that they are more sensitive to changes than OINs indicators, which are the ones usually used in HD sector and monitor the extent to which individuals have accesses to basic needs. They measure the impact of interventions.

According to the HRWS, just a few initiatives have emerged to develop indicators and measurement tools combining HD and HR approaches. It is especially relevant the proposal by the NGO COHRE (Roaf et al 2005), the index to measure non-discrimination and equality progressive realization using existing information (Luh, Baum, & Bartram, 2013) and Flores et al (2013) proposal to measure access to water based on HRW framework in a local context through composite indicators.

GC15 introduces HRW normative criteria: availability, quality, acceptability, physical accessibility and affordability (United Nations, 2002). UN Special Rapporteur gathers up these five dimensions in her reports (United Nations, 2010), thus, those will be considered in this document as a reference of the HRW normative content. Sanitation problems have not received sufficient attention compared to water ones. The Special Rapporteur has tried to reduce this gap focusing the first year of her mandate on exploring and clarifying the scope and content of the HRS (United Nations, 2009). Its normative content could be borrowed from the HRW, considering the same five normative criteria. However, caution is necessary to consider differences among both HR normative content. At the same time, both rights share two key elements according to the HR framework. Firstly, non-discrimination and equality, access to information and participation and accountability are habitually considered as cross-cutting criteria. Secondly, one of the basic obligations is to take steps to the progressive realization of these rights using the maximum of available resources. Thus, progressive realization depends on both ESR outcomes that people enjoy (results on right holders) and policies to achieve such outcomes (conduct of duty bearers).

Methodology

Sources of data and the method used are briefly described below.

Data sources

The article assesses two complementary and recognized international sources of information about the situation of the WASH sector. Strengths and weaknesses of these mechanisms in relation to their contribution to HRWS monitoring are pointed out.

On the one hand, the present JMP post-2015 proposal (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014) is focused on targets and indicators and there is still no specific technical information about the new questionnaires to pick up data. This is why the present article analyses the proposal just paying attention to the last set of indicators (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014). On the other, GLAAS questionnaire (UN-Water, 2013) collects primary data through a survey that solicits information on the situation of WASH services. The questionnaire has changed since the first one in 2008 and thus, this research mainly focus on the 2013-2014 cycle one. Unlike post-2015 JMP proposal, GLAAS assessment is based on list of questions instead of a final set of indicators.

Matrix construction

As it was mentioned before, GC15 and further clarifications by Special Rapporteur have been used for the selection of the normative and cross-cutting content of these HR. Moreover, the seminal work of Roaf et al (2005) has been considered as a starting point to identify the most relevant elements of each HR criteria. However, some adjustments have been included, especially for the HRS as it was not independently developed in the work just mentioned.

It has been considered that each element should be monitored using one or both platforms, depending on its nature. If the element is essentially outcome or structural-process focused it has been analysed in JMP or GLAAS section, respectively. Finally, if the element should be measured in both, it is discussed in the two sections.

When it is proposed that an element should not be measured by the mechanism, a grey colour has been used. If it applies, three possible options have been considered. Red shade indicates that the element should be monitor by the platform considered but it is not possible using the present sources of information and a green shade shows the opposite. Finally, orange means that it is partially achieved. When an element has been highlighted in green, a reference to the indicator proposed in JMP Post 2015 or the question in the GLAAS survey has been included to facilitate the use of results. In the case of red, another table provides elements to improve platforms analysed.

Results

Results are summarized in table 1 where 30 drinking water and sanitation normative elements and 13 general and cross-cutting ones have been analysed applying the methodology explained above. 14 out of 43 have been identified as red, 24 as green and 5 as orange.

	Criteria	Element	JMPpost2015	GLAAS 2013-14
Water: normative criteria	Availability	Priority of essential levels of drinking water over other uses		
		Continuity/Seasonality	3.1	
	Physical Accessibility	% access improved/basic drinking water	Coverage: 2.1 & 3.1	Expanding access: A2- A3
		Water Point proximity	2.1 & 3.1	
		All members at any time	3.1	
		Security at water points and paths		
		Education/Health facilities	Coverage: 2.4 & 2.5	Expanding access: A2- A3
		Secure access to Common Water Sources (CWS)		
	Quality/Safety	Drinking water quality surveillance		B3
		Pollution: regulation & policies		
		Water quality (source) and risk management plan	Household (Yes) / Schools & Health Centres (No)	
		Household water treatment (unimproved)		
	Affordability	Household expenditure on drinking water		
		Assistance to low income groups		A8 & D6
		Disconnections		
	Acceptability	Organoleptic characteristics		

Sanitation: normative criteria	Availability	% access to improved/basic sanitation	Coverage: 2.2 & 3.2	Expanding access: A2- A3
	Physical Accessibility	All members at any time	2.2 & 3.2	
		Security at facilities and paths		
		Education/Health facilities	Coverage: 2.4 & 2.5	Expanding access: A2- A3
	Quality/Safety	Open defecation	1.1	
		Safely management of excreta	3.2	
		Sanitary conditions (facilities)		
		Waste water treatment		B6
		Hygiene awareness		A3
		Handwashing device & soap	Coverage: 2.3, 2.4 & 2.5	Expanding access: A2- A3
		Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM)	Household (Yes) / Schools & Health Centres (No)	
	Affordability	Household expenditure on sanitation		
		Assistance to low income groups		A8 & D6
	Acceptability	Privacy, comfort, dignity	Household (Yes) / Schools & Health Centres (No)	
Cross cutting and general indicators	General	Right to water/sanitation contained in law		A1
		HRWS justiciability		
		Existence of a time-frame national strategy and plan of action to ensure WASH provision		A3
		International financial and non-financial assistance provided by developed States		ESA survey
		Private sector participation		

Accountability // Information & participation	Monitoring mechanisms		Section B
	Civil society inclusion in monitoring process		
	Complaints mechanisms in place		A13
	Service users and communities participation in WASH supply decision making		A13
Non-discrimination - Equity	Attention to marginalized and vulnerable groups in strategies-plans		A8
	Budgetary strategies to address the situation of vulnerable		D5
	Financial flows to address the needs of vulnerable		D11: Some groups
	Inequities reduction	Methodology should be improved	

Discussion

Which HRWS elements can be reported and which not using JMP Post-2015 proposal?

According to HR, JMP can be considered an enjoyment-side approach mechanism. The post-2015 proposal has been guided by five important considerations: improving service levels, including hygiene issues, reducing inequalities, going beyond the households and addressing sustainability of services (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014). Key issues are discussed below.

According to sanitation, stopping open defecation is a major focus in order to promote a clean and hygienic environment that benefits everyone. This idea is very well tuned with HRS as it is considered that no one can fully exercise this HR unless his/her community proceeds towards open defecation free status (Langford, Bartram, & Roaf, 2014). Another group of indicators focuses on the access to sanitation services. Specifically, it is asserted that the facility has to effectively separate excreta from human contact, and it should be conducive to environment protection. Different facility types are considered as improved or basic sanitation where special attention has been paid to their superstructure, platform or squatting slab and sharing of the facility. The facility must be physically accessible, which means that it must be available for use at all times of the day or night; it has to be designed to take account of the needs of women and children, persons with disabilities, as well as those of elderly persons. Finally, the issue of safe management of households' excreta is addressed. All of them are relevant according to the normative content of the HRS.

From a HR point of view, the issues of health protection (safety), physical accessibility, affordability and privacy, comfort and dignity (acceptability) are essential (Langford et al., 2014). In this sense, the new proposal discloses four major shortcomings. First, sanitary conditions of the facility should be considered as these elements might constrain a continued use of the infrastructure (Scott, Cotton, & Govindan, 2003). Second, facilities have to be

situated in a location where physical security can be guaranteed both while using them and walking the paths. Third, there is no mention to the issue of affordability one of the most novel contributions of HR. Finally, it is important to measure the elements related to acceptability criterion mentioned above. These have been considered when monitoring education and health facilities but not at household level.

According to HRWS framework, hygiene is considered as an element of quality/safety criteria. There are a variety of hygiene behaviours that are of greatest likely benefit to health. Post-2015 focuses on the issue of handwashing with soap for target setting. Specifically, spot checks of facilities are proposed as proxies for handwashing behaviour. At the dwelling, the assessment is expected to include two key areas: the sanitation facility and the food preparation area. In spite of unquestionable strides, the proposal is still subject to criticism. The inclusion of menstrual hygiene management (MHM) in the monitoring framework is critical in terms of its impact on health and also on the social development of girls and women. For this purpose, one could advocate for the inclusion of proxy indicators to measure at least the “hardware” side of MHM at household level.

The core indicator for drinking water monitoring uses the type of technology as a proxy for a binary categorization (improved / unimproved) of the sources. But this proposal also highlights some elements that are intrinsically linked to HRW normative criteria, especially to characterize what has been named “safely managed drinking water services” (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014). Continuity and seasonality are included in the proposed indicator. Water quality is also tested at the point-of-use and a risk management plan is necessary to consider that a service is safely managed. It may be assumed that these elements somehow replace the former indicator related to household water treatment. However, it is important to keep in mind that the later could be a key factor for those using unimproved sources. Physical accessibility is explicitly considered at both household and extra-household level when it is emphasized that the water source has to be accessible to all members/users at any time. Even more, a complementary indicator assesses the total collection roundtrip time.

However, gender disparities in water collection are no longer addressed. Although it was not included in the MDGs’ target, gender issues has been dealt with through a core question (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2006) that has been widely analysed in the JMP annual reports. It is an issue of concern in a context where women still bear primary responsibility for collecting water and suffer damage very often which injure their physical integrity. The proposal mentioned that “targets should address the challenge of sustaining services to ensure lasting benefits” (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014) but it does not result in specific targets and indicators in contrast to an earlier version (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2013), where target 4 included affordability and accountability as sustainability-related parameters. Langford (2010) alarmed about affordability final omission in the MDGs Declaration. It seems that history repeats itself in SDGs proposal. Other HRW elements about disconnections and acceptability that could be measured at households have not been included in the proposal.

According to cross-cutting issues, it is widely recognised that MDGs focus on average global progress is a reason to explain the poor progress reported for the most marginalized. Post-2015 agenda seems to move forward as it is proposed to disaggregate data to reflect differences in access between rich and poor, urban and rural, slums and formal urban

settlements, and disadvantaged groups and the general population (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014). Even more, equity and non-discrimination elements have been incorporated into future targets and indicators and methodological approaches: Targets 1&3 incorporate an intra-household equity approach. It is also outstanding the effort to assess separately the male-female sanitation facilities and the inclusion of MHM -which is considered a good proxy to measure discrimination against women and girls- in schools and health centres. Methodologically speaking, disadvantaged groups will be identified through participatory national processes taking into account prohibited grounds of discrimination. Moreover, a specific measurement technique for reduction-elimination of inequalities has been designed (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014).

Despite advances mentioned, there is no clear definition of the population groups considered in the framework, especially in relation to disadvantaged groups. The method by which these context-based types of discrimination will be assessed is also unclear, and there is thus a risk that important areas of discrimination will not be considered. Moreover, the methodology proposes a kind of composite indicator to evaluate different fields of discrimination. It is a function where under performance in some fields can be compensated with over performance in others. The scoring proposal may lead to situations where countries with no progress in a variety of discriminatory fields such as ethnicity, race, nationality, language, religion, sex/gender, age or disability could be classified as “on-track”¹.

Which HRWS elements can be reported and which not using GLAAS 2014 questionnaire?

As it was said before, JMP is outcome focused by nature and its approach is pertinent to report rights holders’ enjoyment of the HRWS. To complement this work, GLAAS strategy offers the possibility to measure process and structural indicators that can be used to monitor duty-bearers achievement of HR obligations. GLAAS 2013-2014 is analysed below to identify challenges and opportunities for HRWS reporting.

A starting point for assessing states compliance with international HRWS obligations is to know if HR is expressly contained in the appropriate legislation, issue that is addressed in section A1 about national laws. However, it is even more important that rights were justiciable in courts or other bodies. Despite the second element was first included in 2011-2012 (UN-Water, 2011), this kind of data is not available in 2013-2014 questionnaire leaving this gap of information.

According to GC15, “the obligation to fulfil requires States parties to adopt the necessary measures directed towards the full realization of the HRW (and sanitation)” (United Nations, 2002). This obligation includes, inter alia, adopting a national strategy and a plan of action to meeting these HR. A2 and A3 provide information on this topic about all different WASH areas, differentiating between urban-rural and taking into account settings beyond HH, as it is

¹ A Traffic Lights System will serve for the overall assessment of the progressive reduction of inequalities under each target, combining the four population groups (poorest vs. richest wealth quintile, rural vs. urban, slum vs. formal urban settlement, and disadvantaged groups vs. general population). Green implies “on track”, yellow shows that there is some progress, but that it is insufficient, and red means “off-track”. If 3 or 4 out of 4 disaggregated groups are on-track, it is assessed as green; 2 out of 4 is yellow; and 0 or 1 out of 4 is red (Joint Monitoring Programme, 2014)

required taking into account a HRWS approach. Based on information collected, it is possible to monitor if countries have set targets for universal access and if those are time-framed. National plans of action must prioritize the provision of essential amounts of water for personal and domestic uses but it cannot be measured using current survey.

Question A8 about universal access for disadvantaged groups deals with a pertinent issue according to HR obligations. There are explicit questions that pay attention to marginalised and vulnerable groups in the plan of action. An exhaustive check-list allows knowing if a policy-plan includes measures to reach a broad range of possible disadvantaged populations.

Two notorious contributions are considered in relation to accountability criterion: i) A13 collects information about the existence of public complaints mechanisms concerning the lack of, or unsatisfactory drinking water and sanitation services. In this sense, despite the question of disconnections - strongly linked to controversial affordability criterion- is a reason of social conflict in relation to water services, has not explicitly been addressed. ii) Section B collects data about monitoring mechanisms. It is possible to report if there is a body/bodies to assess on implementation of all aspects of the HRWS. But it is necessary to consider additional questions that would assess whether such bodies are accessible and if civil society is included in the process, which is not asked in GLAAS survey. Still on the subject of monitoring, B6 allows knowing if states are developing and implementing WASH indicators and benchmarks for progress monitoring and offers specific information about the percentage of waste-water that receives. B3 deals with the issue of independent monitoring and audits regarding water quality regulation and surveillance.

Pollution of water sources and its impact on water quality for personal and domestic uses affecting human health is an issue of concern considering HRW content. GC15 explicitly establishes connections between pollution, encroachment and CWS. Article 23 establishes the obligation to protect the HRW, which requires States to prevent third parties from polluting and inequitably extracting from water resources. Despite using sometimes a different jargon, GC15 delves into concepts as environmental justice or environmentalism of poor (Martinez-Alier, 2014) when deals with the obligations to respect and protect and when it focuses on violations. In this sense, GLAAS is not enough to monitor pollution related issues.

According to information and participation, the questionnaire allows monitoring if national strategies and plans of action have been devised on the basis of a participatory process where individuals and communities can meaningfully contribute to decisions about WASH planning.

Section D gives pertinent insights about financing disadvantaged groups through equity in budget allocations and the existence of financial schemes to make access to WASH more affordable for disadvantaged groups, which complements affordability monitoring from a duty bearers' perspective. Even more, financial flows for WASH promotion allow knowing disparities between urban and rural financing and also between subsectors. Monitoring the percentage of the national/local WASH budget directed towards expanding access to services to the underserved population (United Nations, 2002) is important from a HR perspective but the current proposal does not provide this kind of information. In former cycles there was a questionnaire for external supporting agencies which allows monitoring international financial and non-financial assistance provided by developed States. It is expected that it will be included again in 2013-2014 cycle.

The independent expert emphasizes that HRWS does not express a preference over models of service provision where non-State service providers can play an important role in delivering WASH services (United Nations, 2010). In this context where private sector participation gained legitimacy, State parties' obligations to protect HRWS is of particular importance. B7 is focused on monitoring service providers but it does not allow for specific evaluations of private sector involvement. In 2011-2012 survey there were several questions that offered more information about private sector participation but they have been eliminated in 2013-2014 cycle.

Finally, open questions in GLAAS survey are a rich source of information as it has been demonstrated elsewhere (Jiménez, Cavill, & Cairncross, 2014). Due to their qualitative properties, those have the potential to contribute to HRWS information needs more extensively. It is important to know countries' definition of disadvantaged population or groups (A8), what it is considered to be an effective complaint mechanism (A13), the kind of performance indicators to track progress in each country to evaluate if those are rights-based (B6) or the description of the measures taken to reduce inequities in access and levels of service (D5), among others.

A proposal to move forward

HRWS elements not properly included in UN Water monitoring platforms analysed are taken up again in this section where some ideas concerning the way these shortcomings could be rectified are presented in table 2. A proposal about the platform that could include gaps of information pointed out before, potential indicators to address it based on specialized literature and the techniques that can be used are displayed in it.

Criteria	W/S*	Element	Platform that could include the element	Potential Indicator	Technique**
Availability	W	Priority of essential levels of drinking water over other uses	GLAAS	Priority of essential levels of drinking water [Roaf et al, 2005]	a
Physical Accessibility	W/S	Security at water points, sanitation facilities and paths	JMP	1. Is the path to the water source/sanitation facility safe? [Flores et al, 2013]	b
	W	Secure access to CWS	GLAAS	1.Existence of regulations and policies to provide secure access to CWS [Roaf et al, 2005] 2.Arbitrary interferences with customary or traditional arrangements for water allocation 3.Effective measures to prevent third parties from interfering with the enjoyment of the HRW of populations using CWS	1: a 2&3: d
Quality/ Safety	W	Pollution: regulation, policies, disincentives and penalties	GLAAS	1.Existence of regulations and policies to control pollution of water sources [Roaf et al, 2005] 2.Disincentives and penalties for pollution (States) [Roaf et al, 2005] 3.Number of people whose human right to safe drinking water has been violated due to direct causes of contamination	1&2: a 3: d
	W	Household water treatment (unimproved)	JMP	What do you usually do to the water to make it safer? [JMP (2006)]	b
	S	Sanitary conditions	JMP	Insects-flies / unpleasant smell / cleanliness [Scott et al, 2003]	e
Affordability	W/S	Household expenditure on drinking water and sanitation	JMP	1. HH expenditure on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene / National poverty line [JMP 2013] 2. Expenditure restricts other basic expenses (right to education, food...)	b
	W	Disconnections	GLAAS / JMP	1.Legal prohibition, procedural protections [Roaf et al, 2005] 2.Proportion of HH that have been disconnected from water supply at least once per year [Roaf et al, 2005] 3.Have you been disconnected from water supply last year?	1: a 2: f 3: b

Acceptability	W	Colour, odour and taste	JMP	Organoleptic characteristics -Perception- [Flores et al, 2013]	b
	S	Privacy, positioning, conditions of use, dignity (household)	JMP	Sanitation facility privacy and location -Perception-	b
General	W/S	Human right to water/sanitation justiciability	GLAAS	1.Can people claim their HRWS in a domestic court or similar institution? [UN-Water 2011] // Which are the mechanisms? 2.Number of actions that have been (brought before/resolved by) the Courts	c
	W/S	Private sector participation	GLAAS	1.Percentage of service provision contracted out to the private sector [UN-Water 2011] 2.Government (or a regulator) monitors safety and the affordability of drinking-water supplied by private sector [UN-Water 2011]	c
Accountability	W/S	Civil society inclusion in monitoring process	GLAAS	Collect information about civil society inclusion in monitoring process	d
Non-discrimination - Equity	W/S	Financial flows to address the needs of vulnerable groups	GLAAS	Besides urban-rural, include vulnerable and marginalised groups (in line with JMP Post 2015 proposal but paying special attention to what is considered "disadvantaged groups")	c & f
	W/S	Inequities reduction	JMP	It is necessary to clearly define disadvantaged groups in each country. Review mechanism proposed to progressively eliminate inequalities (to avoid in-country perpetuation of some forms of discrimination)	g

*W: Water // S: Sanitation **a. Revision of national plans of action, policies and/or laws // b. Direct Question (HH) // c. Direct Question (Authorities) // d. Consult Civil Society Organizations // e. Check through observation // f. Consult official data // g. Review methodology

Conclusions

Fukuda-Parr (2011) states that human development analysis can benefit from human rights perspectives and vice versa. In line with this assertion, first it is evident that JMP Post 2015 proposal and GLAAS 2013-2014 survey have fed from human right to water and sanitation framework, which it is very relevant as it introduces new visions in the field. Secondly, the combined use of methods and data from these two human development sector mechanisms can contribute considerably to human right to water and sanitation monitoring. JMP by nature contributes with outcome indicators that may be used to assess the status of the right holders. In comparison with ongoing MDGs-related initiatives, the JMP proposal is a significant step forward towards a monitoring framework where human rights elements are properly included. GLAAS complements JMP adding structural and process indicators for measuring duty bearers' obligations.

By contrast, there are still some critical gaps if both UN water platforms will be used to report progress on human rights to water and sanitation. According to the normative criteria, affordability at household level remains unsolved despite human rights experts have expressed concerns about the importance to visualise it. More attention has to be paid to acceptability issues as well. There are no clear rules about the inclusion of some elements at the dwelling but not in the public institutions, and vice versa, as it is the case of water quality or MHM respectively. The negative effects that water resources contamination has on downstream access to safe drinking water have been largely reported. For a human rights approach it is important to monitor the existence of regulation and policies to control pollution of water sources which is not possible using these platforms. The issue of disconnections is one of the most controversial elements of the HRWS. It could be possible to measure the proportion of HH that have been disconnected from water supply at least once a year but the question has not been addressed. States control and regulation when private sector is involved is necessary too. Both mechanisms are sensitive to non-discrimination and equity issues but more attention should be paid to methods and data if there is a wish to avoid perpetuation of some forms of discrimination.

But, nonetheless, these shortcomings could be rectified, building on existing monitoring mechanisms and taken into account relevant literature proposals as it is suggested in the article. Another way forward for research in this area could be to apply this kind of analysis at different scales, looking for the implications at national and local level.

Finally as a limitation of the article, to analysed cross-cutting and general indicators together for both human rights could be debatable due to policies could differ from drinking water to sanitation subsectors.

References

- Flores, O., Jiménez, A., & Pérez-Foguet, A. (2013). Monitoring access to water in rural areas based on the human right to water framework: A local level case study in Nicaragua. *International Journal of Water Resources Development*, 29(4), 605-621.
- Fukuda-Parr, S. (2011). The Metrics of Human Rights: Complementarities of the Human Development and Capabilities Approach. [Article]. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 12(1), 73-89.
- Fukuda-Parr, S., Lawson-Remer, T., & Randolph, S. (2008). Measuring the Progressive Realization of Human Rights Obligations: An Index of Economic and Social Rights Fulfillment. *Economics Working Papers*, Paper 200822.
- Jiménez, A., Cavill, S., & Cairncross, S. (2014). The neglect of hygiene promotion in developing countries, as shown by the Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water survey. *Journal of Water, Sanitation and Hygiene for Development*, 4(2), 240-247.
- Joint Monitoring Programme. (2006). *Core questions on drinking-water and sanitation for household surveys*. Geneva JMP.
- Joint Monitoring Programme. (2013). Post-2015 WASH targets and indicators. Retrieved from http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/Fact_Sheets_4_eng.pdf.
- Joint Monitoring Programme. (2014). WASH targets and indicators post-2015: Recommendations from international consultations. Updated April 2014. Retrieved from http://www.wssinfo.org/fileadmin/user_upload/resources/post-2015-WASH-targets-factsheet-12pp.pdf.
- Langford, M., Bartram, J., & Roaf, V. (2014). Revisiting Dignity: The Human Right to Sanitation. In M. Langford & A. F. S. Russell (Eds.), *The Right to Water: Theory, Practice and Prospects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luh, J., Baum, R., & Bartram, J. (2013). Equity in water and sanitation: Developing an index to measure progressive realization of the human right. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*, 216(6), 662-671.
- Martinez-Alier, J. (2014). The environmentalism of the poor. *Geoforum*, 54, 239-241.
- Meier, B. M., Kestenbaum, J. G., Kayser, G. L. Y. N., Amjad, U. Q., & Bartram, J. (2014). Examining the Practice of Developing Human Rights Indicators to Facilitate Accountability for the Human Right to Water and Sanitation. *Journal of Human Rights Practice*, 6(1), 159-181.
- Riedel, E. (2006). The IBSA procedure as a tool of human rights monitoring. Retrieved from http://riedel.uni-mannheim.de/inhalt/unterdokumente/downloads/ibsa/ibsa2/2_the_ibsa_procedure_as_a_tool_of_human_rights_monitoring_1_1.pdf.
- Roaf, V., Khalfan, A., & Langford, M. (2005). *Monitoring implementation of the right to water: a framework for developing indicators*. Berlin: Heinrich Böll Foundation.

- Scott, R., Cotton, A. P., & Govindan, B. (2003). *Sanitation and the Poor*. : Loughborough, London & Delft WELL Resource Centre (WEDC, LSHTM & IRC).
- UN-Water. (2011). UN-Water GLAAS questionnaire 2011, http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/glaas_report_2012/en/.
- UN-Water. (2013). UN-Water GLAAS questionnaire 2013, http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/glaas/glaas_report_2014/en/.
- United Nations. (2002). *The Right to Water*. E/C.12/2002/1. General Comment No. 15 of the Economic and Social Council, . New York: UN.
- United Nations. (2003). *Report of Paul Hunt, Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health*. New York: UN.
- United Nations. (2008). *Report on indicators for promoting and monitoring the implementation of human rights*. HRI/MC/2008/3* International Human Rights Instruments. Geneva.
- United Nations. (2009). *Report of the independent expert on the issue of human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque*. A/HRC/12/24. New York: UN.
- United Nations. (2010). *Report of the independent expert on the issue of human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque*. A/HRC/15/31. New York: UN.
- United Nations. (2011). *Manual on Human Rights monitoring*. HR/P/PT/7/Rev.1, . New York and Geneva.
- United Nations. (2012). *Report of the independent expert on the issue of human rights obligations related to access to safe drinking water and sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque*. A/67/270. New York: UN.