Transition to climate resilience – What have we learnt about delivering access to WASH services?
Session notes

Background
The Water for Women Fund was granted a two-year implementation extension and transitioned to a 'principal' climate investment meaning it was 100% climate financed; Project designs were assessed against the OECD Rio Markers. A lot of key learnings from this transition is useful for the WASH sector as well as the wider development sector.

Responding to climate risks -What does it mean to be risk informed?
- WfW projects demonstrating their understanding of climate risk-informing through their project activities -largely through WASH processes and tools that sought changes in WASH services (i.e. adaptation).
- In some settings adaptations were substantive (e.g. switching water supply system in schools from rainwater systems to pumped groundwater);
- In other settings, the risk-informed processes resulted in less infrastructure adaptation but more in terms of management (e.g. modifying O&M management to be more responsive to flooding and related landslide events but otherwise maintained same engineering design).
- A third case emerged whereby the 'risk-informed' process showed an existing approach or design for providing WASH services was already optimally climate resilient and no adaptation were required at this time. In these cases, there were no difference between good quality WASH services and climate-resilient services.
- *"Good WASH projects that understand hazards and have experience with addressing them are well place to undertake risk-informed climate-resilient WASH programming" - Lee Leong*
- *"Climate change is uncertain, so we have to have adaptive planning" - Diana Gonzalez*
- WASH projects should be thinking about climate resilient outcomes alongside (not above) GEDSI and health outcomes – that's what a good WASH program looks like.

Adaptations to WASH services -What does it look like when WASH services are made to be more climate resilient in different contexts?
- *"CR is a good comparison with GEDSI where the WASH sector has had longer to define and understand GEDSI - I think we need more time to define CR to have the same journey" -Naomi Francis*
- Learning from WfW Fund is that through the risk-informing WASH processes, where upfront investment to do so is high (e.g. highly robust infrastructure against climate change), a more cost-effective approach to building resilience may be to opt for a less robust design and build the capacity to maintain the infrastructure well and replace regularly with low-tech, locally resourced techniques.

Sustainability for climate resilience -Can there by climate resilience without sustainability?
- *"Projects need to continually engage with the trade-off between technological complexity and sustainability and demonstrate that solutions are effective, as systems that are not sustainable* ***do not deliver*** *on climate resilience. This is the whole system including operation and maintenance, financing, capacity, spare parts, management, etc." - Lee Leong*

- If we think about sustainability and climate resilience as processes more than end points, a better balance can be struck between focus on building infrastructure vs capacity to maintain and sustain.