



**3rd MEETING OF THE
OECD WATER GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE**

28 – 29 April 2014, Casa de América, Madrid

HIGHLIGHTS



The *OECD Water Governance Initiative* (WGI) is an international multi-stakeholder network of around 100 delegates from public, private and not-for-profit sectors gathering twice a year in a Policy Forum to share on-going reforms, projects, lessons and good practices in support of better governance in the water sector. It was launched on 27-28 March 2013 in Paris and held its 2nd Meeting on 7-8 November 2013 (OECD Headquarters, Paris).

The OECD WGI aims to:

1. **Advise governments** in taking the needed steps for effective water governance reforms through policy dialogue across decision-makers at different levels;
2. Provide a **technical platform** to discuss analytical work on water governance through peer-to-peer exchanges and knowledge sharing;
3. Provide a **consultation mechanism** to raise the profile of governance issues in the **Global Water Agenda** (World Water Forum, Post-2015 Agenda)
4. Support the implementation of the governance targets designed for the 6th World Water Forum (Marseille, 2012) up to the 7th **World Water Forum** (Korea, 2015); and
5. Contribute to the design of **OECD Principles on Water Governance** and **OECD Indicators on Water Governance** to engage decision-makers at all levels, within and outside the water sector, commit to action

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY HIGHLIGHTS	3
NEXT STEPS	5
SUMMARY RECORD.....	7
Opening Remarks	7
Launch of OECD report on Water Governance in the Netherlands	7
Update on recent activities of the WGI	9
On the road to the 7 th World Water Forum.....	9
A Sustainable Development Goal on Water?.....	11
Measuring the performance of water governance: which indicators?	14
Water Governance in the Middle East and North Africa region	16
Water governance at the international and national level: Lessons and challenges learnt by Spain	18
Parallel working session of the thematic working groups.....	19
Stakeholder engagement	19
Performance and governance of water supply and sanitation services	20
Basin Governance.....	21
Integrity and Transparency	21
OECD Principles on Water Governance: Getting Started.....	22
Tour de table of water governance reforms, events and initiatives	25
Wrap-up and next steps	27
ACRONYMS	28
CALENDAR OF 2014-2015 WATER-RELATED EVENTS	29

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

1. The 3rd WGI meeting was held in Madrid, Spain, under the auspices of the Spanish Development Co-operation Agency, the Secretary General for International Development Co-operation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Co-operation, and the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and the Environment. The meeting gathered more than 90 members of the WGI, and 45 observers (click [here](#) to see the list of participants). In addition, around 80 persons joined the event “virtually” via the web broadcast. In all, 21 countries were represented as well as major stakeholders and organisations within and outside the water community.

2. The meeting had the following objectives (click [here](#) to consult the agenda of the meeting):

- Discuss recent developments in the **Global Water Agenda**, especially the road to the 7th World Water Forum (Korea, 2015) and the preparation and negotiation of post-2015 water-related targets;
- Discuss the scope, rationale and building blocks of **OECD Principles on Water Governance**, based on the scoping paper prepared by the Secretariat and key messages from the working groups;
- Discuss policy messages from the 4 **Thematic Working Groups** on stakeholder engagement; performance and governance of water services; basin governance; and integrity and transparency;
- Discuss ways forward to build **Water Governance Indicators** to support the effectiveness and performance institutions and governance arrangements at macro, sectoral; institutional and project level;
- Draw lessons from **regional initiatives** in support of better water governance, in particular in Latin America, Middle East and North Africa, and Africa.
- Share experience on **water governance reforms, events and projects**.

3. Delegates **WELCOMED**:

- The support deployed by Spain to host the 3rd Meeting of the OECD WGI in the Casa de América in Madrid.
- The progress achieved since the 2nd Meeting of the WGI on 7-8 November 2013, in terms of:
 - ✓ Bringing in **new members** from within and outside the water community;
 - ✓ Launching the online version of the **Inventory of water governance** tools and guidelines;
 - ✓ Creating an **online community platform** to easily access background documents;
 - ✓ Keeping the **thematic working groups** active between 2 plenary meetings through webinars, workshops, and exchange of draft documents.
 - ✓ Preparing background material with **draft messages** as inputs for water governance Principles and Indicators.

4. Delegates **AGREED** that the scoping notes prepared by the Secretariat and the dedicated discussions during the meeting on **Principles and Indicators on Water Governance** were instrumental to kick-off the work up to 2016:

- The development of Principles and Indicators will run in parallel, strengthening the role of the WGI as a **discussion platform** to help advance standard setting in the field of water governance;
- The **input-based** and **bottom-up process** will include several opportunities for wide consultation and stakeholder engagement across OECD member and non-member countries

- OECD Principles will target primarily **policymakers** in OECD (34) countries, and may also apply to the 100+ partner countries if sustained with effective **regional consultations** that can tailor some of the principles or implementation toolkit to regional specifics in Latin America, Africa, Asia and Africa.
 - Principles will provide an instrument to set water reform processes in motion and help identify essential points of leverage for change, to **move from good to better governance**;
 - A multi-stakeholder **Advisory Board** will be set-up to provide guidance throughout the development of the Principles and link with country reform agenda for impactful and action-oriented policy guidance;
 - To support the implementation of the Principles, **fact-based** and **perception based policy indicators** will be developed at different **scales** to assess the performance of water institutions, in connection with global and operational indicators;
 - Principles and Indicators to be developed could provide inputs to a potential **dedicated sustainable development goal on water**, keeping in mind that this intergovernmental process has a different timeline and agenda;
5. Future **communications** on the OECD WGI will feature a 1-page summary of the meeting to be disseminated more broadly to the water community in the days following plenary meetings, which delegates can convey to their own networks, websites and social media platforms.
6. Delegates **ADVISED** the Steering Committee of the WGI to
- continue rallying **new members**, especially out-of-the-water-box players and local authorities which remain under-represented; and
 - prepare a note on the WGI **communication strategy** to clarify the approach adopted, different channels available and how members can contribute to disseminate key policy messages.
7. Delegates **SHARED** experience, views and knowledge on:
- Current **projects and publications on water governance** including WIN's forthcoming flagship publication on water integrity which will be a collection of examples, cases, and facts for evidence-based advocacy for water integrity to inform and communicate to the public; South African Water Research Commission's up-coming book on water governance which will include a chapter featuring the OECD WGI; Électricité de France's initiative on the impact of the energy sector on water; and the OECD's on-going project on water governance in future cities which will explore the drivers for adaptive forms of water management in urban areas.
 - **Up-coming events** that could provide opportunities to disseminate the WGI's messages and share the progress on thematic activities. The **3rd Istanbul International Water Forum** (27-29 May) will host a side event on stakeholder engagement; Australia will organise conference on freshwater governance (2015); IME and GWP-Med will organise the **2nd Mediterranean Water Forum** (26-27 November, Murcia) to address water governance challenges in the MENA region; UNECE will hold the **9th meeting of the Working Group on IWRM** (25-26 June, Geneva) to discuss, among other issues, principles for effective joint bodies on transboundary water cooperation; and IWRA invited delegates to submit scientific paper to contribute to IWRA **World Congress** (25-29 May 2015, Edinburg).
 - On-going water governance **reforms** and **initiatives**.

- ✓ In the **Netherlands**, following the policy dialogue on water governance with the OECD, concrete follow-up actions are taking place to i) raise awareness on water-related risks and the need for sizable investments and basic evacuation policies; ii) develop new standards for dams and dikes; introduce new economic incentives (e.g. polluter-pay-principle) in regions where long term investments are needed; and iv) design innovative contracts to improve dialogue between academics and policy makers.
- ✓ **Jordan** is currently revising its legislative framework for water and a law on public-private partnerships is pending. This provides a window of opportunity to address governance and financing challenges to private sector participation, reduce regulatory risks in the sector and enhance stakeholder engagement to improve accountability and buy-in.
- ✓ As part of its post-revolutionary recovery, **Tunisia** is rethinking its water governance framework with a view to ensure the financial viability and budgetary sustainability of private sector participation in the sector, improve transparency mechanisms, and strengthen stakeholder engagement.
- ✓ The National Water Authority of **Peru** provided an overview of the institutional framework for water management in the country, and is currently pilot-testing water resources management plans in 6 river basins.
- ✓ **France** shared the outcomes of the evaluation of water policy conducted in 2013 and the practical measures that will be taken to address issues of water quality, policy fragmentation and financing challenges.
- ✓ **EDF** is conducting two initiatives related to governing water allocation, looking at evaluating the impact of the energy sector on water at the local level, and developing co-ordinated management and financing strategies to manage multipurpose uses of hydro reservoirs and limit risks over competitive uses of water.

8. Delegates **PROPOSED** to host **regional consultations** during the development of the Principles and Indicators on Water Governance in Latin America (CODIA) and MENA countries (MENBO); foster **scientific reflections** on the draft Principles and Indicators and greater involvement of the research community through the academic members of the network (e.g. IRSTEA).

NEXT STEPS

- Coordinators of the thematic working groups will follow-up with the respective contributors to revise the draft note on key messages and draft principles; progress on the definition of indicators; and suggest meetings dates up to the next meeting of the WGI.
 - ✓ **WG n°1** on stakeholder engagement will meet on 2 July by webinar and on 19 September at OECD Headquarters, Paris.
 - ✓ **WG n°2** will be meeting and sharing comments during the ASTEE meeting in Orléans (France, 4 June 2014) and IWA Congress (Lisbon, 21-26 September). In that occasion, the WG will further clarify the preparatory work towards the 7th WWF.
 - ✓ **WG n°4** will meet tentatively during the Stockholm World Water Week (31 Aug-5 Sept) and during the fall by webinar to clarify the expected inputs from the contributors on the different documents and activities.
 - ✓ Dates for **WG n°3** will follow shortly.
 - ✓ The 4th meeting of WGI will be held on **24-25 November 2014**, at OECD Headquarters, Paris.
- The timeline for the preparation of **Principles and Indicators on Water Governance** is as follow:

- **September 2014:** Production of a consolidated draft, building on the Working Groups' inputs, and submission to working groups for preliminary comments;
- **4th Meeting of the WGI (24-25 November 2014):** Peer-review on the draft Principles ;
- **7th WWF (12-17 April 2015):** Specific session for broader consultation and buy-in ;
- **May-December 2015:** Consultation with member states; Regional consultations in the different continents, in co-operation with the Regional Partners of the WGI;
- **2016:** Inputs to the OECD Recommendation on Water and consultation within OECD committees and bodies;

SUMMARY RECORD

Opening Remarks

9. Mr Gonzalo Robles Orozco, Secretary General for International Cooperation and Development of Spain and Director of the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation for Development (AECID), welcomed the delegates and expressed his pleasure to be hosting the 3rd meeting of the OECD WGI in Madrid. Water governance is an issue of paramount importance to Spain, both nationally and internationally. Uneven access to water poses great challenges to food security and sustainable development, which deserve global attention and collective efforts to be overcome, especially in a context of climate change and rising water tensions in some parts of the world. He emphasized that key principles such as equity, legitimacy, efficiency, transparency and accountability form the basis of water governance systems. SDGs can contribute to the global response to water imbalances, and the OECD WGI is a crucial platform to push forward adequate planning and participatory governance which are both crucial to sustainability. He reminded delegates that Spain's commitment to the Millennium Development Goals materialised in 2007 with the creation of the [Millennium Development Goals Achievement Fund \(MDG-F\)](#). In addition, within the framework of the [Cooperation Fund for Water and Sanitation in Latin America and Caribbean \(FCAS\)](#), 19 countries from Latin America have participated in 62 programs and projects on water and sanitation since 2009. Such efforts will continue with the new [Sustainable Development Goals achievement fund](#) which was set-up in 2007 with the contribution from the Government of Spain to the United Nations system. The task ahead will be to articulate these different tools for better water governance in the post-2015 development agenda.

10. Federico Ramos de Armas, the Spanish Secretary of State for Environment, thanked the delegates for their presence in Madrid. He recalled that the water crisis is primarily a crisis of governance and that the case of Spain is no exception. The geographical and temporal distribution of rainfall is uneven across the country. Episodes of droughts and floods have been triggered major emphasis on water planning and infrastructure system for meeting the needs of cities and irrigated agriculture. Spanish water management follows a participatory and consensus-based approach within the framework of 25 river basin districts (created in 1926) and watershed plans. In its role, the Spanish Ministry of Agriculture, Food and the Environment provides clear rules, legal certainty and transparency to build trust among users and operators, and to facilitate public-private cooperation. The implementation of the [European Water Framework Directive](#) as well as the economic crisis, have raised challenges in Spain and the country is currently working with the European Commission to find the appropriate tools for integrating the requirements of the Directive. A priority for the Spanish water sector to meet future challenges is to work towards better integration between domestic water supply and other sources of water, both conventional and innovative (e.g. desalination, water reuse, etc.). In addition, Spain has been actively engaged in Latin America and the MENA region to share lessons learnt and good practices on water management, provide training and raise awareness, through initiatives such as the [Conference of Ibero-american Directors of Water](#), AECID's [Supply and Sanitation cooperation strategy](#), and the [Strategy 5+5 in the Mediterranean](#).

Launch of OECD report on Water Governance in the Netherlands

11. Key highlights from the OECD report [Water Governance in the Netherlands: Fit for the Future?](#) were presented. The report is the result of an 18 month-long Policy Dialogue between a wide range of Dutch authorities and the OECD aiming to assess the performance and capacity of Dutch water governance in coping with future challenges. It was launched on 17 March 2014 by the OECD Deputy-Secretary-General Yves Leterme, in the presence of Ms. Melanie Schultz van Haegen, Ministry for Infrastructure and the Environment of the Netherlands, and was the subject of extensive media coverage. OECD evidence-based assessment was received enthusiastically by the Dutch government who committed to take concrete steps to support the implementation of OECD recommendations, including the endorsement of the report

by the Parliament. The report highlights the excellent track record of Dutch water management but warns that excellency should not lead to complacency. The Dutch *acquis* is being challenged by environment and development trends which create pressing and emerging challenges, especially in terms of water resources quality. Key findings point out an important awareness gap from Dutch citizens' on water-related risks and costs, a limited use of economic incentives, a lack of transparency on the relative and absolute cost-efficiency of the sector, the absence of independent accountability and monitoring mechanisms at an arm's length from water institutions. The development of a new Environmental Planning Act (expected by 2018) provides a window for opportunities to make change happen and consider some short and medium term reform. Following the launch of the report, concrete commitments have been made by the Dutch administration, including the launch of a national "wake-up call" through an extensive awareness campaign (e.g. media, public debates, education) on the need for sizable investments and basic evacuation policies. Cooperation should be enhanced across sub-national actors (regional water authorities, municipalities and drinking water companies) and among ministries to break silo approaches. The Delta Programme will also factor in some OECD recommendations, including the development of new standards for dams and dikes. New economic incentives (e.g. polluter-pay-principle) will be introduced in regions where long term investments are needed; and innovative contracts will be designed to improve dialogue between academics and policy makers. Through this forward-looking process, the Netherlands succeeded in working hand in hand with the OECD in an effort to become a better version of itself. Countries such as Mexico and Brazil have engaged in similar exercise and new countries are welcomed to partner with the OECD based on tailored and demand-driven approaches.

12. Francisco Nunes Correia, peer-reviewer from **Portugal** in the Policy Dialogue, shared his testimony. He explained that although governance models cannot be easily exported from one context to another, they can provide inspiration for improvement. OECD Policy dialogues help assess water governance models and are valuable to identify some results-based criteria to characterise good or bad governance, despite disparities and case specificities, which can be interesting beyond the water sector (i.e. sense of citizenship, transparency). In respect to water security, the illusion of safety deserves particular attention because it undermines the political support required for reforms and discourages investments. The case of the Netherlands has shown that water governance is deeply rooted in history and memory, which both tend to influence how a country can set up future-proof water governance. Key characteristics of the Netherlands, such as the polder approach, meaningful consensus building, and multi-stakeholder dialogues started with water but became much broader concepts that are deeply embedded in the society and political system. Thus, the Netherlands should rely on their strengths from the past to be fit the future.

13. Bernard Barraqué participated in the policy dialogue as an expert from **France** and explained that such an exercise offers an excellent opportunity to up-date the usual approach to benchmarking water policies across countries. The review of Dutch water governance revealed that social dimensions are a crucial component to water management and that there needs to be more cohesion between people living up-land bearing the costs from the wealthiest parts of the Netherlands that are below sea-level. He also warned that the redistributive effect of the Dutch water financing system has been largely ignored and deserves greater attention in the future.

14. Peter Glas, President of the Dutch Regional Water Authorities, was a key interlocutor throughout the policy dialogue and shared with delegates the value-added of such an exercise, emphasising the iterative nature of the OECD consultation process and economic analysis. He committed to addressing the challenges highlighted in the report, such as the awareness gap and water quality issues related to farmers and industries, towards greater adaptive water governance.

Update on recent activities of the WGI

15. Since the last meeting of the WGI (7-8 November 2013), 7 **new members** have joined the network including national government's representatives (United States and China), energy providers (GDF-Suez), NGOs (Global Water Initiative, Water Youth Network, Circle of Blue) and research institutions (Utrecht University, International Journal of Water Governance). In addition, the 3rd meeting welcomed for the first time the National Water Authority of Peru, the Global Environment Facility, the European Landowners' Organization and the Metropolitan Authority of Barcelona.

16. Practical actions have been taken in line with the conclusions of the last meeting. The [Inventory of water governance tools and guidelines](#) was revised to include the comments received from the delegates and was launched online in January 2014. It will be up-dated on a regular basis to include future inputs. An [online community platform](#) was created for delegates to easily share documents. Scoping notes on **Principles and Indicators on water governance** were prepared by the OECD Secretariat and circulated to delegates before the meeting.

17. **Thematic Working Groups** have been active since the last meeting to produce draft key messages and principles on each of their areas. Working Group n°1 on **stakeholder engagement** held a webinar on 17 January to discuss an extensive questionnaire on stakeholder engagement which was sent over to more than 200 respondents. Working Group n°2 on the **governance of water and sanitation services** prepared a scoping note and reflected on indicators to measure performance of water regulators. Working Group 3 on **basin governance** gathered some of its members during the [EURO-INBO Meeting](#) in December 2013 in Bulgaria and also prepared some background material to be discussed tomorrow morning in the breakout session. Working Group 4 on **integrity and transparency** held a webinar on 22 January to launch the work on water integrity codes of conducts and indicators, and organised a [Water Integrity Workshop](#) on 20 March.

On the road to the 7th World Water Forum

18. The 2nd [Stakeholder Consultation Meeting](#) took place on 28-29 February in Gyeongju, Korea, as part of the preparatory process of the 7th WWF. The meeting offered opportunities to present the **framework of the Forum**, further develop the program building on expertise from the international community; and call for participation in working groups. The 7th WWF will rely on **4 processes**: political, regional, science and technology, and thematic, the latter being structured around **actions goals**. i) water security for all, ii) water for development and prosperity; and iii) water for sustainability; as well as **action tools** to construct feasible implementation mechanisms, including effective governance (theme 4.2). The definition and composition of the working groups will proceed in June and the draft Forum Program will be released in December. Registration to the event will start in May.

19. The [Thematic Process of the 7th WWF](#) constitutes the backbone of the Forum and aims to cover **water challenges in all sectors** while drawing out **resolutions** and **roadmaps to visible implementation**, in co-operation with the other processes. A Thematic Process Commission was appointed to define the strategic orientations of the process and is co-chaired by Hyoseop Woo from the Korea Institute for Construction Technology and Mark Smith from the International Union for Conservation of Nature. The Thematic Process will also include the *Water Showcase* as an online platform to share practical case-based project and experiences and provide reasonable resolutions and guidelines to common concerns (i.e. in terms of policy-making, capacity enforcement, etc.). The *Action Monitoring System* that will assess progress of activities and projects for the implementation roadmaps between World Water Fora. In addition, the Thematic Process will be broken down into *Special Groups* in charge of developing the Special Programs and the Action Monitoring System; *Design Groups* in charge of managing themes and

supporting the Water Showcase and the Action Monitoring System; and *Session Groups* in charge of thematic issues and helping to collect cases for the Water Showcase.

20. ASTEE provided an up-date on the progress of the **Science and Technology Process** which will focus on how innovation and science can help design solutions in 5 areas: i) efficient water management; ii) resource recovery for water and wastewater systems; iii) water and natural disasters; iv) smart technology for water; and v) understanding and managing ecosystems services for water. White papers will be prepared for each issue. The Process will also link to how policies can help innovation to be effectively implemented. The WGI can be a strategic partner to make real progress happen, including by providing comments on the white papers and being involved in special programs.

21. The Murcia Water Agency supports the role of WGI as a critical contributor to the governance theme of the Forum. Possible areas to be explored could be recommendations on **practical integrated management in semi-arid regions** as well as on solidarity and co-operation for water.

22. INBO explained that governance issues will also be part of the Regional Process of the 7th WWF. For instance, the **European Process**, coordinated by the Danish Water Forum and the French Water Partnership, will be kicked-off on 19 May in Brussels and European members of the WGI are welcomed to participate. The 2nd Stakeholder Consultation Meeting offered an opportunity to link the Thematic Process to WGI Working Group n°3 on basin governance and to introduce the EU Water Framework Directive implementation and transboundary basin management in Europe in the agenda of the Forum.

23. Butterfly Effect suggested that OECD Principles on water governance under development be discussed in the framework of the Thematic Process in order for the 7th WWF to serve as a test ground for a “**reality check**”. Apart from being an output of WGI, the Principles should be directly linked to the design groups to ensure that governance elements are well-incorporated in specific sessions.

24. WIN mentioned the efforts of WGI Working Group n°4 on water integrity and transparency to develop a **database on existing and forecasted governance assessment**, such as OECD policy dialogues on water that can serve as an entry point for thematic and regional work toward the 7th WWF.

25. UN Water Decade Programme welcomed the **integration of indicators into the governance theme** of the 7th WWF as it will be a key milestone to discuss the work of WGI ahead of the final adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

26. WBCSD acknowledged the WGI as an excellent foundation for the preparation of the next Forum and advised that the 7th WWF governance design groups be fully aligned with the structure of the WGI to **ensure continuity** and **reflects the effort of the international community**. The event will also provide opportunities to discuss and test the Principles and Indicators on water governance with the wider community.

27. SIWI welcomed the WWF as a useful platform to **share important governance messages with decision makers** and **build political support**. It will be critical to integrate governance discussions in other topics, such as investment in infrastructure (e.g. in sub-Saharan Africa, 30 to 50% of investments are lost after 2-5 years), but also for managing increasing conflicting demands and for supporting the realisation of water as a human right.

28. GWOPA has teamed up with UCLG and the World Water Council to initiate a **dialogue process between local authorities and water and sanitation utilities** as part of the [2nd Global WOPS Congress](#) (27-29 November 2013, Barcelona). This initiative, which first met during the [World Urban Forum](#) (5-11 April 2014, Medellin) has 2 objectives to i) encourage local authorities to sign the Istanbul Water Consensus with commitments for water and sanitation; and ii) discuss how to use good water governance

principles to integrate water and sanitation in urban development. The next dialogue sessions will take place during the [3rd Istanbul Water Forum](#) (27-29 May, Istanbul). Members of WGI are invited to participate in this process to maintain continuity and ensure that the Principles on water governance will be endorsed by both local authorities and water utilities at global level.

29. Australia suggested including the topic of **water-related events** (floods, droughts) in the water governance discussions at the 7th WWF, as well as building on the activities of the WGI working groups to exchange case studies and feed the Water Showcase.

30. GWP-Med will coordinate the **Mediterranean process** of the Forum in co-operation with the Mediterranean Institute for water (IME) for which governance holds a prominent place. It will work to align and complement the work of WGI on water governance with regional experiences and expertise.

31. El Salvador noted that the 7th WWF will be a good momentum for **raising awareness among policy makers on the critical challenges facing Latin American countries** and to raise the profile of access to water and sanitation in political agendas of the region.

32. Botin Foundation Water Observatory suggested that the concepts of **virtual water transfers** be discussed under the governance theme of the 7th WWF.

33. WWC reminded delegates of the 7th WWF Political Process in particular the **local authorities and parliamentarians processes** that are also crucial to water governance. It will be important for the thematic and political processes to remain interlinked, in particular leading to the adoption and implementation of SDG targets and indicators.

34. South Africa highlighted the **on-going reform efforts on water in emerging countries** as well as **gender issues** as two possible topics to be addressed by WGI (e.g. within the stakeholder engagement component of the Principles) on the road to the 7th WWF. A conference will be organised in South Africa on 23-25 June 2014 on water governance, regulation and financing, which can help raise awareness and political support amongst African Ministers.

35. Peru also welcomed the WWF as a strategic platform to **discuss and share water governance experiences across countries and governments** and to improve governance at large.

A Sustainable Development Goal on Water?

36. The Chair introduced the session by recalling that the Principles and Indicators on water governance under development will be a major outcome of the WGI's work to support an evaluation of governments' capacity to deliver expected outcomes of water policy, and are very timely in light of the on-going discussions on the **post-2015 development agenda**. There has been a large scale mobilisation of the international water community over the past year to call for a dedicated goal on water and sanitation, which raises formidable opportunities to make sure that **implementation** is addressed while designing such goals, and lessons are taken from the previous Millennium Development Goals framework. WGI stands ready to help support the development of process indicators that can track the effectiveness of institutions and put principles of accountability, participation and transparency as framework conditions for any water SDG to be agreed upon.

37. Gérard Payen, AquaFed and member of UNSGAB presented the process towards **Sustainable Development Goals** structured around global *aspirational goals*, measurable time-bound *targets* and *operational indicators*. UNSGAB recommended to include a comprehensive global goal on water with targets that respond to 3 objectives: i) achieve universal access to sustainable drinking water and sanitation; ii) increase wastewater management and pollution prevention; and iii) improve IWRM and water-use

efficiency. It was followed in January 2014 by a UN-Water call to include 5 water-related targets: i) water resources; ii) water governance; iii) water-related disasters; iv) wastewater pollution and water quality; and v) drinking water, sanitation and hygiene. Existing goals and rising needs are the subject of debates across and within UN-member countries, especially on the scope of a possible dedicated water goal and the precise content of possible water-related targets. For what concerns governance, 15 indicators have been proposed by UN-Water on IRWM, participatory decision-making, water services, regulatory frameworks and knowledge transfers, and will need to be streamlined. Negotiations are currently on-going in the Open Working Group on the SDGs which will make its final recommendations in September 2014, before the final SDG framework is adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2015.

38. Balázs Heinz of the Hungarian Ministry of Foreign Affairs presented the progress of the **Open Working Group on Sustainable Development Goals** which was established after the Rio+20 Conference and is composed of 30 members and 70 contributors. Additional stakeholders and experts from civil society, academia and UN agencies also share perspectives and experiences. Along with Kenya, **Hungary** chairs the Open Working Group and has been a long advocate for a dedicated water goal as stated in the [declaration](#) that followed the [Budapest Water Summit](#). The Open Working Group gathered for 10 stock-taking sessions and is now entering its 2nd phase to define goals and targets to be included in its proposed framework for the SDGs, which will be addressed to the UN General Assembly in September 2014. It will serve as a backbone for the UN Secretary General's report to be prepared in support of inter-governmental negotiations up to the adoption of the SDGs in September 2015. The Open Working Group will hold its next session on 6-9 May in New York City during which the status of water will be discussed.

39. WIN relayed concerns for what regards the **weak position of governance** in the agenda of the Open Working Group and called upon the members of WGI to recommend greater attention on the issue. Beyond the targets and indicators, SDGs can be a strong instrument to factor water governance into national and local processes.

40. Global Water Partnership has carried out extensive **consultation across 30 countries to map their interests regarding the SDGs** and has received very positive responses from the water community as well as from ministries of finance, planning and foreign affairs that have identified water as a strategic issue. The consultation also revealed that often, the SDG framework is used by countries to structure their own national strategic planning. As regards the indicators, feedbacks from countries show they were still considered as too complex and not specific enough to local contexts.

41. The Water Youth Network committed to **provide quality youth participation to the SDG process**, as it was the case during the Budapest Water Summit, and stressed the importance of involving young people in discussions related to capacity development and education as they are the keys to ensure the sustainability of the water sector and international processes themselves.

42. Spain has been advocating for a dedicated goal on water to the Open Working Group as a fundamental factor for development and under the framework of the human right to water. Issues of **residual water, efficient use of resources** and **participative management** should also be taken into consideration in the water-related targets as should governance, monitoring and co-operation to ensure the sustainable management of water in the post-2015 agenda.

43. WBCSD and the overall business community have been very supportive of a possible water goal but highlighted that governance has not been included in the current draft framework. The efforts of WGI to develop Principles on water governance should provide relevant inputs and synergies with the discussion on the SDGs. Conversely, should a water goal be adopted, it will have a critical impact on WGI work on principles and indicators. The WGI should stand ready to **support the implementation of the**

targets and should **contribute to streamlining and simplifying the operational indicators** suggested thus far.

44. UNDP Global Water Solidarity supports local to **local decentralised cooperation on water** and has been working to bring the voice of local actors into the SDG discussions. UNDP has also started a project to provide a framework for local governance and development in over 30 pilot countries and to create new opportunities to introduce water and sanitation components in local governance and planning frameworks as well as other development fields (health, education, etc.). UNDP GWS committed to help WGI shape principles and indicators on water governance and to monitor their implementation at the local level.

45. ASTEE called upon WGI to lobby for a dedicated water goal and governance target. It was advised that **indicators be rationalised into a composite form** that could be sufficiently simple to be understood at global level while still reflect all the issues at stake.

46. The Arno River Basin Authority supports the definition of a water goal, in particular for the positive impact it would have to overcome critical water quality and quantity challenges facing the Mediterranean region, and committed to support the WGI in developing **basin level indicators**, in collaboration with the [SDG solution network](#) coordinated by the University of Sienna.

47. Japan has been a strong advocate for a water goal in the post-2015 development agenda and in particular the definition of **targets on IWRM, wastewater management and water-related disasters** as mentioned by the Parliamentary Vice-Minister of Land, Infrastructure, Transport and Tourism, Toru Doi in his statement during the Budapest Water Summit.

48. Botin Foundation Water Observatory raised some concerns regarding the absence of reference to **water-related technological advances** in the SDG discussions. It was advised to consider integrating tools such as remote sensing and water footprint into a possible water goal.

49. WWC has strongly encouraged its members to be actively involved in promoting a water-related goal for the post-2015 agenda. A task-force, chaired by Karen Kurchneck, was established to investigate which governments were in favour or not of a water goal. It was advised that WGI members use their diplomatic channels to encourage **less vocal governments** to publicly express their support and the WWC stands ready to support the outreach.

50. Butterfly Effect noted that efforts were still needed to secure a stand-alone water goal and encouraged all members of the WGI to help convince the international community. Caution was advised on having water mainstreamed as a cross-cutting issue in the post-2015 agenda as there is a **risk of losing the intended impact**. A dedicated goal would also greatly help countries to raise the profile of water in their national agendas and budgets. Therefore, the targets would have to be universal while calling for national translations into policies and plans.

51. NARBO shared some concerns regarding the little attention water governance has received in the SDG discussions thus far and advised that the WGI help advocate for a water goal as well as contribute to **making it applicable outside the water sector**.

52. Gérard Payen thanked the delegates for their support and shared words of caution regarding the definition of operational indicators as levers for national policies. Indeed, appropriate indicators are instrumental for peer-to-peer and social pressure on governments to achieve the targets and represent the value added of the SDG framework. However, the effort of WGI to develop water governance indicators (descriptive and process-oriented) is independent from the post-2015 agenda and there is no guarantee that the latter will include inputs to be provided by the former as this is a separate intergovernmental process.

On the road to SDGs, the 7th **WWF ministerial declaration** will offer a unique opportunity for governments to voice their support for a dedicated water goal and targets and WGI should ensure that such declaration includes governance messages.

53. Balázs Heincz explained that governance has been a dividing topic in the Open Working Group and called upon EU member states to **share governance targets that can be scaled up at global level and encourage their implementation in other countries**. Horizontal co-ordination within each country between environment, finance and foreign affairs administrations is also critical ahead of the vote on the SDG framework. It was possible in Africa following the Budapest Water Summit, where AMCOW has been leading dialogues on water with African Ministers of Foreign Affairs.

Measuring the performance of water governance: which indicators?

54. Key highlights from the scoping note on OECD water governance indicators were presented. Taking stock of existing indicators at project, sectoral, macro and institutional levels, the note highlights that although several sets of water governance indicators do exist, they fail to embrace the broad range of issues at stake. In developing indicators, key challenges have to be considered: the **complexity** of water governance, the **uncertainty** of the context and the difficulty in establishing **causality** between frameworks arrangements and outcomes. The note suggested a theoretical framework for building indicators based on the OECD Multi-level Governance Gaps framework, the 6th WWF targets on good governance and the inputs from the 4 thematic working groups. Indicators will have a strategic role in the water governance cycle to help move from **good to better water governance**, while tracking the effectiveness of institutions in delivering intended policy goals. This implies fostering a **dynamic assessment**, rather than a **static evaluation of governance**. In practice, monitoring the implementation of OECD Principles and country assessment will take different forms: e.g. institutional mapping, fact and figures on water governance; sub-indicators of each effectiveness dimension; brief explanation of the main investigated gaps and menu of options to bridge them.

55. NARBO shared some lessons from its [Performance Benchmarking of River Basin Organisations](#) and presented the **5 critical performance areas** that were selected: mission, stakeholders, learning and growth, internal business processes and financing. A set of 14 indicators was developed and has helped building convergence, commitment and co-operation, and facilitating networking across RBOs.

56. The [UN Water Assessment Programme](#) was established in 2009 and includes an internal expert group on indicators. Key findings from the Programme have been reported in the 3rd and 4th [World Water Development Reports](#) and important lessons learnt can benefit WGI's efforts to develop water governance indicators. It was advised that **indicators be replicable** and avoid the trap of being dependent on data availability, with the risk of having data-rich, but information-poor indicators. Water governance indicators face several difficulties such as: i) breaking the **vicious circle of poor governance and poor data**; ii) finding a **standardised measure of governance**, taking into account that the definition change from places to places; iii) **defining the performance of institutional and legal frameworks** rather than merely assessing their presence/absence; iv) taking into account the difficulty of establishing causality and consider **the role of externalities**.

57. Extensive research has been conducted on **IWRM indicators for river basin organisations**. Among the 115 indicators that were developed in 2005, some addressed water governance measures and covered issues of **co-ordinated decision-making**, **responsive decision-making**; and **accountability and monitoring**. They have been applied to several American river basin organisations (e.g. Delaware River Basin Commission) and at local levels (e.g. a floodplain management project).

58. Transparency International-Spain, in cooperation with the Water Observatory of the Botin Foundation, developed a [Water Management Transparency Index](#) to **measure information transparency** across water agencies. The 80 indicators, applied in 2010, 2011, 2013, aim at improving transparency by assessing the availability of online information regarding water agencies in Spain, Brazil and Portugal.

59. The National Water Agency of Brazil, in the framework of the [National Pact for Water Resources Management](#), has developed a methodology to **measure the complexity of states' water resource systems and institutional development frameworks**, looking at scope, intensity, number and dispersion of conflicts. The Pact acts as a mechanism to foster co-ordination between the states and the Federal Union, with the aim to strengthen water resource management at state level. The OECD is currently engaged in a policy dialogue with ANA-Brazil to provide recommendations on how to make this Pact happen on the ground, zooming on three states in particular: Rio de Janeiro, Paraiba and Rondônia. The draft report will be peer-reviewed at the 4th Meeting of WGI on 24-25 November 2014, at OECD, Paris.

60. UNECE-WHO/Europe [Protocol on Water and Health](#) has been instrumental to **monitor progress of countries in the Pan-European region to protect health through better water management**. Parties have the obligation to submit a report every 3 years based on different indicators, including on water governance. In addition, the Water Convention obliges countries to co-operate over water governance, although there is no reporting mechanisms in place so far.

61. INBO's key indicators on the **performance of cross-border water management** have been implemented in 10 transboundary basins in Africa. Conclusions show that homogeneity of indicators is complex across different countries, and further work should focus on standardising indicators.

62. A few comments were provided on the **rationale** for water governance indicators. Water Observatory of the Botin Foundation argued that the indicators should **help to spot problems and create incentives and trigger for change**. Decision making and implementation should be measured to foster integrity. It was advised to explore the potential of internet-based indicators. GWP highlighted the need for **dynamic indicators** to help decision making, following a goal and target oriented approach. IRSTEA advised to go beyond a static position of social structures, but also **measure transformative processes** and their evolution. Indicators should also include issues of **equity and justice**. AgroParisTech recalled that developing indicators should not be an end in itself, but a **means to achieve specific purposes**. Indicators will vary depending on the evaluation of policies, decision making processes, benchmarking, etc. Scotland also supported a **goal-oriented approach**, suggesting for instance to look at co-operation and local capacity building to improve participation in decision making and implementation. WIN recommended that **indicators be time-bound** and built according to a **progressive approach with different levels of complexity**. The indicators should also measure water management functions. GEF suggested that indicators be also useful for the evaluation of transboundary water management.

63. Delegates also provided comments on the **scale** of water governance indicators. The Water Observatory of the Botin Foundation, AECID and AgroParisTech agreed on the need of a **global indicator** of water governance. Also, when establishing indicators for people and policy makers, it will be crucial to take due account of **local specificities**. ASTEE suggested working at local and global levels to look at **activities** and **governance** while ensuring that indicators are politically well-understood. It was clarified that OECD water governance indicators will zoom on the policy dimension, and aim to provide a **set of proxies and metrics that can track the implementation of Principles on water governance** under preparation. Hence, the objective is not to find a magic blueprint to the longstanding debate on how to measure water governance, but provide policymakers with a concrete set of indicators that can assess the **performance and effectiveness of water policy**. Having said this, both meta-indicators and operational indicators will be relevant when it comes to developing a toolkit that will support the implementation of Principles on water governance across OECD member and partner countries.

64. Regarding the **roles and responsibilities** for setting up Indicators, GWP underlined the need for institutions to agree on the **monitoring arrangement** and on the processes for working together on their implementation. IRSTEA advised to organise a **stakeholder consensus conference** to discuss the water governance to provide for an open and inclusive process.

65. Regarding the **methodology**, WWAP and GWP highlighted that **human and financial resources** are needed not only for building up indicators, but more importantly for monitoring data in the long term. IRSTEA recommended carrying-out **cost-benefits analyses of indicator systems** in the field of water to assess how adequate is the information generated by previous contributions in the field. Japan Water Agency also advised to secure **regular evaluation** such as yearly peer- reviews of IWRM river basins. AECID underlined that close attention should be paid to the **impact of monitoring on the ground**.

66. Regarding the **development** of the Indicators, NARBO committed to **improve the accuracy** of the suggested water governance indicators by pilot-testing them across Asian RBOs. Bruce Hooper suggested that indicators measure, among others, the **effectiveness of resource management function**, keeping the roles of resource managers, regulators and utility providers separated. INBO suggested to link the development of Water Governance Indicators with the activities of the [European Environmental Agency](#) and its water thematic centre as it produces every year a **review of the state of water in the EU region** and collects a number of indicators

Water Governance in the Middle East and North Africa region

67. The OECD and the GWP-Med partnered on a project to **diagnose key governance obstacles to mobilising financing through public-private partnerships in Jordan and Tunisia**, and support the development of consensual action plans based on international good practices. The project was officially labelled by the Union for the Mediterranean (UfM) in July 2012 and launched in May 2013. The analytical work in Jordan and Tunisia was supported by a grant from the European Investment Bank (EIB). The Swedish International Development Agency funds the project regional platform.

68. GWP-Med co-implementer of project, alongside the OECD, leads the regional component of the dialogue through **multi-stakeholder national and regional workshops**. GWP-Med underlined the **consensus-oriented approach** of the project which provided a neutral platform for consultation between governments and stakeholders in Tunisia and Jordan, and helped facilitate dialogue at regional level between public authorities and the private sector.

69. Key findings from the reports were presented. OECD analysis of **governance challenges to private sector participation in Jordan and Tunisia's water sectors** is structured around 5 pillars: i) the policy and legislative framework; ii) the institutional roles and capacity; iii) the long-term financial sustainability; iv) transparency and accountability mechanisms; and v) experience with PPPs. Following evidence-based assessment of both Tunisia and Jordan, OECD reports include tailored policy recommendations and action plans.

70. In **Jordan**, the uncertainty surrounding the institutional and legislative framework both for water and PSP undermines the legal clarity, opportunity and stability of PSP in the water sector. The legislative framework for water is under revision and a PPP law is pending. The country is also facing a fiscal crisis and a cost-recovery crisis, which threatens the financial sustainability of the water sector. There is now a window of opportunity in Jordan to improve water governance. To support the country efforts, the OECD report [Water Governance in Jordan – Overcoming the challenges to private sector participation](#) provides ways forward to address governance and financing challenges to private sector participation. The report identifies ways forward to overcome bottlenecks focusing on three key pillars: i) managing public-private partnership in a fiscally constrained environment through appropriate budget processes; ii) reducing the

regulatory risks through supporting the development of a high-quality framework; and iii) managing and enhancing stakeholder engagement to improve accountability and buy-in.

71. In *Tunisia*, the water sector faces a deterioration of infrastructures and levels of water performance, as well as growing financing difficulties. Water governance relies on highly centralised responsibilities and decision making power. In such a context, the current situation of post-revolutionary recovery offers a unique opportunity to rethink the water governance framework and the role the private sector can play. The OECD report *La gouvernance des services d'eau en Tunisie – Surmonter les défis de la participation du secteur privé* offers a diagnosis of governance challenges and identifies 3 axis of policy recommendations to the intention of Tunisian authorities : i) understanding the variety of PSP modalities, their objectives and conditions for success; ii) insuring the financial viability and budgetary sustainability of PSP in the water sector; and iii) improving transparency mechanisms and strengthening stakeholder engagement.

72. On the topic of **stakeholder engagement**, Aqua Public Europa questioned whether the OECD policy recommendations included a clear identification of which categories of actors should be targeted and whether the OECD had formulated recommendations on the **financial needs and modalities for water provision in rural areas**.

73. The Mediterranean Institute for Water (IME) raised the question of **irrigation** as one of the biggest water user in the MENA region and which should be taken into account in the analysis of water governance challenges. The IME has worked on **benchmarking legislative and institutional frameworks for private sector participation** in the sector in the Mediterranean which is of interest for the project and could be the focus of a session during the [2nd Mediterranean Forum on Water](#) to be held in Murcia on 26-27 November 2014.

74. Delegates pointed to the paradoxical nature of water management in Tunisia where the national water and waste supply system is in place but large parts of the population are not connected and continue to rely on **community water management** raising questions on whether private sector involvement would address such inequalities. Also, **desalination** is becoming a preferred option, especially for hotels, but implies that these big water users do not rely any longer on the public water supply system thus contributing to the crisis of Tunisia's national water system.

75. South Africa underlined the risks related to private sector participation in contexts of weak regulatory frameworks as it can lead to preferences towards wealthy segments of the population. It was advised that assessing and building water governance should be part of a **broader political democratisation** and that the **correlation between democratic maturity and inclusive governance model** be investigated.

76. OECD shared some final take away messages from the policy dialogues. Looking at private sector participation in the water sector offered a **window to look at broader governance issues** such as stakeholder engagement, financial sustainability, and regulatory frameworks. The value added of the policy dialogues was to **dispel myths on private sector involvement** (i.e. not only valuable to bridge financial gaps) and build greater understanding on the necessary governance arrangements to make it work. In the case of Tunisia, good performances of water supply in past decades may have led to some complacency, while other countries in the region, such as Morocco, were very active in innovating and piloting new forms of governance.

77. GWP-Med also explained that the project targeted the relevant actors across the different institutions including, in addition to public authorities, a wide range of representatives from civil society, universities and research centres, private companies active in the countries, and donors. The project

focused only on drinking water and wastewater supply and did not expand to other uses of water but future collaboration could allow for further investigation. The projects helped **move forward new socio-political scenarios** in Jordan and Tunisia and encouraged a **mentality shift regarding private sector participation** in the water sector.

Water governance at the international and national level: Lessons and challenges learnt by Spain

78. Gonzalo Robles Orozco, Secretary General for International Cooperation and Development of Spain, opened the session by thanking the OECD for the opportunity to share the work developed by Spain, nationally and internationally, on water and sanitation. In line with UN Water *A Post-2015 Global Goal for Water: Synthesis of key findings and recommendations*, Spain has contributed to UN activities and orientations on water. The country helped launch the **Fund for Sustainable Development Goals (F-SDG)**, and made **universal access to water and sanitation** a priority in its development cooperation policies. Consequently, the **IV Master Plan for Cooperation** in Spain (2013-2016) reflects this position through three strategies: 1) integrated water resources management, 2) access to water and sanitation and 3) governance and human right to water. Spain is carrying out various initiatives to address these key issues at national level with the example of the Ebro River Basin, and international level in the framework of development cooperation projects in Latin America and the Mediterranean.

79. Francisco José Hijos, Deputy Commissioner for Water of the Ebro River Basin Authority and President of the Water Committee of the World Council of Civil Engineers offered a **technical perspective on water governance** in Spain. Water is a very strategic issue for the country in terms of territorial balance and sustainable development. Spain can be qualified as a semi-arid country which has encouraged important developments in water infrastructure and facilities. But the country also faces important challenges, in particular for **meeting the requirement of EU Habitat and Water directives**. The Spanish administrative organisation and legal framework for water are characterised by basin authorities, important decentralisation and **participatory IWRM** with all water users. In particular, river basin authorities work closely with the main water user, i.e. irrigators, to develop and maintain updated irrigated land owner censuses. Also, water user communities operating under specific norms regulate water use at community level. River basin authorities are characterized by autonomous and decentralized decision making that involves all stakeholders at basin level to build trust and credibility.

80. Victor Arqued, Permanent Technical Secretary of CODIA, and Deputy-Director of Planning and Sustainable Water Use of Spain, presented the objectives and activities of the **Conference of Iberoamerican Water Directors** (CODIA). CODIA was created as a technical instrument to support the **Forum of Ministers of the Environment of Latin America and the Caribbean**, during the first meeting (2001, Spain). It now comprises 22 Ibero-american countries and 14 meetings were organised. The Permanent Technical Secretary of the CODIA is responsible for the organisation of yearly meetings, supports the development of knowledge on water resources management systems in the LAC region, and encourages experience sharing across water directors. The Iberoamerican Water Cooperation Programme for the training and transfer of IWRM technology was adopted in 2008 with the objectives to **strengthen capacities** and education; create an **experimentation centre on non-conventional technologies** for wastewater treatment; and **strengthen local, regional and national water authorities**. The Programme is structured around 10 thematic areas (with basic, transversal and specific areas).

81. Marco Antonio Fortin, President of the National Administration of Aqueducts and Sewers of Salvador, shared some perspectives on international co-operation on water and sanitation. Water management in Salvador faces a number of governance challenges: fragmented institutional frameworks across multiple actors; legal gaps; lack of specific public policies; weak institutions; silo approaches; gap between rural, suburban and urban areas; and a deficit in public investments. To address these issues, Salvador has established a **2014-2019 strategy in the water and sanitation sector** that aims to ensure safe

and consistent water supply across the country; expand the Master Plan for Sanitation and Environmental Decontamination of Water Bodies at national level; and create a Water Resources Information System. To that end, the [Cooperation Fund for Water and Sanitation in Latin America and Caribbean](#) (2011-2016) has been instrumental in providing support to the Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources to perform diagnosis on water demand; help provide an initial version of the Water and Sanitation Law under preparation; develop the Water and Sanitation National Plan; and strengthen water management systems in rural communities.

82. **Ramiro Martínez**, Coordinator of the Mediterranean Network of Basin Organizations (REMOC) presented the [Water Strategy in the Western Mediterranean](#), jointly developed by Spain and Algeria. The two countries held bilateral meetings to establish the terms of reference as well as two technical workshops to discuss a concept paper and strategic framework for action which tackles issues of effective governance for IWRM; climate change adaptation and water disaster management; water demand management, efficiency, quality and nonconventional resources; and water financing optimisation. The Water Strategy has the ambition to foster experience sharing, sustainable development and the human right to water; and to encourage the definition of a common water policy in the Western Mediterranean region.

83. **OECD** recalled that CODIA and AECID have been key partners and supporters in the work on water governance in Latin America, in particular for the OECD report [Water Governance in Latin America and the Caribbean: a multi-level approach](#) (2012). It was suggested that CODIA serves as a platform to discuss, at directors' level, the OECD Principles and Indicators on water governance as part of regional consultations, and acts as a bridge between OECD and Latin America to share experience and results. Also, REMOB workshops could provide good opportunities to discuss WGI work and findings.

84. **Rafael Garranzo García**, Director of the [Cooperation Fund for Water and Sanitation in Latin America and Caribbean](#), explained that the Fund supports infrastructure development as well as better governance and knowledge transfer in LAC countries. As regards the post-2015 development agenda, current debates will redefine the targets to be achieved and Spain stands ready to support their implementation. The Cooperation Fund is at different stage of implementation depending on the countries but often, the end of the activities will coincide with the adoption of the SDGs and therefore, the new Cooperation Fund will be aligned with the strategic orientations of the post-2015 agenda.

85. **AEAS** recalled that river basin management was introduced in Spain as early as 1926 following a participatory and consensus-based approach. The country has also been a pioneer in river quality control with the implementation of the water control bodies (*comisarias del agua*) in 1959. As regards, water service provision, AEAS called for the existence of a regulator to increase the amount of information (e.g. infrastructures, tariffs), provide performance indicators and help in dealing with customer complaints and dispute resolution.

Parallel working session of the thematic working groups

86. Working groups gathered during parallel working sessions to advance on their respective activities and discuss the draft policy messages, principles and indicators prepared prior to the meeting.

Stakeholder engagement

87. WG n°1 discussed the preliminary results from the **OECD online survey on Stakeholder Engagement for Effective Water Governance**, launched on 1 April. Contributors exchanged views on the methodological aspects of the project, underlying the need to reach as broadly as possible all stakeholders likely to be impacted or have a stake in water decision making (e.g. parliamentarians, trade unions, industries using water). It was also argued that the interpretation of the survey results should take

into account that stakeholder engagement is culturally embedded and also varies across categories of stakeholders which call for detailed analysis of motivations, drivers, obstacles and impacts. Contributors committed to support the survey process by disseminating the questionnaire to key partners (youth associations, agricultural lobbies, regional water authorities). An issues paper with key results and messages from the final survey responses will be prepared by the coordinators by 30 June and discussed during a WG webinar on 2 July.

88. Contributors also discussed the **case studies** to be collected by 20 July to provide some practical experiences, successful or not, to the survey results. It was agreed that case studies would be featured in 3 different ways: i) in the OECD report to be published, according to a common comparable template and agreed-upon selection criteria and proxy to analyse them; ii) in the toolkit and online platform, building also on the inputs collected through the preparatory process of the 7th World Water Forum; and iii) in support of the Principles and Indicators to feed the component on stakeholder engagement. A template for submission will be prepared by the coordinators, along with selection criteria (e.g. replicability, level of satisfaction, level of engagement), and submit for comments to the WG contributors. Several contributors committed to submit case studies (e.g. K-Water, IRSTEA, and South Africa).

89. Breakdown discussions took place to exchange views on the **draft principles for stakeholder engagement** and take-away messages included the need for distinguishing institutionalised/ individual engagement processes and consultative/deliberative approaches. The point was made that principles should include guidance for decision-makers to go beyond “tick-the-box approaches” as well as to clarify responsibilities (including financial) for stakeholder engagement. The principles should suggest tailored-made solutions and be precise on the role of local authorities. All comments will be consolidated in the next version of the principles to be included in the issues paper under preparation. It will help shape the draft report to be developed by early August, discussed during a multi-stakeholder workshop on 19 September and peer-reviewed at the 4th WGI Meeting (24-25 November, Paris)

Performance and governance of water supply and sanitation services

90. WG n°2 presented and discussed the proposal on **principles**, focusing on three levels – institutional actors, service providers and consumers. Discussions focused on institutional frameworks for water services (roles and responsibilities, service levels, and legal instruments); universal access (mandatory service provision, appropriate financing, performance levels and co-operation); and participation (codes of conduct, mechanisms for engagement). Contributors shared comments on the need to take into account different levels of governance, provide definitions when relevant for the Principles, and clarify key concepts.

91. The WG agreed on five work components to develop a **Toolkit for implementation** of the water governance principles: i) provide “Action Monitoring” and “Water showcases” in performance indicators; ii) formulate key messages on governance and performance of water and sanitation services, to feed the Principles on Water Governance; iii) establish a methodological approach to assist governments in setting appropriate service level targets; iv) map regulatory models in connection with the variety of water sector organisations and identify tools to assess the performance of regulation; and v) establish methodologies to assess the quality and accountability of data in benchmark activities and the independence of control.

92. The WG discussed its contribution to the OECD water governance **indicators**, which will start by taking stock of existing work in the field of water supply and sanitation, bearing in mind the needed distinction between policy indicators, global indicators (SDG’s open group) and operational indicators. The WG will be meeting and sharing comments during the ASTEE meeting in Orléans (France, 4 June 2014) and IWA Congress (Lisbon, 21-26 September). On that occasion the WG will further clarify the preparatory work towards the 7th WWF.

Basin Governance

93. WG n°3 on **Basin Governance** structured its meeting around three panels including presentations and group discussions. . The first Panel included presentations about **basin management experiences**, including from Spain, INBO and Green Cross International. Delegates emphasized the need for governance to be sensitive to diversity of water resources (renewable and non-renewable) and for conjunctive management of surface water and groundwater to take advantage the special features of these resources. The discussion highlighted the importance of coordination of water governance with other sectors including land and energy, and of adaptive management in response to changing conditions and knowledge. It was suggested that basin organizations can provide a focal point for building coalitions to address water conflicts. The discussion emphasized that basin governance needs to be relevant to problems at multiple scales, ranging from cooperative mechanisms to address transboundary water issues to specific national and local governance questions.

94. The second panel was devoted to **indicators of basin governance**. Delegates suggested that it was important to assess the performance of basin governance approaches and agreed to create a **sub-group** on the topic to collect evidence and examples at hand.

95. The third panel was about **stakeholder involvement in the river basin**. The discussion emphasized the importance of joint action and sharing of information by stakeholders at all levels, with appropriate representation and participation. A revised version of the principles on basin governance will be shared with members of the working group by the summer, before it is consolidated in an overarching set of principles to be prepared by the OECD Secretariat.

Integrity and Transparency

96. WG n°4 shared outcomes of **recent events**: the [Knowledge Sharing and Planning Workshop](#) (19-20 February, Delft), the French Water Academy/UNESCO meeting on the [Water Ethics Charter](#) (3-4 March, Paris), the OECD [Water Integrity Workshop](#) (20 March 2014, Paris), and the [Water Integrity Learning Summit](#) (29-30 April 2014, Zambia).

97. Delegates also shared views on **draft principles on integrity and transparency**, the guidelines for codes of conduct, the note on integrity indicators, and the draft document to support the implementation of the principles. They also discussed existing learning platforms on water integrity, reviewed capacity development and assessment tools on water integrity; and exchanged on options to monitor the implementation of the 6th WWF targets on integrity and transparency. The point was made that Principles on water governance should provide concrete policy guidance for countries to improve their water governance performance, which requires concrete examples of operationalization of the principles to be included in supporting documents.

98. WG4 developed a guidance (based on WIN code of conduct) to help organisations commit to **standards of transparency, integrity and participation** at country and international levels. A matrix of country based water integrity assessments has been developed to get a full overview of what assessments on water integrity has already been done and to create momentum to engage other countries into working on integrity.

99. A distinction is also needed between top-down and bottom up perspectives on **indicators**. The OECD efforts are primarily taking a top-down approach to indicator development, which can be useful for monitoring and comparing the implementation of principles in different countries. This should preferably be as simple as possible, perhaps only one indicator, one composite index or a simple check-list with scores. On the other hand, indicators used to manage change processes at local (country) level need to have

the bottom-up perspective. They should be understandable in the local context, and reflect its complexity. The indicators might be developed as process tool or training module for development of contextualized indicators. Both types of indicators should be included in the OECD system. It was suggested to compile a list of examples of bottom-up indicators for use, which can inspire and guide indicator development in local contexts. A training module on indicator development could also be developed. The inclusion of an indicator on the share of GDP that is dedicated to water resources management could be useful to measure the funding gap. Many OECD countries lack the sufficient resources; one example being the UK that had trouble handling the recent flood events. The optimal level of funds is not obvious, but should be analysed. However, it might be difficult to find data on this. For example, donor reporting to the OECD on aid to water is not detailed enough to show how much is dedicated to water resources management. It was suggested to set up a project to develop a set of indicators to e.g. monitor the OECD principles on water integrity and apply for funds, to develop and test bottom up indicators in country contexts and/or to develop a global data set on water governance indicators, which is currently lacking.

100. **Next steps** for the working group n°4 include a potential meeting during the [Stockholm World Water Week](#) and another gathering before the 4th meeting of the WGI in Paris.

OECD Principles on Water Governance: Getting Started

101. In line with the overarching goal of the OECD to set-up international standards, a major output of WGI in the coming 18 months is the production of a set of **Principles on Water Governance**, to be officially endorsed by OECD committees and bodies after a wide and full-fledge consultation across members, institutions, and countries. To get prepared efficiently, each thematic working group has been tasked to prepare draft notes on key policy messages and principles, which were circulated to all delegates and discussed during parallel working sessions. These inputs will be streamlined and consolidated with other cross-cutting topics in the coming months.

102. The note prepared by the OECD Secretariat to support the development of the Principles was presented. It was reminded that OECD constituencies are policy makers and the Principles on water governance offer an opportunity to influence the public debate and actions at the highest political level. The OECD has already produced over 250 standards and principles on a wide array of policy fields. Adopted by the OECD Council, these instruments are powerful tools to encourage governments to **catalyse efforts for making good practices more visible** and to **transform national policy frameworks**. Building on existing OECD *acquis* on water (6 recommendations adopted respectively in 1971, 1974, 1978, 1989 and 1992) and new evidence, a new OECD recommendation on Water will be submitted to Council in 2016. It should integrate a component on governance and be accompanied by a **specific toolkit and indicators to support its implementation**. The Principles on Water Governance will encompass the following critical areas: i) clear allocation of roles and responsibilities; ii) design and implementation at the relevant scale; iii) coordination with other policy fields; iv) quality and comparable data & information production and disclosure; v) integrity and transparency; vi) effective stakeholder engagement; vii) framework conditions for inclusive and sustainable access to quality water and sanitation; viii) regulatory frameworks; ix) and capacity development across levels of government and stakeholders. A multi-stakeholder **Advisory Board** will be set up to actively engage in the process and provide some guidance and a reality check throughout the development of the Principles over 2014. The 7th WWF will also offer an opportunity for visibility and broader consultation among decision-makers and experts in the field.

103. Francisco Nunes Correia, professor at the University of Lisbon and former minister of Environment of Portugal shared some reflections, from a **policy-maker perspective**, on the draft scoping note prepared by the Secretariat. The Principles should consider governance according to a **dynamic rather than static approach**. The framework of the Principles should reflect the **social structure, drivers, forces and influence from broad issues such as transparency, democracy and participation**. The Principles should be seen as an instrument to set process of reform in motion to move from *good* to *better*

governance. They should take into account **triggers of change** such as crisis and disasters and provide for a common ground that politicians and practitioners can share. They should create incentives and **mitigate fears and resistance to change**. It is also critical that the Principles help identify the **essential points of leverage for change** such as actors and institutions, as well as win-win situations associated with reform processes.

104. The Butterfly Effect offered the **point of view of civil society** on the ways forward. Important milestones could be added to the timeline for developing the Principles: the **Political Process** for the Ministerial declaration of the 7th WWF will kick-off in November (in New York City) and the WGI could provide some recommendation on the draft discussion paper. The **Conference on water and development** (15-17 January 2015, Zaragoza) offers an opportunity to link the Principles to the SDGs and ensure that governance is well-included. A discussion could be organised with the **youth community** to discuss the draft Principles and the Water Youth Network stands ready to help. As regards the structure of the Principles, a **multi-level perspective** should be adopted to include the **global, policy and operational levels**. The Principles should offer some clarity on **who should carry the costs, monetary and non-monetary** (e.g. in-kind, in time, in energy, in capabilities), toward a wide involvement of stakeholders. In Principles, nexuses (with energy, food, etc.) should be address as a way of working towards better governance rather than as an end in itself. Finally, the implementation toolkit for the Principles should be used also to **help collect data** that otherwise would not be available, and to **create ownership at national and local levels**.

105. WBCSD underlined that the Principles will be instrumental for the **business community** which stands ready to help implement them on the ground. The development of the Principles is a formal process that should also take into account **informal approaches**. They should also foster the engagement of many stakeholders to work more closely together to drive a common objective of better water governance.

106. Aqua Publica Europa committed to support the development of the Principles as they will contribute to institutional stability and coherence which are essential for **water operators** to provide efficient services and investments. The Principles should support **innovative ways of ensuring financial sustainability**, in particular for the involvement of agricultural and industrial actors. Current activities by Aqua Publica Europa to benchmark water pricing mechanisms across operators and countries can contribute to the process, by exploring common challenges and solutions related to transparency and participation. Also, **access to information** is essential to support decision making, to exert democratic control within clearly defined institutional frameworks, and to increase trust and awareness among citizens. The Principles will need to be **“adaptable” to different contexts and scales** for which the implementation toolkit and indicators will be instrumental. Aqua Publica Europa is working on a common set of indicators to assess and benchmark the performance of water services, including issues of transparency, accountability and participation, and which could be consolidated with the OECD Indicators on Water Governance under development. The issue of **stakeholder partnerships**, such as public-public co-operation, should also be addressed in the Principles as a way to strengthen capacities and performances. In itself, the development process for the Principles is a stakeholder engagement mechanism that could serve as good practice for other political contexts. The recent **EU Citizen Process** on the right to water gathered more than 1.8 million signatures, demonstrating the desire and willingness of civil society to take part in EU water policy making, and the need to open-up governance to all relevant stakeholders.

107. ERSAR shared some remarks from the perspective of a **regulator** to support the development of the Principles on Water Governance. **Sound regulatory frameworks** are necessary conditions of success to improve water governance but there is no one-size-fits-all model. The Principles could help strengthen regulatory frameworks and support their implementation on the ground, according to specificities of each context. Most challenges in the water sector derive from a lack of data, and the building blocks structuring the Principles should pay close attention to **data collection** for supporting better decision making. Finally,

the Principles will be a useful tool to shed light on the contribution of **water regulators** to improve water governance systems.

108. The International Journal of Water Governance shared some valuable *academic insights* on the scoping note. It was advised that the Principles should consider governance systems as existing structures with a long-term evolution and strong path-dependency that cannot be changed instantly but need to be improved progressively. The Principles should not attempt to define the optimal scale for water governance but rather **foster the creation of governance capacities at all levels**. The success of a governance system relies on the people that compose it and it is the quality of the **networks and chains** that should help organise the Principles. The issues of fragmentation and integration are closely interlinked and rather than being addressed separately, they should be encompassed into a new concept of connectivity. The Principles should also focus on the **adaptive capacities of governance systems** and the ability to adapt when unexpected changes occur. Finally, the International Journal of Water Governance offered to dedicate a special issue on assessment methods in the water sector, including the Principles and Indicators being developed, to ask scientists in and outside the water sector to share their view.

109. The Metropolitan Area of Barcelona recalled the critical role of *local authorities* in the water sector as the closest institutions from the final users and advised that the Principles should include recommendations to **strengthen local water policies**. Barcelona and United Cities and Local Governments both stand ready to provide experiences from local actors to feed the Principles.

110. Regarding the overall **rationale and framework** for Principles on Water Governance, IRSTEA mentioned they should **foster innovation to change** the global water governance climate. The Principles should recognise the local/community level as a strategic scale to make “real” governance happens. They should **foster adaptiveness** and **low-cost governance strategies** that rely on time, analysis, etc. In that sense, there should be closer co-operation between policy makers and researchers and it is the responsibility of academics in WGI to involve them. SIWI underlined the importance of **fostering quality relation between people, networks and institutions** and the Principles should help define the “rules of the game” for these inter-connections. Tentative indicators could include trust among stakeholders and the quality of inter-relations (e.g. level of interest, respective economic/political/social powers, capacities, etc.). ASTEE suggested developing Principles at **different levels** as well as guidance on how to link them.

111. Regarding specific issues to be included in the **scope** of the Principles, the Netherlands suggested that the [UNECE-WHO/Europe Protocol on Water and Health](#), and in particular the work done under its framework on equitable access to water and sanitation, serves as a basis to address **minorities**, vagrant and the poor as they deserve specific approaches. South Africa also underlined the importance of **non-OECD countries** which will benefit from the Principles as well. Though governance challenges in developing countries are of a different nature than governance challenges in developed countries, WGI can help informed the debate outside the OECD region. By supporting water governance improvement, the Principles will also contribute to overall improvement of water around the world. They should also foster interactions across the different groups of stakeholders as it is an enabling factor for successful water governance systems. IRSTEA advised that the Principles not only tackle the issue of **data collection** but also the processes and procedures to **manage information**. K-Water raised the question of **sustainable financing mechanisms** for water management and advised that the Principles include recommendations on user-pay and polluter-pay mechanisms. ASTEE suggested including the issue of **user/consumer participation** within stakeholder engagement aspects of the Principles to reflect the critical role they play for the sustainability of water services.

112. Regarding the specific issue of **transboundary management**, Turkey advised to not address complex legal and political issues in the Principles and leave them to the discretion of each country and river basin with respect to each context. GWP pointed to **water security** a critical concern, including for

cross-boundary water management. The Netherlands advised to address the question of transboundary waters constructively towards successful management, rather than in a moralising way. UNECE recalled that the existing Water Convention includes legal obligations for **cooperation at basin level**. Draft principles for joint bodies at transboundary levels will be discussed in June 2014 as part of the working group on IWRM of the Convention and could be linked to the OECD Principles on Water Governance. GEF offered to share findings and case studies on legal and institutional frameworks and programmes of measures for managing international waters, as well as circulate the draft Principles among networks of partners to collect inputs. Green Cross International underlined that only 40% of transboundary basins have agreement and organisations, hence the Principles should address cross-border issues to help bridge this governance gap and contribute to current efforts taking place on this topic (e.g. UN Watercourses Convention, UNECE Water Convention, etc.). The Secretariat replied with words of caution regarding the scope and ambitions of the Principles, keeping in mind that they first address **water policy at the national level**. Considering that many conventions and international organisations already deal with transboundary issues, OECD Principles on Water Governance will certainly could consider the transboundary level as one scale of governance, but the key expectation from the basin governance component of the Principles is to address the **effectiveness of basin institutions and arrangements** in managing water at the relevant scale (i.e. in fitting policies to places).

Tour de table of water governance reforms, events and initiatives

113. SIWI presented the outcomes of the **Water Integrity Workshop**, co-organised with OECD, WIN, and Transparency International on 20 March in Paris, as part of the **OECD Integrity Week**. The event was a critical milestone for the activities of the Working Group n°4 and kicked-off the discussions on the draft policy messages, principles and indicators on integrity and transparency. Take away messages from the workshop highlight the potential of Principles to provide entry points for dialogue with governments, the private sector, and civil society. A specific session of the event focused on the contribution of the private sector and a stronger case should be built to better involve businesses in water integrity issues as well as factor in water integrity activities into business models. SIWI is also engaged in the **Water Integrity Learning Summit** (29-30 April, Zambia) which focuses on capacity development efforts and the linkages with political and economic levels. The event was organised in co-operation with regional partners in Africa (Economic Community of West African States, East African Community and Southern African Development Community). Work is also under-going in the MENA region with GWP-Med to assess integrity and transparency in 5 countries and provide training opportunities; and in Latin America to develop training in partnership with Cap-NET.

114. WIN is currently working on a **flagship publication on water integrity**. The publication will be a compendium of issues and cases for evidence-based advocacy for water integrity. It will assess the impacts of water integrity interventions in developing and developed countries contexts in past years. Additionally, WIN is working with Bangladesh, Indonesia, Benin, Ethiopia and Mozambique to address issues of integrity and corruption. WIN is also running integrity programmes in Nepal and Guatemala.

115. France shared the outcomes of the **water policy evaluation** carried out in 2013 which revealed that the country as a good legal and institutional framework in place to help improve water and aquatic environment quality issues. The French system is characterised by water agencies that apply the polluter-pays principle and foster multi-stakeholder dialogues. The identified challenges as part of the evaluation related to water resources quality, wastewater treatment, diffuse pollution and transparency in public water and sanitation services. The **2nd Environmental Conference** in September 2013 established a roadmap with **priority actions to improve water policy** including fighting pollution by nitrates; better managing rainwater and treated wastewater; strengthening local flood management; strengthening capacity at local level for water resources management and flood prevention; and maintaining reasonable cost of water services. There is political will in France to move toward **anticipatory and participatory water**

governance with modernised public water administrations, better involvement of citizens and users, and publicly available data.

116. Peru provided an overview of the water governance system in place in the country. Home to 71% of the world's tropical glaciers, Peru has one of the highest freshwater availability per capita. The country has set-up a **national environmental policy**, a **national water resources policy and strategy**, and a **national water resources plan** to foster better water resources management. The National Water Authority (ANA) relies on a decentralised organisation structured around 14 regional water authorities and 72 local water administrations to enable territorial planning and management of water resources, and is currently pilot-testing water resources management plans in 6 river basins.

117. Électricité de France is working on two water governance-related initiatives, in partnership with the World Water Council. The first focuses on a **water for energy framework** that was selected to be the focus of an action group of the [European Innovation Partnership on Water](#), and which aims to define common knowledge and terminology for evaluating the impact of energy activities on water at the local scale. The 2nd initiative is related to the **multipurpose uses of hydro-reservoirs** such as for cooling off thermal plants and fuelling hydro-power plants. The project will explore how to avoid or minimize conflicts over water use, which tools can be used, what governance arrangements can promote co-ordinated management strategies, and how to set appropriate financing and economic operations for these infrastructures.

118. The Water Research Commission of South Africa is coordinating the publication of a **book on water governance** which will include a chapter on the WGI. Other topics to be address are water governance in the post-2015 development agenda; water governance in various political paradigms and legal and regulatory frameworks; mechanisms for inclusive governance; groundwater governance; integrity and equity; and the future of water governance. The publication will be launched in November 2014. South Africa is also organising two events: an OECD/WRC workshop on 23-25 June 2014 and a [conference on gender, water and development](#) on 7-11 July 2014.

119. The Turkish Water Institute is coordinating the organisation of the **3rd Istanbul International Water Forum** (27-29 May) which aims to collect key messages from the region to be conveyed during the 7th WWF and other international water events. Two major topics will be addressed: *water security* to discuss water governance adaptability at different levels; water, food and ecology nexus; urban water management; and climate change; and the *legal aspects of water*, to address transboundary water co-operation and comparing national water laws. To date, 50 speakers have already registered and 20 side events will be organised, including an OECD side event on stakeholder engagement for effective water governance.

120. Australia up-dated delegates on the status of the Freshwater Governance Conference. Initially scheduled on 5-7 November, the conference will take place closer to the 7th WWF while the original event will now focus on the issue of **fracking** and unconventional production of gas in relation to water and groundwater management. The event will present case studies from Canada, Australia, Spain, France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

121. IME will co-organise with GWP-Med the **2nd Mediterranean Water Forum** on 26-27 November in Murcia, Spain. To prepare the MENA process of the WWF, the event will address water governance challenges in the region to share perspective on recent legal and institutional changes, in particular in the context of the Arab Spring. Delegates of WGI are invited to attend and contribute.

122. UNECE will organise a meeting of the [Water Convention IWRM working group](#) on 25-26 June 2014 to discuss the status of water in the SDGs and share experiences and good practices on joint bodies for water management. Delegates were invited to participate.

123. OECD will contribute to the water governance book coordinated by South Africa with a chapter on existing **international platforms and initiatives on water governance**, as well as a chapter on stock-taking experiences in assessing water governance in several countries. Contributions from delegates are welcomed to reflect on key lessons taken from countries' water reforms. OECD is also carrying out a project on **water governance for future cities** aiming to explore the drivers for adaptive forms of water management in urban areas and their hinterlands. A survey will be circulated across metropolitan areas and cities and delegates are invited to flag cities that feature interesting experiences in that field.

124. IWRA mentioned their [World Water Congress](#) on 25-29 May 2015 in Edinburg, Scotland and invited delegates to get involved in knowledge creation and scientific endeavours by submitting papers and attending the event.

Wrap-up and next steps

125. The 3rd Meeting of the WGI successfully launched the work on Principles and Indicators which will benefit from the contribution of all delegates, regional partners and working groups. Closer co-operation with the delegates of the OECD Committee on Territorial Policy Development (TDPC) will be crucial in the coming months to connect agendas and programmes of work up to the adoption of the Principles by the OECD Council. In that view, the 4th meeting of the OECD WGI will take place on **24-25 November 2014** at OECD Headquarters, in **Paris**, back-to-back with the TDPC meeting, thus offering opportunities for joint discussions.

ACRONYMS

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AEAS	Spanish Association of Water Service Providers
AECID	Spanish agency for International Cooperation for Development
AIDA	International Association for Water Laws
ASTEE	Association Scientifique et Technique pour l'eau et l'environnement
BRICS	Brazil, Russia, India, China and South Africa
CONAGUA	National Water Commission(Mexico)
DFID	UK Department for International Development
EDF	Électricité de France
EECCA	Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia
EU	European Union
FANCA	Freshwater Action Network – Central America
FAN-Mex	Freshwater Action Network – Mexico
GIWEH	Global Institute for Water Environment and Health
GIZ	German Development Cooperation agency
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWP-Med	Global Water Partnership - Mediterranean
IDB	Inter-American Development Bank
IME	Institut Méditerranéen de l'Eau
IMTA	Mexico Institute of Water Technologies
INBO	International Network of Basin Organisations
IWA	International Water Association
IWRA	International Water Resources Association
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
MENBO	Mediterranean Network of Basin Organisations
NARBO	Networks of Asian River Basin Organisations
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIC-ICWC	Scientific Information Centre of the Interstate Commission for Water Coordination
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SUEN	Turkish Water Institute
UfM	Union for the Mediterranean
UNDP	United Nation Development Programme
UNECE	United National Economic Commission for Europe
UNESCO-IHE	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation – Institute for Water Education
UNESCO-IHP	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation – International Hydrological Programme
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WfWP	Women for Water Partnership
WRC	Water Research Commission (South Africa)
WWF	World Water Forum

CALENDAR OF 2014-2015 WATER-RELATED EVENTS

Date & Location	Event	Convening organisation
<i>31 Aug – 5 Sept 2014</i> Stockholm, Sweden	Stockholm World Water Week	SIWI
<i>8-9 September 2014</i> Geneva, Switzerland	Second meeting of the Task Force on the Water-Food-Energy-Ecosystem Nexus	UNECE
<i>9-12 September 2014</i> San Francisco, United States	13th IWA International Specialised Conference on watershed and river basin management	IWA
<i>19 September 2014</i> OECD, Paris	Multi-stakeholder Workshop “Stakeholder Engagement for Effective Water Governance”	OECD
<i>21-26 September 2014</i> Lisbon, Portugal	IWA World Water Congress	IWA
<i>5-7 November 2014</i> Adelaide, Australia	Freshwater Governance Conference 2014	Australian Water Association
<i>12-16 November 2014</i> Bucarest, Romania	Europe INBO 2014	INBO, MENBO, CEE-NBO
<i>24-25 November 2014</i> Paris, France	4th Meeting of the OECD Water Governance Initiative	OECD
<i>26-27 November 2014</i> Murcia, Spain	2nd Mediterranean Forum on Water	IME
<i>26-27 November 2014</i> Geneva, Switzerland	Seventh meeting of the Working Group on Water and Health	UNECE
<i>15-17 January 2015</i> Zaragoza, Spain	UN-Water Annual Zaragoza Conference	UN-Water Decade Programme on Advocacy and Communication
<i>12-17 April 2015</i> Daegu, Korea	7th World Water Forum	World Water Council – National Committee for the 7 th WWF
<i>25-29 May 2015</i> Edinburgh, Scotland	IWRA World Water Congress	IWRA
<i>26 May 2016</i> Edinburgh, Scotland	5th Meeting of the OECD Water Governance Initiative (tbc)	OECD