

## 12<sup>th</sup> MEETING OF THE OECD WATER GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

20-21 June 2019, GLS Campus, Berlin, Germany

### HIGHLIGHTS



The [OECD Water Governance Initiative](#) (WGI) is an international multi-stakeholder network of 100+ members from public, private and not-for-profit sectors gathering twice a year in a Policy Forum to share on-going policy reforms, projects, lessons and good practices in support of better governance in the water sector. Twelve meetings have been held since its creation (27-28 March 2013, Paris; 7-8 November 2013, Paris; 28-29 April 2014, Madrid; 24-25 November 2014, Paris; 26 May 2015, Edinburgh; 2-3 November 2015, Paris; 23-24 June 2016, The Hague; 12-13 January, Rabat; 3-4 July 2017, Paris; 20-21 November 2017, Vienna; 12-13 November 2018, Zaragoza, and 20-21 June 2019, Berlin).

The OECD WGI aims to:

1. Provide a **multi-stakeholder technical platform** to share knowledge, experience and best practices on water governance across levels of government;
2. **Advise governments** in taking the needed steps for effective water reforms through peer-to-peer dialogue and stakeholder engagement across public, private and non-profit sectors;
3. Provide a **consultation mechanism** to raise the profile of governance in the Global Water Agenda (Sustainable Development Goals, World Water Forum, Habitat III, COP etc.);
4. Support the **implementation** of the *OECD Principles on Water Governance* in interested member and non-member countries by promoting the uptake of the Water Governance Indicator Framework and peer-to-peer exchanges; and
5. Foster continuity on governance discussions between two World Water Fora (every 3 years), currently between the 8th World Water Forum (Brazil, 2018) and the 9th World Water Forum (Senegal, 2021).

## Table of Contents

<b>Summary of outcomes</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>Next Steps</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>1. Day 1: 20 June 2019</b> .....	<b>7</b>
1.1. Welcoming Remarks.....	7
Welcoming Remarks by the Chair .....	7
Welcoming Remarks by the German Hosts .....	7
Updates on recent developments since the 11 <sup>th</sup> WGI Meeting.....	8
1.2. Launch of the report: “Applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to Floods: A Checklist for Action” .....	8
1.3. Tour de table on latest water governance research and policy reforms .....	9
Water Integrity Global Outlook in 2021, WIN .....	9
Serving SDG implementation: A role for good water management and governance, GWP .....	9
Monitoring community participation in water and sanitation under SDG 6.b, WHO.....	10
National Congress on the Environment (CONAMA), 26-29 November 2018, Madrid, Spain, AEAS .....	10
10th Water Economics Forum, Granada, Spain, 26 March 2019, IMDEA.....	10
IWA and the International Water Regulators Forum: LATAAC & Asia Pacific, IWA .....	11
Update on WGI contributions to the global agenda, OECD .....	11
Group Discussion .....	11
1.4. Women and Water decision-making: Challenges and Opportunities .....	13
Building evidence for inclusion of women in water governance, Women for Water Partnership .....	13
Draft methodology to assess the role of women in water decision-making, OECD .....	14
Group Discussion .....	14
1.5. Water security for sustainable development in Africa.....	17
Update on the Programme: The governance and economics of water security for sustainable development in Africa, OECD Secretariat .....	17
Outcomes of the workshop in The Hague (Netherlands), WIN .....	18
Group Discussion .....	19
1.6. An Overview of Key Governance Challenges in Africa: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward .....	20
Mr Canisius Kanangire, Executive Secretary, AMCOW .....	20
Ms Daniela Krahl, Deputy Head of the Division of Water, Urban Development and Mobility, BMZ, Germany .....	21
Mr John Dini, Researcher, Water Research Commission, South Africa.....	21
Group Discussion .....	22
1.7. Peer-review of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Argentina .....	23
Pablo Bereciartua, Secretary of Water Infrastructure and Policy, Argentina.....	23
Key findings and policy recommendations, OECD .....	24
Reactions from peer-reviewers (Spain, Netherlands).....	25
Group Discussion .....	26
1.8. Update on the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru .....	29
1.9. Kick-off of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Brazil .....	30
<b>2. Day 2: 21 June 2019</b> .....	<b>31</b>
2.1. Water Governance in Germany .....	31

---

Mr. Jens Libbe, Head of Department, Infrastructure, Economy and Finance, DIFU.....	31
Mr. Martin Grambow, Head of Department, Water Management and Soil Protection, StMUV...	32
Mr. Mario Sommerhäuser, Head of Department, River Management, EGLV .....	32
Mr. Thomas Stratenwerth, Head of Division, Water Management and Climate Change Adaptation, BMU.....	33
Mr. Gerald Linke, Chairman of Directors Board, DVGW.....	34
Group Discussion .....	35
2.2. Advancing WGI Working Groups on Indicators and Capacity Development.....	37
Working Group on Indicators .....	38
Working Group on Capacity Development.....	39
2.3. Report back to Plenary and next steps .....	41
2.4. Concluding Remarks.....	41

## *Summary of outcomes*

On 20-21 June 2019, the OECD Water Governance Initiative held its [12th meeting](#) at the GLS Campus, Berlin, Germany. The meeting gathered 80+ practitioners, policymakers and representatives from major stakeholder groups (see the [list of participants](#)). The WGI is hosted by the OECD and its Centre for Entrepreneurship, SMEs, Regions and Cities (CFE). The 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the WGI had the following objectives (see the [agenda](#), [presentations](#) and [pictures](#)):

- Launch the report “Applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to Floods : A Checklist for Action”;
- Update delegates on WGI latest contribution to Global Agendas (SDGs, COP, Habitat III);
- Peer-review the National Water Policy Dialogue (NWPD) with Argentina, introduce preliminary insights from the NWPD with Peru, and kick-off the 3rd NWPD with Brazil;
- Discuss progress from WGI working groups on Capacity Development and Indicators;
- Share knowledge and experience on recent water governance reforms, research and events;
- Learn from Germany’s water governance;
- Discuss the role of women in water governance.

The report [Applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to Floods: A Checklist for Action](#) was released officially. Delegates can download the e-version of the report on the [OECD iLibrary](#)(username: oecd2019-cfe; password: ilibrary2019).

Delegates shared **updates on water governance** including the preparation of the [2021 Water Integrity Outlook](#)(WIN); Supporting SDG 6.5.1 monitoring and implementation on integrated water management (GWP) and the need for including more than one indicator to monitor SDG 6.b on community participation in water and sanitation (WHO). Delegates shared the outcomes of the [National Congress on the Environment \(CONAMA\)](#), 26-29 November 2018, Madrid, Spain and the [10<sup>th</sup>Water Economics Forum](#), 26 March 2019, Granada, Spain. Delegates also informed about upcoming meetings: the 12<sup>th</sup> Ibero-American Forum on Regulation, 16-17 October 2019, Cartagena, Colombia and the [2nd Asia-Pacific Water Regulators Forum](#), 1 November 2019, Hong Kong. Delegates were updated about the preparatory process of the [9<sup>th</sup>World Water Forum](#) (Dakar, 2021) and OECD-WGI co-leadership over the Means & Tools theme under which governance is one priority area. Initial discussions have suggested trust, transparency and accountability, multisector policy coordination and inclusiveness as important topics to advance.

Delegates discussed the preliminary findings from the *OECD – Women for Water Partnership* literature review on “**Women and Water decision-making**”, and provided guidance on the proposed survey and methodology to build further evidence.

Delegates discussed the Programme on “[Water Security for Sustainable Development in Africa](#)”, especially the synergies with existing initiatives, cooperation with regional players, identified donors, and proposals for collaboration from 60+ institutions to produce data, host events or share case studies. The outcomes of The Hague Workshop (21 March 2019) were also shared with calls for multi-stakeholder partnerships anchored in Africa, and insights from BMZ, AMCOW and South Africa’s Water Research Commission shed light on policy and governance challenges faced in the sector.

In the presence of Mr Pablo Bereciartua, Secretary of Water Infrastructure and Policy of Argentina, delegates peer-reviewed the OECD draft report “**Water Governance in Argentina**”. It provides assessment and policy recommendations to address institutional fragmentation, strengthen economic regulation, support better planning and investment, and reinforce basin management.

---

Delegates, including peer-reviewers from Spain and the Netherlands, provided guidance to fine-tune proposed ways forward, building on international best practice. Delegates were updated on the fact-finding mission of the National Water Policy Dialogue with **Peru**, and the capacity development scope of the third National Policy Dialogue with **Brazil**.

The session on **water governance in Germany**, arranged by BMU, encouraged exchanges on a variety of subjects such as water-sensitive urban development, holistic water infrastructure, sustainable water management, Germany's National Water Dialogue and the status of drinking water quality in the country.

Two breakout sessions were dedicated to advancing the work of the **Working Groups on Indicators and Capacity Development**. Delegates discussed and agreed on the outputs for the 9<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum, the timeline and priority setting, as well as the set of activities to be carried out.

A field excursion took place on: **Water management in Berlin at the time of the Wall**. It included a visit to the Berlin Wall Memorial, followed by a lecture about how water cooperation unexpectedly took place between East and West Berlin. However, due to increasing unreliability of cross-border water exchanges, both sides saw the need to reduce the vulnerability of their own system, leading to the alignment of supply networks around the new political geography of division.

## *Next Steps*

Next steps on the road to the 13<sup>th</sup> WGI meeting (to be held on 9-10 January- 2020, OECD Headquarters, in Paris, France):

- Extend the survey deadline for the Water Security in Africa call for collaborations and coordinate with potential partners with regard to their collaboration and involvement in the several activities of the programme.
- Define selection criteria for the collaboration proposals and liaise with volunteers and potential donors.
- Revise the draft paper “Women in Water Decision-Making” in collaboration with Women for Water Partnership by 15 October.
- Revise draft report "Water governance in Argentina" to be officially released late September 2019.
- Advance the Working Group on Indicators through i) finalising the scoping note with comments received; ii) mapping attempts to measure water governance outcomes; iii) paving the way for a research paper/journal in collaboration with WGI members; iv) identifying 1-2 impact indicators to be correlated with governance; v) expanding the number of self-assessment pilots; and vi) developing user-friendly material to expand the outreach of the indicator framework (videos, PPT toolkits etc.)
- Advance the Working Group on Capacity Development through i) finalising the scoping note with comments received; ii) mapping existing capacity development activities and initiatives, both within WGI members and beyond; iii) promoting the OECD WGI water governance framework; iv) developing and promoting different types of capacity development material (case studies, PPT toolkits, videos, etc.); v) launching a formal call to OECD WGI members to seek volunteers to become facilitators and/or mentors.
- Hold a webinar for each Working Group in October-November to discuss interim findings ahead of the 13<sup>th</sup> WGI meeting.

## 1. Day 1: 20 June 2019

### 1.1. Welcoming Remarks

#### *Welcoming Remarks by the Chair*

**Peter Glas, Chair of the [OECD Water Governance Initiative \(WGI\)](#)**, expressed his gratitude to the Secretariat and the German hosts and his satisfaction that so many WGI members have gathered for the [12th Meeting of the OECD Water Governance Initiative](#), 20-21 June, in Berlin, Germany. The Chair welcomed the delegates and thanked the Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ), for their excellent support in the preparation of the meeting and warm welcome, as well as for the magnificent Venue. In addition to being an active member of the WGI, Germany has mobilised tremendous energy and resources in the past months to make this event happen. The Chair also extended his thanks to the German Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) for their engagement in the meeting. The Chair excused the absence of the Steering Committee members INBO, ASTEE, Transparency International and SIWI due to other engagements, such as the preparatory event for the next World Water Forum and the INBO-Europe Meeting taking place elsewhere.

#### *Welcoming Remarks by the German Hosts*

**Ms Susanne Dorasil, Head of Division of Water, Urban Development and Mobility, BMZ**, officially opened the event by welcoming delegates to the 12<sup>th</sup> WGI meeting at the GLS Campus in Berlin and thanked her colleagues from GIZ for their support in the organisation of the meeting. Ms. Dorasil emphasised the importance of this meeting given the current situation of water stress where 2.21 billion people are still without access to safe and affordable drinking water and 4.5 billion people lack safely managed sanitation services. Ms Dorasil expressed the need to get on track, especially regarding the existing financing gap in the water sector, estimated at between 68 and 100 billion US\$ between now and 2030, equivalent to three times the current annual financing efforts without including operation and maintenance costs. She signalled corruption as one of the main governance issues in the water sector, which is especially prevalent in the context of development cooperation: between 20 % and 40 % of financing in the water sector is lost to poor governance and corruption. The [2017 BMZ Water Strategy](#) explicitly recognises poor governance, corruption and mismanagement as one of the main reasons for inadequate water and sanitation services and the overuse and pollution of water resources. This year, BMZ has also published a [Strategy for Interlinkages between Water, Good Governance and Urban Development](#) in order to interlink the promotion of integrity by German Development Cooperation authorities at all levels. Integrity and good governance is also supported by these authorities in partner countries to create appropriate conditions for the sustainable and effective use of investment and development cooperation measures. In order to strengthen capacities in these aspects, BMZ has entertained a fruitful partnership with WIN since its establishment in 2006. Another topic that Ms Dorasil highlighted was the importance of gender considerations in governance in the water sector and beyond, which has not been sufficiently understood and recognised in the past. In this sense, BMZ has financially supported the Women and Water Decision-Making project carried out by Women for Water Partnership in collaboration with the OECD. Ms Dorasil stressed that good governance is a core concern for BMZ in all activities and expressed her pride in being able to host the WGI meeting where such thematic discussions will be taking place. She highlighted that the work being carried out by the WGI through the Working Groups and the Africa Programme are unique opportunities for exchange of knowledge and experience. The valuable discussion that will take

place at the meeting will give members the chance to leave with further recommendations and innovative approaches on how the water community as a whole can help attract more attention from the outside world about the challenges of the water sector.

### *Updates on recent developments since the 11<sup>th</sup> WGI Meeting*

The **Chair** shared **recent developments** since the [11th WGI meeting in Zaragoza](#), 12-13 November 2018. After the 11<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Terms of Reference and the Programme of Work 2019-2021 of the WGI were shared with the OECD Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC), which is the oversight committee responsible for the WGI within the OECD. Based on the outcomes of the Working Group session in Zaragoza, the Secretariat has drafted two Working Group scoping notes that have been discussed by members during two webinars held on May 20<sup>th</sup>. The revised drafts were shared with WGI members ahead of the 12<sup>th</sup> WGI meeting for discussion.

The **Chair** also reminded delegates of the **OECD report** on [Applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to Floods: A Checklist for Action](#), which included the outcomes of the peer-review session that took place in Zaragoza. The Chair highlighted that this type of publication testifies to the tangible analytical contributions of the WGI to advance the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance and support better policies for better reforms.

The **Chair** stressed the nature of the **WGI as a technical platform** and welcomed the opportunity to explore new research such as the role of Women in Water Decision-Making, water security in Africa and several water policy dialogues ongoing in Latin America notably in Argentina, Peru and Brazil.

The **Chair** welcomed **new members** to their first meeting of the WGI: 2030 Water Resources Group from the World Bank, the African Civil Society Network on Water and Sanitation (ANEWS), the African Ministers' Council on Water (AMCOW), the Secretary of Infrastructure and Water Policy of Argentina, Cap-Net UNDP, the International Water Management Institute (IWMI), the Ministry of Environment of Peru, Royal HaskoningDHV, the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy. The WGI now counts 103 members in total.

## **1.2. Launch of the report: “Applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to Floods: A Checklist for Action”**

**Mr Håkan Tropp, OECD Secretariat**, launched the [OECD Flood Governance report](#). Mr Tropp stressed that flooding is the most common of all natural disasters, and there is growing consensus that the frequency and number of people at risk from floods will increase. Global megatrends including climate change, population growth and urbanisation profoundly exacerbate the frequency, intensity and impact of flooding.

The report forms part of the Strategy to implement the [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#), developed by the WGI. It applies the 12 OECD Principles to analyse a compilation of 27 specific cases of flood management from around the world and suggests a Checklist with self-assessment questions to support flood management decision-making. For each Principle, it provides a Checklist to support stakeholders' self-assessment of flood governance policy frameworks (*what*), institutions (*who*), and instruments (*how*). The Checklist intends to encourage stakeholder dialogue and peer learning; to better understand how flood governance systems are performing at local, basin and national level; and help guide decisions.

The information provided was analysed to sketch out best practices, and lessons learnt for more effective, efficient and inclusive flood management.

The report primarily targets responsible flood decision-makers and managers at local, basin and national levels, but is of relevance to water stakeholders at large. It unpacks challenges and key features of flood governance approaches. The Principles, Indicator Framework and Checklists provide a constructive basis to analyse other water subsectors, such as drought management, the management of water supply and sanitation, the management of wastewater, and more.

**Mr Tropp** highlighted that the report has gone through several iterations and benefitted greatly from comments and feedback from both case study providers and a range of flood management experts and stakeholders, as well as experts and stakeholders from the water sector in general. The WGI has made several inputs to draft versions of the report, especially during the 7th and 11th meetings of the OECD Water Governance Initiative, which provided the opportunity to test hypotheses, collect feedback and peer-review the report at different stages. Mr Tropp extended his gratitude to all those WGI members that provided inputs and comments on earlier versions. The further guidance from WGI members on future courses of action and priority water sub-sectors to work was seen as very valuable by the OECD Secretariat.

### 1.3. Tour de table on latest water governance research and policy reforms

#### *Water Integrity Global Outlook in 2021, WIN*

**Ms Barbara Schreiner, Executive Director, WIN**, announced that WIN's [Water Integrity Global Outlook](#) (WIGO), published for the first time in 2016, would become a regular flagship report published every three years. The next one will be launched in 2021. In each future edition, apart from the update on global context, there will be a regional or subsector focus. The focus for the 2021 edition will be on urban water and sanitation, given the situation of rapidly increasing urban populations, especially in developing countries, and the impact of informal settlements on the provision of water and sanitation services. This publication is intended to be a collaborative publication and Ms Schreiner invited delegates to provide information and evidence for the next WIGO edition on where corruption and lack of integrity are playing out and how people are being impacted, as well as success stories and failures.

#### *Serving SDG implementation: A role for good water management and governance, GWP*

**Mr François Brikké, Senior Network Officer, GWP**, presented developments on SDG implementation in water resources management. Mr Brikké announced that GWP will launch a new strategy for 2020-2025 '[Mobilising for a Water-Secure World](#)' based on three main pillars: SDGs, climate resilience and transboundary cooperation. He suggested that this work could be embedded within nationally binding frameworks and stressed the importance of active learning not only through the knowledge provided by partners but also through a revamp of the already-existing [IWRM Toolbox](#). SDG 6.5.1 on Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) is a key entry point for water management and, in this regard, GWP highlighted the monitoring work carried out by UNEP in 2017 on [IWRM Baselines in over 170 countries](#). UNEP is currently working with GWP and Cap-Net to support policy dialogue on IWRM implementation, building on the data that has already been collected from different monitoring tools. Mr Brikké highlighted that there is much work to be done in supporting the implementation of water governance and IWRM at country level, and encouraged delegates to work actively to avoid duplications and find complementarities.

***Monitoring community participation in water and sanitation under SDG 6.b, WHO***

**Ms Marina Takane, Technical Officer, WHO**, gave an update on the work that WHO has been doing in collaboration with the members of the WGI and UN Environment on the monitoring of community participation in water and sanitation. Ms Takane reminded delegates that many different perspectives exist on *what* target 6.b. on monitoring community participation is meant to monitor. In order to evaluate these different views, WHO has been working with SIWI and the University of North Carolina (UNC) Water Institute on an in-depth study report on SDG 6.b. A conclusion is that there will never be one single indicator that will be able to adequately reflect all the aspects that target 6.b proposes: a way forward is to take a broader view and explore all these different perspectives in order to get a more holistic picture of community participation. These diverse perspectives will be included in the revised GLAAS Survey, which will appear in the [GLAAS 2019 report](#) along with other relevant analyses. WHO will continue to support the strengthening and reinforcing of national monitoring systems and will continually publish External Support Agency (ESA) reports and country highlights.

***National Congress on the Environment (CONAMA), 26-29 November 2018, Madrid, Spain, AEAS***

**Ms Gari Villa-Landa Sokolova, Head of International Affairs, AEAS**, presented to the WGI the results from the [2018 CONAMA Congress](#), where AEAS organised a Working Group on water governance to raise awareness on the need for water governance and identify what is working and the main gaps and challenges of water governance in Spain. The Working Group used the [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#) and the [OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework](#) as a basis for their work, and the conclusions of the three meetings held are being gathered in a report. She highlighted the fact that many new non-traditional actors and members of other sectors participated in the Working Group and it was very enriching to engage across sectors. In order to collectively analyse the governance concepts in a practical and transparent manner, AEAS also organised a workshop by using the [Recovery of the Segura River case study](#) as a basis. CONAMA 2018 is the starting point of a long-term project, with the main objective of raising awareness of the need for water governance and creating a culture of water governance, not just water management.

***10th Water Economics Forum, Granada, Spain, 26 March 2019, IMDEA***

**Mr Gonzalo Delacámara, Senior Research Fellow and Head of the Water Economics Department, IMDEA**, presented the results of the [10th Water Economics Forum](#), a public debate initiative held in Granada. One aim of the Forum was to find synergies with the [OECD's work on Circular Economy](#). Some key messages included:

- In less developed countries and regions, circular economy approaches are perceived as eccentric in comparison to the challenges faced in these environments. However, circular economy can be a driver for advanced wastewater treatment and re-use.
- Water re-use is a pervasive issue. The point is to foster water treatment and water re-use, especially a much more systematic approach to water re-use and material recovery.
- There is scope to discuss the optimal spatial scale for water re-use initiatives.
- There is a need for more sectoral policy coordination, which requires new institutional frameworks.
- Very often pricing approaches are looking to the past rather than dealing with risk management. There is much scope to see how to secure needed capital investment,

make these projects sustainable and find equitable and efficient mechanisms of sharing costs and benefits.

- Discussions suggested that a circular economy approach is not just about resource efficiency, it is also about water resource control and the protection of water upstream. There are efforts to be made in the conservation of aquatic systems in order to lower the unit cost of wastewater treatment.

### *IWA and the International Water Regulators Forum: LATAC & Asia Pacific, IWA*

**Ms Carolina Latorre, Senior Officer of Water Policy & Regulation, IWA**, announced the next two regional events that will take place within IWA's [International Water Regulators Forum](#) initiative, established in 2014, which brings together regulators involved in the provision of water, sanitation and wastewater management services for peer-to-peer learning, synergies and collaboration to inform water-wise policies. The XII Ibero-American Forum on Regulation will take place on 16-17 October 2019 in Cartagena, Colombia. The focus will be exploring the role of regulators in achieving the SDGs, notably SDG 6, together with other shareholders. The [II Asia-Pacific Water Regulators Conference](#) will take place on November 1 2019 in Hong Kong within the 8<sup>th</sup> IWA-Aspire Conference and Exhibition. During this Conference, relevant authorities will discuss resilience and explore the governance principles in the region. Ms Latorre invited delegates to participate in the meetings.

### *Update on WGI contributions to the global agenda, OECD*

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat**, updated delegates on WGI contributions to the global agenda. Ms Akhmouch firstly highlighted that the [9th World Water Forum](#) is an important milestone for the WGI, as the WGI itself is emanates from the 6<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum (2012) and the work that is currently being conducted will be launched in Dakar, 2021. The OECD has been invited to take part in the International Steering Committee of the Forum preparatory process and to lead with other organisations the *Means and Tools for Implementation* Pillar, under which governance is included as a theme. This is an excellent opportunity to promote continuity between two World Water Fora regarding governance discussions. Ms Akhmouch invited delegates planning to participate in the [COP 25](#) (Santiago, Chile) to signal their appetite for joint sessions or events on that occasion. The [10th World Urban Forum](#) will take place at Abu Dhabi, UAE on February 8-13 2020. The theme of this year's Forum is *Cities of Opportunities: Connecting Culture and Innovation*, with room to plan water sessions in collaboration with WGI members. Finally, Ms Akhmouch invited interested WGI delegates to the [1st OECD Roundtable on Cities and Circular Economy](#) (July 4<sup>th</sup>) and the [1st OECD Roundtable on Smart Cities and Inclusive Growth](#) (July 9<sup>th</sup>).

### *Group Discussion*

**Ms Joannie Leclerc, Dialogue and Societal Impact Director, SUEZ**, asked the WHO representative if the GLAAS report will be brought for discussion at the next WGI meeting.

**Ms Marina Takane** responded that the GLAAS 2019 report will be launched on August 28<sup>th</sup>, 2019, during the Stockholm World Water Week and that the in-depth report on SDG 6.b will be launched at the end of the year.

**Ms Susanne Dorasil** asked the meeting delegates if there was feedback from countries on the use and application of the many existing water indicator frameworks.

**Mr François Brikké** gave feedback regarding a workshop that took place in Kinshasa, RDC, where different assessment frameworks were discussed (GLAAS, OECD and UNEP frameworks).

He stated the added value of organising back-to-back discussions on these three frameworks that address different perspectives but present strong complementarities. He invited all institutions to consider further possible synergies when approaching the same countries with their respective frameworks, and suggested that the SDG framework could be a good candidate for country-level convening.

**Ms Marina Takane** informed delegates that GLAAS has recently completed its fifth cycle of data collection. From the results, it is clear that most countries understand how the monitoring process works, but there are difficulties with follow-through and maintaining the momentum, due to the existence of many other assessment methodologies. Therefore, she highlighted the value of the WGI members working together on consolidating and coordinating on these issues for more efficient use by countries.

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch** suggested that a first step to encourage synergies among initiatives is understanding what countries need, which may not always be data and monitoring (but, for instance, self-assessment and multi-stakeholder dialogues). She offered to coordinate with WIN, as part of the WIGO process, given the forthcoming OECD project on *Cities and Public Procurement* should the next WIGO edition also cover OECD/partner countries.

**Mr Antonio Herman Benjamin, Chair, WCEL**, brought the judge's perspective to the discussion. He reminded delegates that even though the SDGs, benchmarks and other frameworks do not have a binding nature, these can be considered by judges in litigation, and the more precise they are, the more they are taken into consideration.

**Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat**, flagged that the OECD is participating in the discussions promoted by UNEP on the update of the Survey and methodology for Indicator 6.5.1 towards the new round of data collection in 2020. Other organisations involved are, amongst others, WHO, FAO and UNESCO. The OECD shared the 10-step methodology to support more effective multi-stakeholder dialogue.

**Ms Gari Villa-Landa Sokolova** shared a practical case study concerning the use of the OECD Principles in ongoing work. ISO has recently created a Working Group to develop guidelines in corporate governance for water utilities and the OECD Principles are being used, in an adapted form, as the basis for these guidelines. This will be ongoing work for the next 2 years.

**Ms Lesha Witmer, Butterfly Effect/Women for Water Partnership**, mentioned that there are two recently-published manuals that could be of use. One has been published by the office of the UN Secretary General and another has been published by the multi-stakeholder group coordination mechanism at the UN in New York for the High Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development (HLPF). Ms Witmer recommended looking at this last document in order to get a better idea of how to combine different groups, what stakeholder mechanisms have worked in different countries, and what aspects could be improved to make stakeholder participation and consultation more effective. Ms. Witmer stressed the importance of collecting data and mentioned that many surveys end up in different Ministries and Agencies, with the danger of information not being properly disseminated. Ms Witmer suggested a mapping of different information-collection mechanisms and stressed the importance of collecting citizen data and using it in an academically useful way.

**Mr. Antonio Herman Benjamin** informed about the Judges in Water Initiative that was launched during the [8th World Water Forum](#) and mentioned its use in a case in the Supreme Court of Bombay. The [Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice](#) is now available after long deliberations and the related training programs are planned to begin. Mr. Hermann Benjamin encouraged delegates to examine the Declaration and stated his willingness to discuss with and assist interested delegates to make use of it.

**Ms Aparna Sridhar, Policy Advisor for Water, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)**, highlighted that work has been carried out with the aim of incorporating water governance principles, including the OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework, regionally and globally, as well as work on how to engage a number of tools that incorporate ecological items alongside governance mechanisms. In Africa, a regional-level Congress on water security will be held in April 2020. In Latin America, TNC will be supporting a Congress during the summer of the [Latin America Water Funds Partnership](#), a joint multi-stakeholder partnership with the aim of discussing how investments in nature-based solutions can support water resources management. Lastly, Ms Sridhar mentioned that there is an emerging body of work in the European context, building on two workshops in Spain and the UK, where the role of nature-based solutions in water agendas was explored.

**Ms Barbara Schreiner** informed the delegates about WIN's work on Integrity Indicators for Water Utilities and encouraged interested members to approach WIN for more information.

**Mr Gerald Jan Ellen, Researcher/Advisor - Governance and Spatial Planning, Deltares**, mentioned that the Dutch government is working on the Blue Deal project, focusing on SDGs 6.3 to 6.6. Deltares is working with local partners on this and makes use of the OECD water governance indicators in the monitoring and evaluation approach of this project.

**Ms Rochi Khemka, Global Partnerships Coordinator/Asia Regional WRM Specialist, 2030 Water Resources Group**, took the opportunity to introduce the organisation to the delegates and stressed that their local-level multi-stakeholder platforms function as a governance mechanism in itself, both in the governance process as well as in the outcomes. She encouraged delegates to look for synergies with 2030 Water Resources Group to advance governance frameworks at the local level.

#### 1.4. Women and Water decision-making: Challenges and Opportunities

The **Chair** introduced the session, which discussed the thematic work on Women and Water decision-making. One of the outcomes of the [WGI Satisfaction and Forward-looking Survey](#) extended to WGI members (May 2018) was to promote thematic work on innovative and crosscutting areas. This session discusses a draft Working Paper on the methodology to assess the role of women in water-decision making and existing evidence gaps in the literature.

##### *Building evidence for inclusion of women in water governance, Women for Water Partnership*

**Ms Lesha Witmer** invited delegates to input comments and feedback in order to improve the draft Working Document. She stressed that the focus of the project is to try to find impact of gender mainstreaming in the water sector given the fact that despite the amount of policy and guidance, there does not seem to be a proportionate translation into action and impact. The question was posed: if more women are participating, is there a change in how decisions are being made and their outcomes? Ms Witmer invited WGI members to look into their research and databases and share their information. Ms Witmer summarised the main findings of the first phase:

- There is very little existing gender-disaggregated data, either collected or reported, on the role that women play in governance as well as their decision-making impact.
- From the information that does exist, it is obvious that women are under-represented in decision-making, policy setting and strategies in water resources management, tariff setting, technological and environmental choices.

- What seems to be hindering more women-inclusiveness is often linked to stereotypes and traditional roles. If women are involved, their involvement seems to follow the traditional perception of their roles as caretakers: women tend to concentrate in committees of social inclusion and social impact but are less frequently involved in infrastructure, tariff setting and technology, especially in the water and energy sectors.
- Some of the research indicated that when there are informal procedures originating in alternative governance structures, women tend to play a bigger role, but this fact is rarely documented. Looking at these informal decision processes could be useful as a learning point for other more formal governance processes.
- The role of women as influencers of water governance is not explicit and their knowledge is not acknowledged and appreciated.
- There is a strong link between legal rights and women's access to water and water decision-making.

### *Draft methodology to assess the role of women in water decision-making, OECD*

**Mr Tropp** highlighted that the Working Document is work-in-progress and encouraged members to give their comments and feedback. Mr Tropp stressed that the ultimate objective is to explore how to build up policy recommendations for different kinds of stakeholders and improve knowledge at different levels on inclusivity when it comes to decision-making in water.

**Mr Tropp** outlined the main aspects of the methodology. The desk review has thrown light on the lack of water sector-specific information on the inclusion of women in governance processes. The Survey is based on bridging gaps that were concluded by the literature review. It aims to assess the current state of play of women in water, and also to take a step further and look at what hinders women-inclusive governance in the water sector and what other opportunities exist for women as well as the difference that increased engagement of women can bring about in both the governance processes as well as their outcomes. The Survey will be complemented with a number of in-depth interviews, best practices and case studies and will be disseminated to a range of stakeholders that will cover primarily the public sector at the national level and other sectors (private and non-for-profit) as well as the more local/transboundary and basin levels (due to their responsibility in the delivery of water services), with the aim of capturing both formal and informal processes. Some examples include relevant ministries, government agencies working on water (such as regulators and basin organisations), associations of water service providers, NGOs, business associations and large water related companies. The intended geographical scope of the Survey is to reach 50 or 60 countries around the world, both within the OECD and beyond.

**Mr Tropp** concluded by inviting members to flag additional reports and evidence that have not been considered as well as expressing interest in participating in the implementation of the Survey.

### *Group Discussion*

**Mr Kevin Collins, Senior Lecturer on Environment & Systems, The Open University**, brought attention to the fact that gender inequality is a systemic problem, which entails cultural, social, economic and political dimensions. He recommended to bring direct focus on education and access to education, particularly in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) subjects. Improving the methodology could be done by focusing on the University sector and to what extent women are able and willing to access STEM subjects.

**Mr Erik van Lith, Strategic Advisor for Drinking Water, Water Chain and Water Systems, Royal HaskoningDHV**, mentioned a recent decision by the Eindhoven University of Technology

to only allow women to respond to vacancies given the lack of women in the sector. Mr van Lith suggested that this could be of inspiration to the water sector as, sometimes, “old boys’ networks” backlog the position of women and there is also an issue regarding women themselves in their tendency to underestimate their capabilities when applying to vacancies. The building of relationships through networking can help women to enquire and discuss about job requirements to support more informed and confident judgement on the capabilities required for certain jobs.

**Ms Maelis Monnier, Dialogue and Societal Impact Project Officer, SUEZ**, presented three main suggestions. Firstly, it would be useful to more precisely define the role of women in governance (first as a community member and secondly, as a leader and manager). Both these roles have different incentives and capacity of impact on inclusivity. Secondly, SUEZ has done some research to measure the impact of women in sustainable development and offered their support in providing guidance to the project. Thirdly, it was suggested to carry out further analysis and ask about other factors that may be involved in promoting more inclusiveness such as through employee consultations and cultural circumstances.

**Ms Ellen Pfeiffer, Researcher, IHE-Delft**, informed delegates that IHE-Delft is currently conducting an action-research project on promoting the involvement of water-related decision-making in Africa and expressed interest in contributing to this initiative. Ms Pfeiffer expressed some concern about the language and presentation of the draft Working Document: if women have the inherent right to be involved in decision-making but more inclusive governance is presented as something to be done because it improves decision-making, it can be implied that access for women still has to be earned and granted. Instead, Ms Pfeiffer suggested to measure impact in terms of the societal cost of women not being involved in decision-making. Other suggestions that were made included ensuring women agency in these kinds of initiatives, and making sure that we know where women are, how they identify themselves and how the work carried out by initiatives like this one can link to women’s experiences on the ground.

**Mr Gonzalo Delacámara** suggested that the project could become more ambitious and radical by going down to the roots of the issue. In this sense, he explained that there tends to be a misleading idea that this is a water-sector specific problem, and it is not. Therefore, the emphasis should be placed on what are the distinctive features of gender inequality in the water sector, but also in public policy overall. Enhancing representation in governance processes is critical, but it is a means to an end, which is to give voice to those women that do not have a voice or cannot use it. Furthermore, it is important to show critical linkages between gender inequality and other issues, such as lack of access to high-skilled labour market opportunities and education for women in both less developed and OECD countries as well as inequality and poverty.

**Ms Carolina Latorre** informed about a study carried out by IWA in collaboration with US-AID, titled [An Avoidable Crisis: WASH Human Resource Capacity Gaps in 15 Developing Economies](#) and emphasised that it is important to understand that this is not just a problem affecting women, but a global problem in the sense of representing a human resources capacity gap. Ms Latorre expressed IWA’s interest in contributing to the initiative.

**Ms Sogol Jafar Zadeh, Environmental Affairs Advisor, OSCE**, informed members of an ongoing project on women, water management and conflict prevention with the aim of incorporating gender perspectives on water governance and conflict prevention in Central Asia and Afghanistan. This project not only looks at interlinkages between SDG 5 and 6, but also 16. Furthermore, the OSCE is currently developing a manual on how to integrate gender aspects in water governance. It will provide practical guidelines on how to incorporate gender aspects into water governance for the use of water professionals and university professors. Furthermore, the OSCE is organising a regional training course on water diplomacy and gender sensitive

negotiation. Ms Jafar Zadeh offered the OSCE's contribution to the initiative, as an example of information from non-OECD countries.

**Ms Barbara Schreiner** informed that there is not enough information on the table either about the links between gender and corruption. Ms Schreiner pointed to the existence of some interesting research outside of the water sector and expressed her interest in working together with Women for Water Partnership and the OECD on the initiative.

**Mr Francois Brikké** informed members that the SDG 6.5.1 survey mentioned before has several indicators on gender but expressed concern about the fact that the gender indicator is the least well-reported indicator out of the 33 sub-indicators. More research needs to be done to understand how to reformulate this indicator. Mr Brikké also offered GWP's collaboration in terms of sharing information and pointed to work being carried out on the topic in collaboration with the Water Research Commission (WRC) of South Africa. Mr Brikké concluded by emphasising that the ground breaking, innovative point of the proposed survey is the impact part to construct evidence to convince of the need of gender approaches, and this has to be done through both quantitative and qualitative data.

**Ms Marina Takane** echoed Mr Brikké's comments and informed members that, from an SDG 6.b perspective, the GLAAS Survey asks specifically about women's participation. Mr Takane offered to share the data to have others expand on it and move forward.

**Ms Rochi Khemka** informed members that the 2030 Water Resources Group launched a report in March 2019 on the nexus between [water, agriculture and gender](#), which included six case studies in Asia. She suggested that a linkage could be made within the methodology between underrepresentation in gender within decision-making process and the systemic issue of lack of access to finance, markets and resources.

**Ms Susanne Dorasil** informed members that gender equality is an important and crosscutting issue for the German Development Corporation and there are indicators for all of their Programmes. She expressed concern about considering participation as a means to an end, and rather preferred to consider it an end in itself. Ms Dorasil continued by expressing concern about the issues being presented as a water-specific issue and national governments not being sure about how to use the information that is generated to close the gaps in gender equality.

The **Chair** asked Ms Lesha Witmer and Mr Håkan Tropp to react to the comments.

**Ms Lesha Witmer** thanked the members who offered to give access to further data and to review the Survey questions. She stressed that though many of the comments are relevant and useful, due to financial constraints, it is not possible to research all aspects of gender equality and the focus has been placed on the impact of women-inclusive governance in the water sector and on other water-related issues. Ms Witmer also made reference to comments on the topic of education. Though there is still a big gap in women participation in official education in the water sector, it is not so much in the academic field (the availability of education), but rather in access to the labour market. Furthermore, what is also missing is the link to vocational training at secondary level. Ms Witmer highlighted the importance of the impacts related to women's involvement (formal and informal); what made it successful; what bottlenecks exist, and what it means for the water sector. She concluded by mentioning that there is research that has been done on the impact of governance involving women, but most of it has been done in the private sector, which could be a source of inspiration for members of the public sphere to carry out similar type of work.

**Mr Håkan Tropp** thanked members for their comments and expressed his interest in capturing this feedback in further versions of the Survey but reminded members that the future of the project is conditioned upon achieving funding for phase II. Mr Tropp also highlighted that though

capturing impact is the main aim of the initiative, the systematic capturing of both bottlenecks and enabling environment factors is also something of value to add to existing material on the subject. In regards to impact, Mr Tropp echoed a previous idea on measuring the losses brought about by non-inclusiveness in governance and considered it an interesting perspective that could be explored. He also mentioned that one very important distinction when measuring impact is not to consider women inclusiveness from the perspective of it being “good or bad”, but rather from the perspective of achieving different outcomes.

## 1.5. Water security for sustainable development in Africa

The **Chair** introduced the session and reminded the WGI members that during the 8<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum in Brazil, the OECD Secretary-General received the King Hassan II World Water Prize. This Prize recognised the OECD’s and WGI’s work to raise the profile of water in local, national and global agendas. As a follow-up, the OECD Secretariat has set up a new two-year Programme on Water Security for Africa that aims to produce new data, evidence and awareness raising campaigns in cooperation with a wide range of institutions active in the region and select African countries (including Morocco and Senegal). The Programme will leverage the prize money (100,000 USD) to catalyse more funds through partnerships and the findings from the programme will be released at the next World Water Forum in Dakar, Senegal in 2021.

### *Update on the Programme: The governance and economics of water security for sustainable development in Africa, OECD Secretariat*

**Ms Maria Salvetti, OECD Secretariat**, updated delegates on the progress of the Programme since the previous WGI Meeting where the programme’s scope was discussed following a webinar that shaped its contours with 30+ WGI delegates on 15 June 2018. Firstly, a mapping of existing initiatives in Africa was completed by the Secretariat, in collaboration with the WGI Steering Committee, in order to identify collaborative partnerships, synergies and donors. The findings were discussed in an informal workshop with some WGI members held in The Hague on 21 March 2019, whose outcomes were shared and discussed. The proposed working programme includes the following activities to be carried out within the next 2 years: a regional survey on water governance in Africa; at least three policy dialogues at different scales (country, basin, city); and an online-repository of solutions for better water security in Africa. An additional set of cross-cutting activities will seek to foster capacity, raise awareness, and share best practices throughout implementation. The programme will deliver concrete outputs for the World Water Forum (Dakar, 2021) in the form of reports, infographics and user-friendly tools, a communications campaign, online datasets and toolkits, and will function as an umbrella for various related activities led by partner institutions in Africa. A two-page brochure has been produced both in [English](#) and [French](#).

The Secretariat insisted that all programmatic activities should be demand-driven, co-produced, and co-implemented with relevant African countries, stakeholders and other institutions.

The Programme was launched on World Water Day, 22 March 2019, with a new [partnership between the OECD and the WWC in cooperation with the Kingdom of Morocco and the Republic of Senegal](#). A call for collaborations was sent out in the weeks before the WGI Meeting to invite partners to join the initiative and consider complementarities with regards to water-related data production and research, or any of the four activities of the Programme described above. Seventy-six responses to the survey were received, mainly coming from research institutions (32%), international organisations (25%) and civil society and NGOs (22%). Overall, seven institutions contribute or have proposed to contribute financially to the development and implementation of

the programme. 29 institutions are proposing to collaborate on the regional survey with a majority being research institutions (35%) and international organisations (31%); and most of them being international (31%), European (35%) or African (28%) institutions. 36 institutions have proposed collaboration on policy dialogues, with a majority of them being research institutions (31%) and civil society and NGO entities (28%). Among the collaboration proposals expressed, 25 concern a dialogue at national level, 17 at basin level and 18 at city level. Sixteen institutions have proposed policy dialogues at various scales. The themes most commonly proposed for the policy dialogues include governance (23%), water supply (21%) and water resource management (19%). 59 respondents volunteered to collaborate on the online repository, proposing predominantly to share best practices, practical solutions and success stories. 37 institutions have volunteered to host international events. In a majority of cases, the proposed location of the event is still to be discussed. However, some institutions are already proposing to host an event either in Africa or in Europe. The type of possible event is broad, ranging from conferences, workshops to summer university or capacity building. The possible themes of these events focus mainly on water security and water governance. However, there is some room for further discussion on the themes for a large majority of events. A complete summary of the results of the online survey is available and being sent along with the present highlights of the 12<sup>th</sup> meeting of the WGI.

Next steps include defining the criteria for selection among the proposals received; engaging discussions with the African countries that signalled interest to participate, and with selected organisations on how to best cooperate and coordinate.

### *Outcomes of the workshop in The Hague (Netherlands), WIN*

**Mr Teun Bastemeijer, Chief Advisor on Strategic Outreach & Programmes, WIN**, highlighted that the Prize is seen as one of the best opportunities of the WGI's collective work and an example of the use of the governance angle to establish favourable policy environments within and outside of the OECD countries through the promotion of a water culture that favours sustainable outcomes, given that without improved governance and integrity, achieving the SDGs is not feasible. Mr Bastemeijer informed members that the workshop objectives were to provide inputs to the planning and decision-making concerning the Programme in preparation for the WGI meeting in Berlin and to have a feel for where the Programme could be directed, with a particular focus on ensuring African ownership.

**Mr Bastemeijer** stressed that the workshop in The Hague (Netherlands) that took place in March 21, 2019, did not have any formal status. The participants in the workshop highlighted the importance of the Programme unfolding as a multi-stakeholder partnership, the idea being to support policy dialogues and other kinds of initiatives that would involve both WGI members and partners in Africa as a matter of principle and practicality. A strong case was made to make sure the Programme work complements the [Africa Water Vision 2025](#) and the [AMCOW Strategy](#).

**Mr Bastemeijer** outlined that the most important outcome of the Programme would be to have a number of coherent projects and partnerships before as well as during the next World Water Forum so that follow-up could be ensured during the years thereafter. However, this cannot happen without sufficient institutional anchorage in Africa. A graph was presented which showed some existing entities and programs as well as potential synergies in order to make the Programme provide leverage in a cost efficient way. This graph is just a suggestion of possible synergies that were discussed at the meeting in The Hague.

**Mr Bastemeijer** concluded by thanking WGI members and encouraging them to help and engage in making this Programme a long-term success.

### *Group Discussion*

**Mr Ignacio Deregibus, Officer, IWRA**, announced that the next IWRA [World Water Congress](#) to be held in Daegu, Korea is a key milestone on the road to Dakar. Given that this year, the main theme of the Congress is on water security and resilience, it would be a good place to showcase progress on the Africa Programme.

**Mr Federico Properzi, UN-Water Chief Technical Adviser, UN-Water**, congratulated the OECD Secretariat on the achievement of the Prize. Mr Properzi reminded delegates that integrated water resources management is now enshrined in the 2030 agenda as one of the key targets of SDG 6. Member states of the United Nations approved the targets and the indicators for each target and the national statistical offices have approved the methodology to check progress against the indicators. Mr Properzi indicated UN-Water's contribution to this data collection and benchmarking and that surveys on IWRM have been carried out at the global level by the UN in 2008, 2012 and 2017. In the SDG framework, the custodian agency for SDG 6.5.1 is UNEP. The current plan is to have a global data drive in 2020. In Africa, AMCOW is the focal point for UN-Water to be able to reach out to all countries. Mr Properzi emphasised that there is great potential for synergies to be explored between these different initiatives to avoid duplication and overburdening countries with data requests.

**Ms Monika Weber-Fahr, Executive Secretary and CEO, GWP**, congratulated the OECD Secretariat on the award and reiterated UN Water's invitation to avoid duplications. There is room to use existing systems, structures and initiatives to make the most of their complementarities. Ms Weber-Fahr suggested that the Working Groups may constitute a suitable place to discuss in more detail. She also enquired whether the deadline for the "call for collaborations" sent to stakeholders in June could be further extended to allow more institutions to input properly, which was agreed.

**Mr Canisius Kanangire, Executive Secretary of AMCOW**, thanked the OECD Secretariat for inviting AMCOW to the 12<sup>th</sup> WGI meeting, congratulated the teams that worked on the Africa Programme and expressed sorrow at not being able to attend the workshop in The Hague on 21 March due to other commitments. He expressed content at the fact that there is a convergence on the need for supporting greater water security in Africa and key pillars of the proposed OECD Programme and AMCOW's Strategy. This Strategy emphasises three major ideas: *water security* seen in all different aspects (supply, water resources management, water *vis a vis* climate change, etc.); *good governance* (building the political will and support of water issues, building the capacity of water decision-makers and providing updated and accurate data); and *sanitation*. Most of these issues are taken into consideration and, during the implementation phase of the Programme, there will be more collaboration reflecting the contribution of the African continent. Mr Kanangire invited the OECD Secretariat to consult further with some key actors in the African context to foster a more demand-driven process, which can secure broader buy-in and ownership. Building on already-created foundations, such as AMCOW, can be a means to make implementation more efficient and for results to be more sustainable.

**Daniela Krahl, Deputy Head of Division on Water, Urban Development and Mobility at BMZ**, echoed the importance of the programming being based on clear demands and needs. She expressed the importance of making sure the policy dialogues involve authorities at the national level and suggested that it would be helpful to work with Morocco, which has a particularly compelling voice in Africa in terms of water scarcity and climate change issues.

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch** thanked the delegates and reminded them that the monetary prize was given as an *ex post* recognition of the OECD's work, and had no strings attached, providing ample room for tailoring a programme that brings value and can make a difference. She insisted that the proposed activity is, for the time being, considered for a time-bound period to provide a modest

contribution to guide public action related to water security in Africa. She was very appreciative of the inputs suggested in terms of coordinating with and avoiding duplication with the massive data driven effort that will be undertaken by UNEP and other UN-Water members in 2020 and suggested that close coordination be undertaken to (co-)design the foreseen regional survey. As next steps, Ms Akhmouch suggested that the OECD draft a short paper with the detailed proposals from the call for collaboration, and set up a task force of few WGI members (in addition to the Steering Committee) who wish to participate more directly in the programme's implementation.

**Mr Teun Bastemeijer** responded to Mr Kanangire's intervention and emphasised that the effort has always been driven towards finding a way to use the prize money in order to leverage existing efforts. Mr Bastemeijer suggested that perhaps a better term to use for these contributions would be "proposals". He also suggested that, as soon as possible, there could be some smaller in-between meetings of a task force of entities made up of both WGI delegates and important players in Africa to see the best way forward to make sure that programmatic offers are matching demands.

## 1.6. An Overview of Key Governance Challenges in Africa: Lessons Learned and Ways Forward

The Chair introduced the session where different stakeholder perspectives on key governance challenges in Africa were presented and discussed. Delegates were invited to share their experiences and best practices on water governance in African contexts.

### *Mr Canisius Kanangire, Executive Secretary, AMCOW*

**Mr Canisius Kanangire** thanked delegates for the opportunity to speak and gave an overview of key challenges in Africa. Water security, water availability, water quality and water risks are all issues that characterise the vulnerability of the African continent and which hamper achievements in other sectors such as the energy and health sectors. Other problems include lack of capacity for water resources management, both at national and continental level, low level of knowledge management and dissemination mainly because of poor quality of data, which affects the quality of monitoring as a basis for decision-makers.

**Mr Kanangire** mentioned some pervasive issues in African governance such as the lack of appropriate policies and legal frameworks as well as notable gaps in implementation, with the result of the impact not being commensurate to the efforts being put in. When policies are not transparent and efforts are not putting focus on integrity and accountability, it leads to significant governance challenges. This is aggravated by a lack of adequate capacity in terms of human resources, investments and financial allocations, which would translate into having the right infrastructure to ensure water security. As far as governance is concerned, policies and institutional frameworks need to be improved and strengthened. They would also benefit from a clear reflection of transparency, accountability and integrity issues.

In order to address these issues, AMCOW initiatives are working with other entities on the African continent other than Ministries such as river basin organisations, regional economic communities and the African Union. Of notable interest is the development of the Africa sanitation policy guideline, which helps guide clear policies at country level. The same will be done with water supply. Another initiative is to ensure that water and sanitation monitoring is conducted so that the data can be used by countries in their planning and allocation endeavours. This initiative is linked to the needs of countries so that they can better respond to the expectations of the different monitoring agencies. Furthermore, Mr Kanangire informed delegates that a knowledge management hub is currently being developed to provide countries with knowledge so that peer-

to-peer learning can take place. Through peer-to-peer learning, more transparency and more accountability are encouraged within communities, which leads to greater integrity. Finally, efforts are being made to use the opportunities granted by technology to develop capacity development programs that will aid in the democratisation of knowledge in water and sanitation.

*Ms Daniela Krahl, Deputy Head of the Division of Water, Urban Development and Mobility, BMZ, Germany*

**Ms Daniela Krahl** emphasised to delegates that good governance is a core concern for BMZ in its work in the water sector in developing countries. She shared German development cooperation experiences and lessons learned in water in Africa for more than 50 years, demonstrating that Africa is a key regional focus of German development cooperation in the water sector.

**Ms Krahl** presented four different categories of work done in governance in Africa, all of which aim for greater transparency and participation. The first category is management and planning, which includes budget allocation, and, more specifically, the establishment of transparent and clear budgetary criteria. The second category is sector reform and institutional framework, of which a central aspect is working with the regulatory bodies for them to use tools to enhance good governance through transparency, participation and integrity. The third category concerns monitoring and reporting, and more concretely, the establishment of regular sector reporting, which allows more transparency in utility performance and accountability in water service providers. Kenya and Tanzania were promoted as examples of the impact of these activities. The fourth category is integrity management and approaches in this area tackle water user involvement, as this is crucial to improve governance. Ms Krahl then went on to present the case study of Kenya as a successful example. Mr Krahl emphasised that through its work, the German development corporation tackles water governance issues at different levels: national, utility and consumer level.

**Ms Krahl** concluded by outlining a number of essential points: when we want to achieve good governance, we need to promote good governance at all levels, hand-in-hand with investments and through a pro-poor approach. This requires close collaboration of technical and financial resources.

*Mr John Dini, Researcher, Water Research Commission, South Africa*

**Mr John Dini** aimed to provide insight on the national level. Mr Dini stated that South Africa is not an exception to the challenges affecting the African context. However, an element that sets it apart is the existence of a platform of good policy and good law stemming from innovative water regulation passed when South Africa transitioned into democracy. However, Mr Dini outlined that there are still immense challenges to face in South Africa, some of which are unique to its history of apartheid and its impact on inequalities in access to water.

**Mr Dini** outlined the work that WRC is doing in order to illustrate the challenges that are being faced, and explained that South African water stakeholders had to ask some very hard and honest questions about if policies and laws in place today are still as cutting edge and implementable as they were 25 years before. Through the lens of Decolonisation theory, perhaps there are missing elements and a need to look at water governance from the perspective of plurality. In this sense, through its work, the WRC is exploring the WGI water governance Indicators to see how they add value, notably in the municipal context, as the South African Constitution assigns the provision of water services to the local sphere of government. Through this evaluation, the WRC has found some systemic flaws and weakness to be addressed. Mr Dini expressed optimism that the WGI Indicator Framework might offer assistance to improve the situation in South Africa and also that the South African experience might help the WGI to develop the next set of indicators on impact.

According to **Mr Dini**, the experience in South Africa is that the SDGs do not change the agenda but they prove very useful to organise and integrate existing framework, as a sort of common language to coordinate, not just within the water sector and not just within flagship national departments focusing on water, but also across sectors. In terms of participation, there is a lot of trust and social capital that has been eroded in the last 5 to 10 years in South Africa and some of the challenges in implementation have become apparent. This had led South African stakeholders to ask the question of how to strengthen and restore trust, notably in terms of civil society participation, in the various processes of water governance.

**Mr Dini** concluded by sharing some of the emerging lessons of water governance in South Africa. In this sense, the thrust around transparency, accountability and participation are seen as means rather than ends in themselves. Mr Dini stressed that conversations on policy also have to involve conversations about implementation and highlighted the need to be realistic about what can be achieved, cautioning delegates that the enablers for integrity and accountability lie frequently outside the water sector and often rely on the broader environment of governance.

### *Group Discussion*

**Mr Teun Bastemeijer** referred back to Mr Kanangire's comments and underlined that in order to deal with these issues, it is often crucial to have an enabling environment and leading persons that are aware of the situation and eager to change it. Mr Bastemeijer suggested that a way forward could be to identify some of these people and see in which countries and institutions capacity building in this regard could be anchored.

**Mr Antonio Herman Benjamin** intervened to stress to delegates that judicial data is one of the best thermometers to see how policy implementation is going in any country. Mr Benjamin suggested working with judges in looking into judicial databanks in order to get a clear picture of the status of implementation.

**Mr Håkan Tropp** thanked the session presenters and posed the question to Ms Krahl about the amount and allocation of German investments, notably if BMZ had data on how much of total investment in the water sector in developing countries is going to water governance-related issues. On a more general note, Mr Tropp mentioned that it would be important to be able to pinpoint investments in governance and asked the other presenters to share any information they had in regards to this issue in their own countries.

**Mr Greg Leslie, Professor, The University of New South Wales**, brought attention to a capacity building activity currently being carried out by the Australian government, focused on midlevel water managers in East Africa. The activity is a seven-week training course on transnational water management in conjunction with the University of Eldoret in Kenya. One of the features that may be of interest is the focus on the development of the "return-to-work action plan". In this sense, the successful candidates are required to bring with them the problems that they are dealing with, and over the course, they are required to work with the trainers to bring together an action plan that will be monitored for 12 months afterwards. This monitoring helps both to inform the trainers to make sure it is relevant and to maintain ongoing engagement in training.

**Ms Marina Takane** highlighted some of the work being done by WHO on water governance in the form of sanitation policy case studies in five countries in Africa, with the aim of forming the evidence base on the Africa sanitation policy guidelines. Ms Takane also echoed previous comments that the benefits of the monitoring need to be acquired by countries themselves, and this is a topic of focus in the GLAAS cycle. Ms Takane concluded by informing members that WHO is looking for partnerships in this area and will continue to work with AMCOW and others to maximize the value of the data collected.

**Ms Daniela Krahl** responded to Mr Tropp's question and stated that though she cannot differentiate what amount of investment goes to governance from the total, she could confidently state that most of it goes to infrastructure, as investment is desperately needed in this area in the region.

**Mr Canisius Kanangire** assured delegates that, indeed, ministers in Africa are among those who welcome discussion on governance issues, including corruption. AMCOW understands that not all the ministers have the same understanding of the issues. In this sense, Mr Kanangire stated that AMCOW has the platform but lacks the capacity to present the material and launched a call for partnerships in this direction.

**Mr John Dini** responded to comments by informing members that WRC has just completed a knowledge review focusing on water governance and, more specifically, on the amount of investment in R&D in water governance in South Africa.

## 1.7. Peer-review of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Argentina

### *Pablo Bereciartua, Secretary of Water Infrastructure and Policy, Argentina*

**Mr Pablo Bereciartua, Secretary, Secretariat of Infrastructure and Water Policy of the Ministry of Interior, Public Works and Housing of Argentina**, thanked the Secretariat for their excellent work throughout the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue (NWPD) as well as delegates for the opportunity to obtain their valuable feedback during the WGI meeting. He informed delegates of the efforts that the current Argentinian administration has placed in the last 4 years to re-connect with international organisations and raise the profile of water in the national agenda. He reiterated the significant importance of this dialogue, which has proven both timely and relevant to support effective decision-making in Argentina through a neutral, external and independent assessment of the country's sector performance and concrete recommendations to bridge identified governance gaps.

**Mr Pablo Bereciartua** highlighted three key aspects of the NWPD:

- It captures in a precise way the complexity that the administrative and territorial characteristics of Argentina poses in water policy and effectively points out opportunities related to this structure. Argentina is a federal state with 23 provinces and the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, where the Constitution recognises that natural resources management is a provincial competence. Thus, the national government must negotiate policy measures, including legal reforms, investments, infrastructure projects, etc., with the provinces. However, the current structure also presents opportunities for partnerships across different levels of government.
- It introduces a new perspective on water policy in Argentina by analysing water governance (institutional, legal, regulatory, etc.) and water risks of too much, too little, and too polluted water and universal access to water services in a systemic manner. By doing this, it is changing the way Argentinian authorities think about water, and is helping uncover opportunities related to water, both for closing the gaps in public services and to use water as a more significant source for economic development and growth.
- The assessment and recommendations proposed by the OECD are generating consensus among Argentina's policy makers and other stakeholders from the public, private, not-for-profit and academic sectors. The dialogue will enrich the

next edition of the National Water Plan, whose key objective is to place water as a key driver to sustainable growth.

**Mr Bereciartua** concluded by informing delegates about the water investment policy followed during his mandate. The National Water Plan foresees that the country needs 44 billion dollars of investment to close current infrastructure gaps and increase water security. To complement infrastructure investments, Argentina is boosting its data infrastructure system with the installation of new meteorological radars and the renewal of the meteorological network. Lastly, Mr. Bereciartua presented the *Canal Continental* project that aims at increasing water availability in the country and foster climate change adaptation. Mr Bereciartua emphasised that government is investing in traditional infrastructure, but with the aim to innovate and explore opportunities to link water, energy and food.

### *Key findings and policy recommendations, OECD*

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat**, thanked the Secretary and the team for the unique and transparent exercise as well as the political commitment and leadership. Ms Akhmouch also thanked the peer reviewers from Spain, the Netherlands, Australia and Brazil, who are participating in the national dialogue for their valuable insights throughout the process based on their country experience and excellent expertise.

**Ms Akhmouch** outlined some of the key messages that the OECD identified as intrinsic to the situation of Argentina, including the diversity of climates and regions of a large, urbanised and decentralised federal country. Ms Akhmouch also gave a brief summary of the water-related reforms in the last 30 years, which included several provincial water laws, decentralisation-privatisation-nationalisation of water supply and sanitation services over the 1980s-2000s, a (2003) Federal Agreement setting down 49 principles for managing water resources, and a new National Water Plan (2016).

**Ms Akhmouch** then introduced key findings from the Draft Report presented for peer review. Chapter 1 provides an analysis of all the water risks (too much water, too little and too polluted water, disruption to freshwater systems, universal coverage) in the face of megatrends such as macroeconomic difficulties, urbanisation and large rates of informal settlements, expansion of service delivery and the implementation of targeted place-based social tariffs, climate change and digitalisation's opportunities to close some of the gaps and foster more water use efficiency. In Argentina, there is a conjunction of these risks that require trade-offs in terms of managing investments, but also sequencing reforms and minimising the impact on the economy. The Draft Report then takes the OECD Principles as a reading template to understand who is doing what, at which scale and how, looking into issues of multi-level governance in water management (chapter 2), water resources governance (chapter 3) and water services governance (chapter 4). In addition to the nation-wide assessment, the report also zooms in on four specific case studies in order to tailor the assessment to the diversity of situations in Argentina (Metropolitan Area of Buenos Aires, Santa Fe and Mendoza).

The four main challenges discussed in the report are fragmentation, planning and investment, regulation and river basin management. In terms of fragmentation, the dialogue investigated interesting mechanisms to foster better coordination across federal, provincial and local authorities following best practices from Australia or Brazil. In terms of planning and investment, the issue is how to align existing plans so there are no duplications or contradictory/split incentives and how to ensure water-related decisions are consistent across relevant policies and sectors. At basin level, many tensions persist in terms of water quality, allocation regimes, and flood management sometimes due to misalignments in the economic incentives (that neither allow for collecting revenues nor foster behavioural change towards more rationale water use). Inter-jurisdictional

Basin Committees, where they exist, can circumvent the fact that there is no national water agency in charge of transboundary rivers and foster a shift from a management based on administrative and territorial boundaries to a more catchment-based governance and from a crisis to a risk management perspective. Finally, in terms of economic regulation, the report flags three areas to move forward: i) improve access to drinking water and sanitation, particularly, in terms of wastewater treatment; ii) address issues of quality and low efficiency, not only in irrigation, but also in households as there is no systematic metering; and iii) foster financial sustainability and the full potential of economic instruments.

**Ms Akhmouch** concluded by providing a quick overview at some of the proposed (preliminary) recommendations such as raising the profile of the Federal Council for Water Resources as a full-fledged coordination body, promoting effective planning and multi-level investment, strengthening economic regulation, enhancing the use of financial and economic instruments and harmonising and strengthening information systems. This discussion is to culminate with a consensus building policy seminar that will convene 90+ stakeholders (Buenos Aires, 18-19 July) where the findings of the report will be discussed and the Action Plan co-produced.

### *Reactions from peer-reviewers (Spain, Netherlands)*

**Mr Gonzalo Delacámara, IMDEA**, congratulated the Argentinian team and the OECD for their presentations and commended the efforts of the Argentinian government in acknowledging mistakes and challenges. According to Mr Delacámara, there are two main enveloping challenges in Argentina: the connection between water and macroeconomic performance and the connection between water policies in the context of a federal country with a complex allocation of legal powers.

**Mr Delacámara** gave a brief outline of the economic situation in Argentina and the fluctuating nature of the economy, leading to difficulties in long-term planning of investment in priorities areas such as energy, transportation and water and sanitation. The economic dependence on exports puts massive pressure on water resources in the country. Mr Delacámara also stated that there is also some leeway for improvement in terms of vertical and horizontal sectoral policy coordination as well as improvements in circular economy demands and pollution source control. In terms of water services, other challenges include efficiency, micro measurement and actual incentives for efficient use of water and control of leakage. There is major potential for improvement with minor investments, not necessarily through new technologies but also performing contracts, etc.

**Mr Delacámara** concluded by informing delegates that the case in Argentina shows how important it is to connect water and the economy and how water is not a sectoral or environmental issue, but rather is at the core of socioeconomic development.

**Ms Monica Altamirano, Deltares**, thanked the Secretariat for the invitation to be a peer-reviewer and proceeded to give her overview of key challenges and solutions, focusing on the financial aspects of water resources governance. In terms of the challenges stemming from the federal system, this translates into prohibitive transaction costs and sub-optimisation in the use of scarce financial and water resources, which constrains economic growth and prevents efficiency gains. The process of decentralisation has resulted in a very large disparity in the capacities and resources of service providers, which results in limited opportunities for economies of scale and scope. In terms of water resources management, the most pressing issue is the fact that the optimisation is done at the provincial level, which could be leading to serious maladaptation. Ms Altamirano suggested Argentinian authorities should evaluate this issue. In terms of the challenges affecting investment in the water sector in Argentina, she emphasised the importance of making sure to adopt a long-term investment planning process where incentives for efficiency and effectiveness are built in and emphasised the importance of strengthening river basin committees to drive changes in

water resources development planning. Ms Altamirano also mentioned the role of efficient implementation and the development of strategic procurement strategy to support rational decision-making. She recommended the adoption of hybrid collaboration alternatives between the public and private sectors to create strong incentives for sustainability in service delivery.

**Ms Altamirano** concluded by commending Argentina's progress and the high quality of the technical expertise and recommended the switch from a mono-disciplinary approach to a multi-disciplinary one. Ms Altamirano emphasised that the economic crisis is a window of opportunity to change the rules of the game to incentivise efficiency and sustainability. In the process of strategic investment planning, Ms Altamirano focused on the importance of a long-term vision on water and infrastructure, notwithstanding the complexities of creating ownership within a federal system. However, she expressed conviction that Argentina has the capacity and expertise to get water systems to support decision-making.

### *Group Discussion*

The **Chair** then opened the floor for discussion and contribution to the peer review of the OECD Draft Report on "Water Governance in Argentina".

**Mr Teodoro Estrela Monreal, Head of Hydrological Planning Office, Júcar River Basin Authority**, congratulated the Secretary of Infrastructure and Water Policy for the initiative to undertake a dialogue with the OECD, and shared with delegates the ongoing collaboration between Spain and Argentina on water issues. He stressed the importance of planning, at national, subnational level and basin levels, as a coordination mechanism between all administrations as well as the benefits that come about through multi-stakeholder involvement processes, building on the experience in Spain. In particular, he highlighted the importance of water plans that are binding and come with sufficient budget. For instance, Mr. Estrela explained that, in Spain, currently no infrastructure project not included in a basin water plan would be eligible for funding from any administration at any level of government. This has increased accountability and built trust across national and subnational governments and basin organisations, as well as with non-state stakeholders.

**Mr Francois Brikké, GWP**, congratulated the Argentinian delegates on the excellent presentation and asked three questions to Mr Pablo Bereciartua: i) how inter-jurisdictional basin committees have evolved during his mandate and what role do they have in trans-basin projects, such as the *Canal Continental*; ii) which water allocation mechanisms and methodologies are being used by Argentinian water authorities to manage interests across different water users; and, iii) whether integrated water resources management works efficiently in Argentina.

**Ms Monika Weber-Fahr, GWP**, countered the affirmation that growth in nitrate use due to agricultural activity growth is good for the economy and asked for further clarification on this point.

**Ms Joannie Leclerc, SUEZ**, recognised Argentina's courage in carrying out this exercise and thanked the OECD for bringing this fantastic material for constructive dialogue as an inspiration for other stakeholders and countries. Ms Leclerc, who was intervening in her personal capacity (rather than her organisation's), informed delegates that it was the Argentinian experience that set the foundation of SUEZ's commitments to governance and stakeholder engagement. Ms Leclerc then outlined several important comments on the Draft Report. Firstly, she highlighted the absolute necessity for private operators to face strong and skilled clients and regulators as without such capacity, one ends up with a short-term view within a controlling and confrontational environment. Secondly, Mr Leclerc outlined that the Report underlines the risks deriving from multi-level and multi-lateral financing that is not based on proper dialogue and coordination, which leads to

infrastructure that is visible and concrete but not necessarily useful for the city, province or country. Thirdly, she stressed the challenge of providing access to services in informal settlements and address the issues of illegal connections and inefficiencies in the whole system. Fourthly, she echoed the Report's mention of the absolute necessity of user participation. Lastly, Ms Leclerc warned against the risk of low-level equilibrium that threaten all countries, even in mature democracies.

**Mr Kevin Collins, The Open University**, reinforced comments about the openness of Argentinian authorities to undertake an in-depth and transparent dialogue with the OECD. Mr. Collins advised the Secretariat to provide more information on the source of monetary resources currently being used to promote water investments in Argentina as well as the role played by international financial institutions. Mr Collins stressed that there is an ongoing global discussion about the role of international investment in environmental responsibility and their real contribution to making water governance greener. Mr. Collins explained that, for example, some investments in water infrastructure may promote the development of intensive agriculture which will have an impact in terms of nitrate pollution.

**Mr Mathieu Tristan, Executive Officer, FP2E**, was very impressed by the work that has been done and commended the role of KPIs in putting water policy at the top of the political agenda, based on the experience in France.

**Mr Oscar De Moraes Cordeiro Netto, Director, ANA**, thanked the OECD and Argentina for the invitation to be peer reviewer in the next mission and highlighted the common history and water resources between Brazil and Argentina notably in terms of the complexity of federal states and economic restrictions. Mr De Moraes Cordeiro Netto expressed his conviction that the NWPD would be of great benefit to Argentina, as it was to Brazil. He concluded by emphasising that Brazil can bring some experiences and successful initiatives, which have helped improve vertical integration between federative entities such as Progestão, Procomitês and Qualiáguas.

**Mr Peter Gammeltoft, Expert**, thanked the Argentinian delegates and the OECD for the insightful presentations and the Draft Report and highlighted several issues. One was the need for Argentina to emphasise the importance for other kinds of information, not only meteorological information, such as the pressure of other sectors on water resources for consistent policy at the federal level. There is also a significant issue of capacity at regional and local level and for water policy to work in a federal system, there needs to be capacity at these subnational levels or else the quality of the decisions will be worsened. Mr Gammeltoft also outlined the issue of how to fund the building of this kind of capacity such as through federal subsidies or water charges and echoed the previous comments on the issues of planning coordination and its importance for effective implementation of plans as well as the importance of horizontal coordination between different sector policies at Ministry level.

**Mr Ignacio Deregibus, IWRA**, thanked and congratulated the OECD Secretariat and Argentina for the valuable and self-critical analysis. Mr Deregibus suggested to place a bigger focus on structural poverty in Argentina and asked Mr Bereciartua for more insights on how the government is planning to ensure continuity of policies after the national elections in October.

**Mr Michael Eichholz, Federal Institute for Geosciences and National Resources of Germany**, congratulated the Secretariat and Argentina for the Report and asked Mr Bereciartua about the balance between the measures to increase water supply and control demand, especially in light of the relatively low rate of water metering in some areas of the country and the complexities stemming from the federal system. He recommended the inclusion of more reflections on this issue in the report.

**Mr Christian Minelli, External International Relations, ARERA**, congratulated Argentina and the OECD on their excellent presentation and commended the NWPD's call for the definition of clear policy objectives. However, Mr Minelli recommended more thought from an industrial and a governance perspective. From the industrial point of view, the challenges that Argentina faces are old problems of infrastructure, as is the case for many countries. Mr Minelli recommended that three questions be answered: 1) what is the adequate level of expenditure on operational costs and capital costs; 2) who is going to fund the infrastructure and how will it be funded in a such a way as to recover costs and keep prices affordable enough for users; and 3) what are the possible regulatory arrangements for the sector, of which a menu of possibilities exist around the world. Mr Minelli insisted that these choices depend on the industry's structure and the desired governance system to best be able to reach set objectives all the while keeping in mind that issues of efficiency, quality standards, universal access and affordability are typical problems everywhere.

**Mr Antonio Herman Benjamin, WCEL**, congratulated the Secretariat and Argentina for the robust document presented and gave two comments to the text. Firstly, Mr Benjamin advised to add an explicit reference to transboundary cooperation and policies, especially given that Brazil and Peru, Argentina's transboundary neighbours, were present at the meeting. Secondly, Mr Benjamin recommended authors to include more information on water law and innovation through judicial practice, especially given the importance of the *Matanza-Riachuelo* case in the global judicial literature.

**Mr Danny Greenwald, Head of Reclaimed Water Department, Israeli Water Authority**, thanked the delegates for the interesting discussion. Mr. Greenwald also expressed his concerns about Argentina's investment policy, in particular about the pre-condition (i.e. provinces are obliged to reach consensus among themselves if the investment will be realised in an inter-jurisdictional river basin) for providing federal resources to provinces. Mr Greenwald stated that, based on the experience in Israel, this policy could work in the short term, but lead to "Nimby" situations in the long-term with the result of unfavourably affecting weak and vulnerable parties. Mr Greenwald asked Mr Bereciartua for his thoughts on how this issue could play out in the long-term in Argentina.

The **Chair** closed the floor for questions and thanked delegates for their contributions. He then gave the floor to Mr Bereciartua and Ms Akhmouch for their reaction.

**Mr Pablo Bereciartua** thanked delegates for their active contribution to the peer-review and emphasised the great value of this exercise and the positive impact to bring about change in Argentina. Mr Bereciartua emphasised the great political change that has taken place in Argentina and that though many efforts depend on the evolution of the political system, the government has been working on promoting profound and long-lasting change. Mr Bereciartua then spoke about how investments in infrastructure are being financed in Argentina and mentioned that the restriction of reaching fiscal deficit limits the amount of public works that can be financed through multilateral banks. These resources are being complemented with private investment, as in the case of AySa (Water Supply and Sanitation Company for the city of Buenos Aires) where bonds have been issued and the company was proposed more money than it needed to levy on the market, thus showing the confidence of the market into the Argentinean water sector and operators. In the *Matanza-Riachuelo* area, the Government has invested substantial resources from the World Bank into a restoration project. Should the right planning framework be in place, resources could be secured from many donors. With regards to the issue of confederation and coordination between levels of government in Argentina, Mr Bereciartua stated that the federal nature of the country was deeply rooted in history and not subject to change. However, there are some good practices, such as the Inter-jurisdictional Colorado River Basin Committee, which brings together five different provinces that have delegated decision-making power to the entity for specific aspects of water

management. Mr Bereciartua suggested that the replication of this coordination model could be a way forward for improvement in coordination across levels of government.

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch** thanked delegates for their inputs, which will be reflected in the revised draft. Ms Akhmouch addressed the questions on transboundary management and multi-lateral development. On the latter point, she mentioned that the Dialogue is being carried out jointly with the Inter-American Development Bank and close coordination is ensured with the main donors in the country to facilitate the mainstreaming of the policy recommendations in their respective technical assistance programmes with Argentina. The dialogue also discussed how donors' strategies had progressively switched from supporting large-scale grey infrastructure to more nature-based solutions, green infrastructure, water use efficiency, demand management and institutional strengthening. Ms Akhmouch concluded by informing delegates that the revised versions will be discussed at a seminar to be held in Buenos Aires, 18-19 July, and that the final version will be published in October.

## 1.8. Update on the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru

The **Chair** introduced the session dedicated to the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru to update the delegates on the progress of the Dialogue. A fact-finding mission in Lima, Peru, took place in May 2019 involving peer-reviewers from Spain, the European Commission and Portugal, with the enthusiastic involvement of the Ministry of Environment of Peru.

**Mr. Luis Guillermo Marino Nava, Director-General of the Economy and Environmental Finance Directorate-General, Ministry of Environment of Peru**, first took the opportunity to thank the delegates and the OECD Secretariat for the work that been carried out. Mr Marino Nava emphasised that the National Water Policy Dialogue (NWPD) has already involved a great number of stakeholders from the public and private sectors. Peru faces important water challenges and risks, including water scarcity, floods, inadequate water quality and unequal access to safe drinking water and sewerage. Two thirds of Peru's economic activity and population are concentrated in the coastal area, which has very little supply of water resources (less than 2% of total water resources in the country). Therefore, mitigation policies must touch upon water resources management due to the structural heterogeneity in water resources distribution. Peru has collaborated with the OECD since 2014, when the Country Programme was launched. The NWPD represents an important opportunity to analyse and improve the integrated water resources management, the multilevel governance and the use of economic and regulatory instruments.

**Mr Marino Nava** concluded by informing delegates of the results of the fact-finding mission that took place in May 2019 in which 60 entities and a total of 140 actors were mobilised among the private, public and academic sectors. From this mission, it has become clear that one of the main challenges is the institutional fragmentation, due to the difficulties of coordinating amongst a number of bodies with responsibilities in the water sector. Other challenges faced by Peru include revising the effectiveness of tariff setting, strengthening budgetary sustainability with regards to the sector, ensuring investments in nature-based solutions, improving the quality of water data and the sharing of this data between stakeholders and educating and capacitating the population on sustainable water use. Mr Marino Nava expressed the Ministry's engagement with the NWPD and expressed his gratitude to the OECD.

**Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat**, thanked the Ministry of the Environment for their intervention and their efforts in the organisation of the first fact-finding mission in Peru and confirmed that the final report will be launched in May 2020. Ms Romano acknowledged that water is very high on the national political agenda in Peru, provided an outline of the main themes of

discussion that took place during the 1<sup>st</sup> fact-finding mission with the Peruvian stakeholders and identified some main challenges as well as some good practices that are already starting to surface. Mr Romano announced that the issues paper will be produced in the coming weeks and the next mission will take place in September 2019, where specific case studies will be analysed. The main findings will be discussed in Paris, during the 13<sup>th</sup> WGI Meeting on January 9-10 2020.

## 1.9. Kick-off of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Brazil

The **Chair** introduced the session launching a third collaboration between the Brazilian National Water Agency (ANA) and the OECD. The aim of the collaboration is to implement the policy recommendations resulting from the 2013 and 2017 NWRDs between the OECD and Brazil.

**Mr Oscar De Moraes Cordeiro Netto, Director, National Water Agency (ANA), Brazil**, thanked the OECD Secretariat for the opportunity to share the experiences of the ANA/OECD collaboration with the delegates. ANA has been a member of the WGI since 2013. Two National Water Policy Dialogues have been carried out: [Water Resources Governance in Brazil](#), released in 2015, and [Water Charges in Brazil](#), released in 2017. An additional paper titled [The Governance of Water and Sanitation Infrastructure in Brazil](#) was produced in 2017 to support ongoing discussions on basic sanitation regulatory reform in Brazil. Both of these reports culminated with respective Action Plans for implementation.

**Mr De Moraes Cordeiro Netto** informed delegates that water security and basic sanitation regulation and dam safety have emerged as important issues of the national agenda, in which ANA plays an important role. The economic and social impacts of droughts and floods in Brazil in recent years have led to more integrated actions and further investments in infrastructure. These efforts have also been accompanied by a regulatory framework reform for basic water supply and sanitation rights. There is currently an ongoing parliamentary debate on further regulatory reform in this sector. Reference was also made to the recognition of dam safety as a great national priority in light of recent catastrophic disasters that have taken place in Brazil as a result of the collapse of dams, such as the Brumadinho dam in the state of Minas Gerais. The partnership with OECD is expected to bring valuable insights for the improvement of water resources management in Brazil, considering present and future challenges. The third phase of this collaboration with the OECD will focus on the implementation of the previous OECD recommendations through a four outcome-oriented workshops to be held in 2019 and 2020. The planned workshops have the goal of raising awareness, sharing information and allowing peer-review with the support of international experts on the means of implementation of the OECD recommendations. Mr De Moraes Cordeiro Netto concluded by reinforcing the importance of the WGI and expressed ANA's gratitude to the OECD for its commitment.

**Ms Akhmouch** thanked ANA for their commitment and highlighted their important political role in the role of Brazil's ongoing journey to OECD membership. Ms Akhmouch informed delegates that the OECD will contact some of the WGI members bilaterally to engage participants in future capacity development activities to be organised within this third dialogue with Brazil. Each workshop will lead to a chapter that will feed into a final OECD synthesis report. The draft chapters will be the subject of discussion in forthcoming WGI Meetings and the final synthesis report will be launched in 2021.

## 2. Day 2: 21 June 2019

The **Chair** welcomed delegates to the second day of the WGI meeting and made two announcements on behalf of the Steering Committee. Firstly, the Chair announced that Mr Teun Bastemeijer would soon retire from his work at the WGI in his capacity as member of WIN and then welcomed new Steering Committee representative for WIN, Ms Barbara Schreiner. Secondly, the Chair announced that the Africa Programme Survey would be extended for another week until June 28 2019 as requested by GWP the previous day.

### 2.1. Water Governance in Germany

The **Chair** introduced the session on Water Governance in Germany where the water governance framework of the host country was presented and discussed, along with the challenges and opportunities for the future of water governance in Germany.

**Ms Janine Muzau, Policy Officer, BMU**, introduced her organisation and thanked the delegates, the Secretariat and BMZ for the possibility of presenting different aspects of water governance in Germany. A great variety of speakers were invited to speak at the session, each shedding light on sustainable water governance in Germany and the approaches to existing and future challenges.

*Mr. Jens Libbe, Head of Department, Infrastructure, Economy and Finance, DIFU*

**Mr Jens Libbe** thanked the Secretariat and Ms Muzau for the opportunity to speak at the WGI meeting. Mr Libbe's presentation was based around four main notions:

1. The question of water governance and water-sensitive development as such is not the main focus of the municipal agenda in Germany. However, in the context of concern about climate change and sustainable development, the question of water-sensitive urban development *is* a municipal issue. In face of increasing temperatures and water shortages, municipal governments are concerned about how to guarantee quality of life to its citizens and how climate adaptation can be integrated into municipal growth. Therefore, water issues are often connected to many other fields of action in the municipal context. This links to questions of governance, and more concretely, to the possibility of integrating innovative systems solutions into the municipal administration.
2. There is, thus, a need for conceptual guiding principles about the future of water infrastructure. The infrastructure in German cities is connected to paradigms and guiding systems and, at the moment, there is new thinking in Germany about the future of water infrastructure. There is a big need for further development of water objectives at different levels (national, lander and municipal levels) and these discussions are now increasingly taking place. Much emphasis is being placed on technological innovation.
3. The conceptual approach and the dialogue about the future of water infrastructure and the question of water governance opens windows of opportunities to re-evaluate the technical systems in place in Germany. Several municipal projects are identifying areas for transformation, i.e., increasing implementation of rainwater management and water re-use systems. This demonstrates that the local and city

districts levels are an appropriate level to bring together different interests. However, in order to implement these new systems and sustainable infrastructure solutions, new ways of thinking about urban planning are required.

4. In order to carry this process forward, the clarification of targets and the manner in which water infrastructure systems should be developed is essential. This clarification will help guide the political discussions, notably as regards the allocation of financial responsibility for these needed infrastructure investments.

***Mr. Martin Grambow, Head of Department, Water Management and Soil Protection, StMUV***

**Mr Martin Grambow** thanked the Secretariat for the invitation and explained that the StMUV has been tracking the progress of the WGI Indicator Framework and considers it as a helpful approach. Mr Grambow reminded delegates that water is the most political resource in the world, which many times imply great governance challenges. Mr Grambow used three aspects to present his ideas:

1. How to implement water governance: Mr Grambow stressed the fact that no nations or states are using the same principles of water governance due to water management being woven into the geographic, cultural and historical background of any nation or tribe. Therefore, comparison between models is challenging and complex. Fortunately, there are three basic things that everyone should do to manage water: monitoring, utilisation management and formative management. Mr Grambow pointed to the important governance role of states, as these are the only bodies that are able to successfully guarantee water resources and recommended that all water-related responsibilities be integrated into one administrative body in order to be more efficiently and effectively governed.
2. Technical or material aims: Mr Grambow argued that these aims are the core questions for Germany. Economic development and related indicators seem to be the most important driving factor in water. Europe seems to do quite well with regard to ecological indicators, but is lacking in social indicators. Even though there is a human right to drinking water and sewerage, there are currently no indicators for health, scenery, landscape and for the role of rivers and lakes as a source of inspiration and spirituality. Though everybody seems to know that this is important, the German system does not currently sufficiently contemplate on these aspects.
3. Administrative indicators: Mr Grambow emphasised the need to treat all the people in an administration and institution respectfully at every level, given the fact that Germany has different water institutions at all three levels of government and they all have to work closely together. Many different types of institutions are important to make water management successful, including governing bodies, universities and technical associations. Communication within the water governance network and with the outside world (other sectors) is a crucial part of German water governance systems, through both vertical hierarchical structures within different levels of government and parallel horizontal structures across river basins.

**Mr Grambow** concluded by stating that if there is a human right for water, then there is also a human right for good water governance and administration.

***Mr. Mario Sommerhäuser, Head of Department, River Management, EGLV***

**Mr Mario Sommerhäuser** thanked the delegates and the Secretariat for the opportunity to make this presentation on a practical example of water management, the Emscher Restoration Project. It

is the biggest restoration project in Europe in terms of investment and kilometres to restore and involves concepts such as public participation, urban development and urban resilience.

**Mr Mario Sommerhäuser** outlined the different areas and river basins that comprise the Project and gave a brief historical description. In the context of the Emscher River, affected by booming population growth due to substantial coal mining in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the lack of wastewater treatment led to the spread of diseases and was a cause of poverty in the area. This situation could not be solved by the municipalities, so a cooperative was founded in 1899, an independent water management association under public law. Mr Sommerhäuser provided overview of how the cooperative was organised and financed. The solution that resulted from this cooperative process, initiated over 100 years ago, was a very technical solution that used the river system for wastewater transportation, with consequent water quality challenges that remain today. During the 1990s, the Restoration Project was implemented in order to turn the former “grey” solution into a new “blue” solution. Over 5 billion euros were invested in the construction of new wastewater treatment plants, subterranean sewers and restored waterways. It is a good example of a project that based its success on working at the basin scale with participative and cooperative institutional frameworks. The Emscher Restoration Project is of long-term value for people in the region, not only for ecological and economic reasons, but also for improvements in investment, education, urban development, public health and tourism. The Master Plan for the Emscher Restoration Project was designed by all municipalities with the help of public participation, and includes 3000 smaller projects along the whole river. Mr Sommerhäuser gave some examples of these individual projects that form part of the Master Plan.

**Mr Sommerhäuser** concluded by reflecting on the cooperative institutional structure which helped successfully carry out the project through the values of solidarity, democracy and freedom and the principles of self-government, independence and self-reliance. Mr Sommerhäuser suggested that this example could constitute practical input for future WGI discussions.

*Mr. Thomas Stratenwerth, Head of Division, Water Management and Climate Change Adaptation, BMU*

**Mr Thomas Stratenwerth** made a presentation describing the main aspects of the [German National Water Dialogue](#). The background to the Dialogue was the UN Water Decade, which, together with the existence of several water management challenges in Germany, served as motivation to kick off the dialogue. In order for Germany to achieve the SDGs in water management, there is a need to achieve a better common orientation and vision among the stakeholders and administrations involved in the process, especially in light of pressing trends such as climate change, demographic and land use changes, technological innovations, and changing consumer behaviour. These transformation and adaptation processes need proper framing and time.

**Mr Stratenwerth** informed delegates that the national government decided not to leave these questions to the local decision-making bodies alone. The National Water Dialogue embraces a multi-governance level approach, engaging all levels of administrations and all relevant stakeholders, even beyond the water sector, as well as citizens, in order to develop a shared vision on what kind of water management they want and what is needed to address these issues properly. The first National Water Forum was held in October 2018 in Berlin and this Forum focused on discussing the problems and challenges of water governance and management in Germany. This Forum brought together 130 participants from a variety of sectors.

**Mr Stratenwerth** informed that BMU will draft a National Water Strategy by 2021 based on this Dialogue process according to a number of guiding principles such as ensuring the long-term protection of water as a habitat and core component of ecosystems; securing water in its various facets as a resource for current and coming generations including aspects of health, nutrition,

production and locational advantages; and tapping opportunities for long-term social, economic development throughout water management. The National Water Dialogue and ensuing Strategy constitutes the response to the demand from participating stakeholders that water needs to play a greater role in environmental policy and more value needs to be attached to the quality of water within society. The Strategy will thus recognise and enforce the political significance of water as the basis for life and its linkages to other sectors such as agriculture, energy and health.

**Mr Stratenwerth** then explained to delegates how the discussion within the National Water Dialogue is organised. Topics have been classified into several clusters: network infrastructure; risk-factor of substance inputs (pollutants and chemicals); agriculture and consumer protection; water management and cooperation and possible synergies with nature conservation. A separate cluster on water and society will feed into the other clusters but will not be the focus of discussion.

**Mr Stratenwerth** briefly went through the timeline of the National Water Dialogue. It started in October 2018 with the first Forum where the clusters of strategic and operational goals were discussed. A dialogue will be held in September 2019, and this milestone will focus on required action and possible solutions. A mid-term review is planned for November 2019, where all the clusters will be looked into. Another dialogue will take place in January 2020 for further discussion on in-depth actions and potential solutions. The final event will be the second National Water Forum in September 2020, with the aim to get a package of agreements on strategic and operational goals and a set of possible solutions and approaches which will certainly include all areas, from law-making to administrative issues to technical solutions.

**Mr Stratenwerth** concluded his presentation by informing delegates that the National Water Strategy to be published in 2021 will be based on the results of the Dialogue as well as on other elements not specifically discussed within the Dialogue such as international cooperation aspects of water management and other issues which are linked to other strategies currently planned by BMU and other German federal Ministries.

#### *Mr. Gerald Linke, Chairman of Directors Board, DVGW*

**Mr Gerald Linke** gave a presentation about what DVGW sees as the most important water management issues to affect Germany. Mr Linke emphasised the need to think about the threats that will appear in the future and mentioned DVGW's campaign Water Impulse, which aims to address the issues by anchoring the value of water and the awareness of society and among politicians and encourage all stakeholders to talk about future water supply and long-term sustainability of water infrastructure in Germany.

**Mr Gerald Linke** presented a series of five water features considered as important:

- The importance for German lawmakers to legally enshrine the priority of water, given the fact that the number of water protection areas are below target.
- The importance of becoming aware of increased pollution of water due to increases in the levels of several different pollutants such as nitrate from agricultural activity, new substances from new products and changes in consumption behaviours. Mr Gerald Linke advocated for the avoidance of pollution and making risk assessment for new products mandatory and controlled.
- The threat of the “business as usual mentality” by which companies expose themselves to risks. It is important for companies to abide by legal standards.
- The importance of maintaining and investing in infrastructure as part of an inter-generational contract. Water infrastructure in Germany dates back to the 1950s and 1960s and there is not enough knowledge about the state and condition of the water grids. There is no proactive investment scheme and the replacement rate is quite

low in Germany. It is essential, out of the respect of obligations towards younger generations, to sustain these assets in order to develop municipalities as without water supply, regional development lags behind.

- The importance of planning for the future. Mr Linke emphasised that many municipalities and companies hesitate to plan for the future, but the future is already here. The design of local water visions in the form of time-critical emergency measures can help mitigate the impact of climate change on water supply.

**Mr Gerald Linke** concluded by thanking the delegates for their attention and highlighting that the DVGW will continue to work in clusters to discuss what investments and infrastructures are needed in Germany in order to get rid of lags and design what is needed for the future.

### *Group Discussion*

The **Chair** thanked the German delegates for their contributions and opened the floor for discussion.

**Ms Burcu Çalli, Expert, SUEN** thanked the German delegates for their presentations and asked Mr Mario Sommerhäuser about the percentage of reuse potential in Emscher area.

**Mr Mario Sommerhäuser, EGLV**, responded that they are currently using the sludge from wastewater treatment for incineration and phosphorus reuse, but that there is not a great amount of separation of grey water and wastewater in the area.

**Peter Gammeltoft, Expert**, thanked the German delegates for their complete and honest picture of both the successes of German water policy and the challenges that it faces. Mr Gammeltoft showed particular interest in the National Water Dialogue and asked how BMU is ensuring the support of the other Ministries that control other sectors related to water management.

**Ms Lesha Witmer, Butterfly Effect/Women for Water Partnership**, expressed some concern regarding the choice taken by BMU within the National Water Dialogue to treat social aspects of water management separately. Mr Witmer asked the presenters if there are some more ideas to follow up on the outcomes of the [Action Plan of the High-level Panel on Water](#) to incorporate conclusions from the report and if there are possibilities for the German authorities to work with other groups to advance on that agenda.

**Ms Rochi Khemka, 2030 Water Resources Group**, thanked the German delegates for their insightful comments and asked Mr Stratenwerth if there had been any reflection within the National Water Dialogue of the creation of ecosystems for innovation or resilient management by industry and companies and about getting the non-state actors more engaged.

**Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat**, thanked the German delegates for their insightful presentations and asked Mr Jens Libbe how German authorities were addressing issues related to shrinking cities, notably in terms of rethinking water supply and sanitation infrastructure.

**Mr Antonio Herman Benjamin, WCEL**, asked the German delegates for their views on the water issues that are most litigated in German courts and was also curious to know what the legal status of water is in Germany.

**Mr François Brikké, GWP**, thanked the German delegates for their interventions and asked Mr Jens Libbe about how integrated approaches to urban settlements are playing out in Germany.

**Mr Kevin Collins, The Open University**, asked Mr Gerard Linke his view on how directors consider leadership in practice and the methods they use to change their thinking in order to drive the questions that are being explored by German water sector stakeholders.

**Mr Teun Bastemeijer, WIN**, highlighted the common history and culture between the north of Germany and the north of the Netherlands as well as the fact that there are transboundary water links between these two regions. Mr Bastemeijer cited the OECD report [Water Governance in the Netherlands: Fit for the Future?](#) as a good example of country analysis of resilience and adaptation to the risks of the future and asked Mr Stratenwerth if he believed Germany felt the need of carrying out a similar type of exercise.

The **Chair** thanked the delegates for their questions and their enthusiasm about the topics presented by the German delegates and asked them to briefly respond to the delegates' questions.

**Mr Thomas Stratenwerth, BMU**, thanked the delegates for their comments and questions and led the response on the part of the German delegates. Mr Stratenwerth assured delegates that other Ministries were invited to the National Water Dialogue events. However, they are not taking part at the Ministerial level, but rather through their administrative or scientific authorities and institutions, from which valuable input is received. With regard to the societal element that is currently less the focus of the National Water Dialogue process, Mr Stratenwerth explained that it is often a question of resources and time and expressed hope to be able to take these issues up as far as possible when developing the National Water Strategy. He also reminded delegates that when the National Water Strategy is completed, it will also be opened up beyond the stakeholders into the public sphere for discussion and debate. The Principles of the Action Plan of the High-level Panel on Water are not directly taken up in the National Dialogue. However, Mr Stratenwerth assured delegates that these international recommendations will be considered when developing the Strategy.

**Mr Stratenwerth** mentioned that it was too early to say what ideas and recommendations will come out of the National Water Dialogue on ecosystems for innovation. In parallel to the Dialogue, there is an ongoing participatory process with the aim of developing a new research programme on water management in the framework of the national sustainability and environmental research program under the auspices of the Federal Ministry for Research and Education, which addresses the issues discussed in the Water Dialogue. Mr Stratenwerth emphasised that this collaboration also helps to pave the way for constructive work on innovation that can also trigger the private sector, which is also involved in these research projects, in order to find solutions. In terms of the legal questions posed by WCEL, Mr Stratenwerth responded that in the higher administrative courts the most litigious issues were those related to the authorisation of larger projects in harbours or shipping ways; issues with regard to the use of the 4.7 exemptions under the EU Water Framework Directive; and issues regarding the application of the Directive's non-deterioration principle. However, he could not give figures from the lower administrative courts. The legal status of water is that water is a public good and each water user in Germany has to have a permit, regardless of its origin.

**Mr Stratenwerth** made reference to the comment on integrated visions for urban settlements and mentioned that these kinds of visions are starting to appear through pilot projects in many larger German cities, though they are still not part of the mainstream, and suggested that smaller cities do not have the capacity to implement these kinds of initiatives. Concerning the coastal areas in the north of Germany and their connection to the north of the Netherlands, Mr Stratenwerth highlighted that improvements are required in terms of integrated coastal management, of which the Germans can learn from the Dutch example.

**Mr Gerald Linke, DVGW**, intervened to answer the delegates' questions about water infrastructure in Germany and cautioned that even though large water utility companies seem to understand the economic appeal of conserving and investing in infrastructure, smaller companies, generally under the influence of municipal governments and political pressure, still face difficulties in manoeuvring these challenges in order to sustain infrastructure. Mr Linke pointed to the fact that

industries in Germany are self-regulated and thus, design their own standards and develop them every year, differently to industries in many other European countries, and highlighted that it is, thus, very important that these small companies that belong to the water sector are brought to the table to discuss the issues they are facing. Mr Linke also took the chance to emphasise that the DVGW has a strict view that water must be managed and used in a sustainable way, and mentioned some ongoing projects in Germany where water and wastewater are being used sustainably to produce energy for other sectors.

The **Chair** concluded the session by thanking the German delegates for their interesting insight on the state of affairs of water governance in Germany and praised the fact that delegates from different scales and levels of administration were invited to speak.

## 2.2. Advancing WGI Working Groups on Indicators and Capacity Development

The **Chair** introduced the next session in which delegates gathered in parallel breakout groups, facilitated by their respective coordinators, to discuss the implementation of the actions proposed in the background Scoping Notes. Each Working Group discussed 1) achieving outputs for the 9<sup>th</sup> World Water Forum and members' contribution and 2) who does what, how, when and resources needed to deliver. The Chair stressed that the prime aim for this session was to discuss the implementation of the Scoping Notes and the resources needed herein.

**Mr Håkan Tropp, OECD Secretariat**, introduced the Scoping Note on Capacity Development and reiterated that the version on the table incorporated inputs from several iterations with members during webinars. The aim of the working sessions is not to discuss the Scoping Notes as such, but rather how delegates can make progress in implementing and operationalising them.

**Mr Tropp** then went on to outline the main points in the Scoping Note on Capacity Development after input from the [webinar on May 20 2019](#). There will be an inventory made of ongoing activities about capacity development in water governance to build on what is existing and follow a demand-driven approach. Mr Tropp stressed that whatever is developed should be adaptable to different kinds of contexts and encourage interactive learning as well as be based on proven learning methods. The main outputs put forward in the Scoping Note is to develop a set of modules for capacity development with a strong focus on organisational capacity development, capacity as part of policy reform and the process of moving the water sector forward. There are also proposals to develop a facilitator's guide as well as modules with proposed content. Mr Tropp emphasised that it would be important to discuss how some of these learning modules can be developed as well as gathering some ideas on the water governance capacity development lab.

**Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat**, outlined that that the Working Group on Indicators will discuss priority activities proposed in the Scoping Note as a result of discussions that took place at the [11th WGI meeting in Zaragoza](#) and the [webinar held on May 20 2019](#). Ms Romano then summarised the three main proposed activities: 1) Facilitate the uptake and use of the OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework; 2) Develop impact indicators to complement the existing OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework; 3) Provide guidance for multi-level governance engagement for water-related SDGs monitoring. Members were invited to share their priorities with regards to the three options, as well as highlight challenges and propose contributions. Ms Romano concluded by stressing the importance for the Working Group on Indicators to be able to find linkages with the work carried out by the Working Group on Capacity Development.

### *Working Group on Indicators*

The Working Group on Indicators gathered 25 WGI members. The OECD Secretariat led the discussion together with AEAS, as Steering Committee member.

The majority of the members of the group assigned the highest priority to “**facilitate the uptake and use of the OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework**”, in order to further raise awareness on water governance and support multi-stakeholder dialogues. As such, it was suggested to concentrate most efforts on this pillar and strive to facilitate more self-assessment at different levels in the coming two years. A first step could be to check the availability and willingness of the pilots (OECD, 2018)<sup>1</sup> to actually carry out a dedicated self-assessment, prior to enlarging the base. This exercise could lead to the tailoring of the indicator framework to specific functions (e.g. droughts, floods, water services etc.) and scales (e.g. local, state or national level), to follow up on the subsequent action plans. Further cases at the national, regional, basin and local level could also be foreseen.

Concerning the second proposal on **developing impact indicators**, while many members stressed the relevance and need to better track and measure governance outcomes through impact indicators, others expressed reservations on what could end up being i) another time-consuming exercise that could deviate resources from the priority of increasing the use of the current self-assessment framework; ii) a potential overlap or confusion with other data-related efforts such as SDG 6 monitoring (stressed by both UN Water and WHO); and iii) a methodologically challenging effort given that correlation does not imply causality. Instead, delegates advised to map existing impact indicators, rather than develop new ones from the onset. It was highlighted that, on the one hand, defining “impacts” is very challenging and open to several interpretations. If impact indicators were to be developed, a concrete proposal was to narrow the scope by taking into account a specific water governance dimension (e.g. existence of river basin councils) and verify its impacts on water risks (e.g. less pollution). The Secretariat offered to revisit the output alongside what could be an innovative “Working Paper” or “Special Issue of a Journal” that could combine multi-stakeholder papers from WGI members assessing the literature and state of the art in measuring water governance outcomes.

Concerning the third proposal to provide guidance for multi-level governance, some members (notably UN Water and WHO) conveyed the existence of such guidance and the risk of overlap. The Secretariat recalled that this activity was an explicit request from several members of the WGI at the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting (Zaragoza) but that in the absence of massive support, it should receive less attention from the Working Group. Instead, the Secretariat offered to map those countries that carried out a voluntary national review including SDG 6 and invite some of them to the next WGI meeting to share their consultation experience as they have been using and valuing existing UN-related guidelines for VNRs. This exercise would help shed light on vertical and horizontal coordination challenges, and could be of inspiration to conduct future water governance self-assessments based on the 10-step methodology proposed as part of the OECD framework.

Finally, WGI members identified linkages with the Working Group on Capacity Development. In particular, to favour the uptake of the Indicator Framework, various capacity building activities can be designed together such as the PowerPoint toolkit on the indicators and the self-assessment, more

---

<sup>1</sup> OECD (2018), *Implementing the OECD Principles on Water Governance: Indicator Framework and Evolving Practices*, OECD Studies on Water, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264292659-en>.

translations of the Indicator Framework and a video or MOOC<sup>2</sup> to support self-assessment dialogues. In addition, short testimonies from previous pilots on their experiences in carrying out the self-assessment and lessons learned would be useful to the broader audience. Networks and umbrella organisations could disseminate this material.

### *Working Group on Capacity Development*

#### *Group 1*

The Working Group on Capacity Development (group 1) gathered 16 WGI members. The OECD Secretariat led the discussion together with Steering Committee member WIN.

The Working Group started by clarifying that the scope of the Working Group was not to perform capacity development as such on water governance as there are already many organisations working on the topic, especially among WGI members. Priority was given for the WGI to rely on these individual members' experiences and skills. The Working Group deliberated on the question of how the Principles and related tools could be transformed into relevant capacity development content. Clarification was also given about the target audience. Some members suggested to use the WGI framework at a basin and local level but expressed concern that at the national level, the Principles would overlap with the SDG framework. It was mentioned that the Working Group should promote the development of different types of material that will be useful for capacity development such as case studies, short videos, PowerPoint presentations, etc. Emphasis was placed by participants on the need to use existing resources and to focus on guidance and training, especially in peer-to-peer processes. However, some participants in the Working Group expressed concern that many existing resources tend to have a limited perspective on the meaning of governance and recalled that the added value of the WGI is its comprehensiveness and long and practical experience working on water governance. Therefore, there will also be a need to focus on developing new tools and not just building on already-existing ones.

In terms of material to be produced, some participants raised the question of the possibility of integrating already-existing material from different organisations into a single toolkit. The challenge of making sure that these tools be developed or produced according to demand was raised as a key focal point of the discussion as a way of shaping work of the Working Group. Furthermore, the Working Group discussed how the Principles could be used to inform integrated water resources management processes and the importance of making sure that each organisation's context is taken into account. Some suggestions were made to gather experiences from organisations on implementation to encourage debate within other organisations about how the WGI water governance framework could be implemented.

The importance of incentivising capacity development was raised given that capacity development is increasingly linked to resource mobilisation. In this sense, organisations could be encouraged to develop their capacity as a way of becoming more credible and bankable rather than focusing on sanctions and compliance. Given this change in landscape, the tools developed should be adapted and incentives could be produced as a way of encouraging change in behaviours.

Several specific offers were made by delegates to facilitate knowledge and capacity (Israel, IWA, IWRA, Jucar Basin and AMCOW).

Some participants expressed concern about the timeframe and highlighted the importance of achievable objectives. The Principles and the Indicator Framework were suggested as the core of these efforts and members emphasised the importance of focusing on the learning experience in order to facilitate uptake by others through the possibility of enabling learners to adapt it to their

---

<sup>2</sup> A massive online open course (MOOC) is an online course aimed at unlimited participation and open access via the web.

own needs. Suggestions were made to design a learning process for capacity building through the establishment of learning objectives that would then shape the content for the proposed modules. The group concluded on the need to map and take stock of existing initiatives. This inventory will then provide the foundation for developing the practical and inter-active capacity development modules and materials.

### *Group 2*

The Working Group on Capacity Development (group 2) gathered 17 WGI members. The OECD Secretariat led the discussion together with Steering Committee member SUEZ.

The Working Group commenced by clarifying that the scope of the Working Group activities was not to perform capacity development on water governance as such, as there are already many organisations working on the topic, especially among WGI members. Priority was given for the WGI to rely on these individual members' experience and skills. Furthermore, clarification of the targeted audience for the capacity building tools was given and the Working Group emphasised that water professionals should be the targeted audience of the capacity development materials.

In terms of next steps, it was suggested that, in order to gain some knowledge on the specific knowledge and experience of the WGI members in capacity development, a mapping of their activities in the topic should be scoped. Some members voiced that they believe that there presently is no strong demand regarding the Principles, and that we should help emulate that demand. It was also highlighted that as a start, the demand could come from WGI members themselves, which could be useful to test the capacity building material. It was acknowledged that no one would be interested to read and use the Principles by themselves, and thus capacity building must integrate ways to advertise them. Members discussed how this could be carried out:

- Explain concisely what the benefits of using the Principles are, i.e. through a one-minute video and/or cheat-sheet.
- Bring concrete examples on how to use the Principles and what can be learnt from these examples.
- Start from a concrete situation where an issue has to be tackled: how can the Principles help address the issue? Diffuse potential conflicts, etc., with the possibility for a quiz among WGI members: "Do you have an issue? Could the Principles help you address it? How?"
- Emphasise the role of the Principles as a checklist, and what they have brought to users (especially for the 11 pilot tests and the stories). The possibility of creating a documentary/repository of the stories and lessons learnt was mentioned.
- Remind the audience that the overall aim is good water governance, and that good governance is a means and not an end of itself.

Some participants reminded the Working Group members of the useful role of the Principles to help all stakeholders realise that they can be part of the issue as well as part of the solution. However, some concern was expressed that if the Principles were used after project development (i.e. stories) then were they really useful? In this sense, a solution was suggested to highlight the outputs of their use both before and after project development. Working Group participants discussed about the limited experiences regarding the use of the Principles. It was said that more pilot testing was needed to assess the Principles' impact and the process of their practical implementation. Other WGI members showcased that their organisations had experience in implementing the Principles, even if it has not always been labelled as such, as the Principle themselves are quite new.

Concerning the content of the modules, the Working Group participants agreed on the need to have modules, in the format of a toolkit, to provide guidance on how to use the Principles, what can be expected of their use, etc.

The Working Group made some recommendations to ensure that the capacity development:

- Is context focused: the notion of good governance itself should be adapted to local specificities, especially at different levels of governance such as local authorities.
- Is adaptable, especially with a regional focus.
- Addresses processes gaps (methodology, facilitation, partnership/collaboration building, and stakeholder engagement).
- Follows a bottom-up approach: using the Principles as a way to open up and/or trigger discussion with/or among stakeholders.
- Is problem solving and/or solution-oriented.
- Builds on experience: showcase from the pilots and potential additional interview/pilots (volunteering from ANA, Scotland and Israel) on how the Principles impacted specific issues/solutions.

The Working Group discussed the need for more human support for facilitation and mentoring. Working Group participants highlighted that there is already work on capacity building and thus, that WGI should rely/interlink with them. Therefore, rather than strict guidelines to use the Principles and the indicators, participants highlighted that having a contact/support person to call would be very useful as it could personalise/tailor support and recommend some Principles over others based on specific needs expressed. It was recommended to distinguish the need for facilitators among WGI members and outside WGI members. In this sense, a formal call should be sent to OECD WGI members to seek volunteers to become facilitators and/or mentors.

### 2.3. Report back to Plenary and next steps

**Mr Håkan Tropp, OECD Secretariat**, thanked the Working Groups and reminded delegates that it was the first time at a WGI meeting that there were two parallel breakout groups for the same Working Group (Capacity Development). Mr Tropp noted that the outcomes of the group discussions were very complementary. Mr Tropp also noted the results of the Indicators Working Group in their progress on establishing priorities. Moreover, there is a need to further explore the links between both Working Groups in the form of providing capacity development for the use of the Indicator Framework.

**Mr Tropp** highlighted the **next steps**, reminding delegates of the importance of keeping a realistic outlook on ambitions and the timeframe to make sure that work progresses swiftly. Work on inventorying will seek to make use of existing initiatives as much as possible. One or several webinars will be held to discuss preliminary findings prior to the next WGI meeting.

### 2.4. Concluding Remarks

The **Chair** announced to delegates that Mr Teun Bastemeijer was formally retiring from WIN and thus also from being an original Steering Committee member to the WGI. The Chair commended his enthusiastic engagement in the work of the WGI over the years and wished him the best for the coming years on behalf of all the WGI members.

**Mr Teun Bastemeijer** intervened to commend the WGI on its collaborative nature and reflected upon the mission of the WGI of achieving better water governance for better lives. Mr Bastemeijer outlined that the WGI as a technical platform is quite exceptional given its diverse membership and the crosscutting issues that it discusses. Mr Bastemeijer extended his tanks to the delegates for their work in the great learning experience that is the WGI.

The **Chair** thanked Mr Bastemeijer for his services and wrapped up the meeting by thanking the delegates for their engaging interventions as well as Ms Dorasil and Ms Krahl from BMZ and their team for their excellent work in the organisation of the meeting and the wonderful venue in which it took place. The Chair then thanked the fellow members of the Steering Committee and the OECD Secretariat. It was announced that the next WGI meeting would take place at the OECD headquarters in Paris (confirmed dates: 9-10 January 2020). Finally, the Chair invited members interested in hosting the 14<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the OECD WGI around June/July 2020 to contact the Secretariat.