

13th MEETING OF THE OECD WATER GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

9-10 January 2020, OECD Headquarters, Paris, France

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. Thirteen 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; 20-21 June 2019, Berlin and 9-10 January 2020, Paris).

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

Summary of outcomes	3
Next Steps	5
Day 1: January 9, 2020	6
Welcoming Remarks	6
Launch of the “Water Governance in Argentina” Report	6
OECD Council Recommendation on Water & OECD Contribution to the G20	7
On the road to the 9 th World Water Forum, 2021, Dakar, Senegal	7
WGI Contributions to Global Agendas: Key outcomes and developments	9
Localising and Measuring the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	13
Water Governance in African Cities	17
Water Governance in Asia	20
Peer-review of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru	23
Upgrading, Governing and Financing Water Infrastructure in Brazil	27
Water Governance for Indigenous Peoples	31
Day 2: January 10, 2020	35
Key Research and Analysis on Water Governance	35
Updates from the OECD Horizontal Water Programme	38
Advancing WGI Working Group on Indicators	41
Advancing WGI Working Group on Capacity Development	43
Conclusions of the Meeting and Next Steps	47

Summary of outcomes

On 9-10 January 2020, the [OECD Water Governance Initiative](#) (WGI), held its [13th meeting](#) at the OECD Headquarters in Paris, France. The meeting gathered 80+ practitioners, policymakers and representatives from major stakeholder groups. The 13th Meeting had the following objectives (see the [agenda](#), [list of participants](#), [presentations](#), and [pictures](#)):

- Launch the OECD Report “Water Governance in Argentina”
- Discuss WGI contribution to Global Agendas (World Water Forum, SDGs and COP 25)
- Discuss progress in SDG 6 monitoring and learn from broader OECD work on the SDGs
- Discuss interim findings on “Water governance in African cities” and “Water Governance in Asia”
- Peer-review the policy dialogue on “Water Governance in Peru” and preliminary findings on governing water infrastructure in Brazil
- Share knowledge and experience on recent water governance reforms and research
- Advance WGI working groups on Capacity Development and Indicators

The report [Water Governance in Argentina](#) was officially released. Delegates can download the e-version of the report from the [OECD iLibrary](#) (username: 2020cfe-oecd; password: iilibraryaccess).

Delegates were informed of progress on the implementation of the [OECD Council Recommendation on Water](#), OECD contributions to the G20 and progress on the road to the 9th World Water Forum by representatives from the OECD, World Water Forum and World Water Council.

Delegates shared **updates on research and analysis on water governance** including: water governance studies in Africa (Mali and Niger) (Waterpreneurs and Action Contre la Faim); progress on the preparation of the [2021 Water Integrity Outlook](#) (WIN); Improving Water Governance in Norway using the OECD Principles on Water Governance (Norwegian Environment Agency); example of a virtual campus as an innovative platform for delivery of capacity development (Cap-Net); and the [Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice](#) (WCEL).

Delegates also **informed about past and upcoming meetings**: Water Governance in Cidade da Praia, Cape Verde, 17 September 2019; [11th INBO World General Assembly](#), 30 September – 3 October 2019, Marrakech; [25th United Nations Climate Change Conference](#) (COP 25), 2-13 December, 2019, Spain; [IWA Water and Development Congress & Exhibition](#), 1 - 5 December 2019, Colombo, Sri Lanka; [IWRA XVII World Water Congress](#), 11-15 May 2020, Daegu, Korea, and the [4th Asia-Pacific Water Summit](#), 19-20 October 2020, Kumamoto, Japan.

The session on **Localising and Measuring the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** presented the [OECD Action Plan on SDGs](#) and the [OECD Programme on A Territorial Approach to the SDGs](#), which documents how cities and regions use the SDGs to improve their plans, strategies and policies, and measures their distance to SDGs targets, compared with national average and peer cities. During the session, delegates were also updated on the measurement of official development assistance to the water

and sanitation sector for target 6.a.1. Delegates were provided with examples of national voluntary reviews on the SDGs, in Israel, Netherlands and Peru.

Delegates discussed the OECD Programme on [Water Security for Sustainable Development in Africa](#), and in particular a dedicated Survey on Water Governance in African Cities. Findings were shared on OECD work on urbanisation in Africa, including the [Africapolis](#) database, which maps new urbanisation dynamics in the region. Evidence was presented from the OECD [African Economic Outlook 2016](#) on the rural-urban divide in terms of access to safe drinking water and sanitation.

In the session on **Water Governance in Asia**, delegates discussed the progress of the OECD's collaboration with the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to produce the 2020 Asian Water Development Outlook, and introduced a survey to 40+ countries in the region on water governance. Key findings were presented from relevant works on water governance taking place in Asia, including the OECD [Multi-Dimensional review of Thailand](#), as a practical example of the application of the [OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework](#). Delegates discussed the OECD's work on [integrated urban policies](#) and [disaster risk management](#) in the Asian region, and their potential to improve water resources management.

Delegates peer-reviewed the OECD draft Report "**Water Governance in Peru**" in the presence of Peru's Vice Minister for Environment, Mr Gabriel Quijandria Acosta, and provided guidance to fine-tune recommendations, building on international best practice.

Delegates were updated on the outcomes of the Workshop on Water Infrastructure held in Brasilia in October 2019 as part of the **Third Phase of the OECD National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Brazil**, focused on the implementation of the OECD's Recommendations made during the 2015 and 2017 Policy Dialogues. The OECD's broader work on [effective public investment across levels of government](#) was shared amongst delegates due to its relevance in considerations of infrastructure.

During the session on **Water Governance for Indigenous Peoples**, the authors from the Australian National University and the University of Guelph (Canada) discussed the article "[Whose Rules? A Water Justice Critique of the OECD's 12 Principles on Water Governance](#)" and the OECD presented the work on [Linking Indigenous Communities to Regional Development](#). Some ways forward were proposed to apply the principles to Indigenous Peoples and other specific groups and contexts.

Updates from the OECD Horizontal Water Programme were provided on [the reform of water policies in agriculture and the monitoring of progress](#) (Trade and Agriculture Directorate), [the governance of water regulators](#) (Public Governance Directorate), harnessing the benefits of the [sustainable ocean economy](#) for developing countries (Development Co-operation Directorate) and [water and climate change adaptation](#) (Environment Directorate).

Two back-to-back sessions were dedicated to advancing the work of the **Working Groups on Indicators and Capacity Development**. Delegates participated in lively co-creation workshops and group discussions to advance the deliverables for the 9th World Water Forum.

Next Steps

Next steps on the road to the 14th WGI meeting (date and location to be confirmed) are to:

- Advance the **Working Group on Indicators** through a stocktaking of the literature review on the measurable impacts of water governance on water management, based on the results of the working group session during the 13th WGI meeting. Through a voting procedure, WGI members identified some key hypotheses linking water governance dimensions to specific results. These hypotheses will be further investigated through evidence-based analyses and conclude with the preparation of an OECD Working Paper to be released at the 9th World Water Forum in Dakar.
- Advance the **Working Group on Capacity Development** through the development of a toolkit for the use of the Principles and selected self-assessments using the OECD Water Governance indicators. The toolkit will consist of: a guidance for carrying out the self-assessment; power point presentations on the Principles; a video or animation promoting the uptake of the OECD water governance framework
- Hold **a webinar for each Working Group** in May 2020 to discuss interim findings regarding Working groups activities ahead of the 14th WGI meeting
- Present preliminary findings of the Water Governance in African cities Survey during the next WGI meeting to be held in October 2020
- Consider and propose future avenues of action for possible work on Indigenous Peoples and water governance, both within ongoing and future National Water Governance Policy Dialogues, and as a specific subject of research

Day 1: January 9, 2020

Welcoming Remarks

Mr Peter Glas, Chair of the [OECD Water Governance Initiative \(WGI\)](#), opened the meeting expressing his gratitude to the Secretariat, to the Deputy Secretary-General, Mr. Ulrik Vestergaard Knudsen, and all participants for coming to Paris for this meeting. The Chair congratulated Ms. Oriana Romano, in her new capacity as Head of the Water Governance Programme; welcomed new members, the Japanese Water Forum, and presented the [agenda](#) and [list of participants](#), both available on the [website](#). The Chair highlighted that members gathered virtually prior to the meeting in two webinars (on November 4, 2019) to advance on the working group's activities on [capacity development](#) and [indicators](#) and that dedicated sessions were foreseen on Day 2 of the meeting. The **Chair** mentioned that the Steering Committee held a meeting on October 10, 2019 to provide strategic guidance on the activities of the WGI, notably the administrative elements, leadership and financing.

Launch of the “Water Governance in Argentina” Report

Mr Ulrik Vestergaard Knudsen, Deputy Secretary-General, OECD, launched the OECD report [Water Governance in Argentina](#) as a result of a yearlong policy dialogue carried out by the OECD, in collaboration with the Inter-American Development Bank and over 250 stakeholders from across levels of government, public, private and non-profit sectors in Argentina. The report was peer-reviewed at the 12th meeting of the OECD Water Governance Initiative in Berlin on 20 June 2019, in the presence of Mr. Pablo Bereciartua, the former Secretary of Infrastructure and Water Policy of Argentina.

Mr Knudsen recalled the OECD work on water governance, supporting decision makers with data, evidence, analysis and guidance to tackle the policy challenges of having too little, too much and too polluted water, and to provide better water and sanitation services to all. Argentina, like many countries in the world, is facing several of these problems: floods represent 60% of all critical events and are responsible for 95% of the country's economic losses due to natural disasters; and gaps in access to water services are important since only 54.7% of the rural population is connected to drinking water supply (versus 87% for urban dwellers). These challenges are likely to exacerbate over time if no action is taken, especially due to climate change, rapid urbanisation and the fluctuating nature of the Argentinian economy, that affect both the continuity and the predictability of public policies in general and water is no exception.

Mr Knudsen highlighted that the new report shows that important milestones have been achieved in Argentina: from the creation of a dedicated ministry of infrastructure and water policy, the National Directorate of Drinking Water and Sanitation, to the design and implementation of a National Water Plan. Still, there are a number of challenges to be addressed. The report provides 20 policy recommendations for the water sector in Argentina, which can be structured around four overarching orientations:

- First, to strengthen multi-level cooperation between the national and provincial governments to deal with water challenges at the appropriate scale.
- Second, to establish an ambitious long-term and robust planning and investment framework.

- Third, to strengthen river basin governance arrangements.
- Fourth, to strengthen economic regulation by providing minimum requirements for quality service; making result-based plans compulsory for operators; and fostering financial sustainability of water services, for instance through tariffs revenues and efficiency gains in operations and maintenance.

Mr Knudsen concluded by emphasising that the OECD has been working with the new Argentinian administration to foster policy continuity and support the implementation of these recommendations. The OECD has also worked very closely with the Inter-American Development Bank to mainstream policy recommendations in IDB's technical assistance programme with Argentina, and to develop an Action Plan for the new administration. There are already promising signs of the tangible impact of this dialogue and the resulting report for the country such as the development of a new law on Water and Sanitation, submitted to Congress in December prior to the change in government..

OECD Council Recommendation on Water & OECD Contribution to the G20

Multilateral Engagement on Water, Mr Anthony Cox, Deputy Director, Environment Directorate, OECD

Mr Anthony Cox, OECD Secretariat, illustrated to the WGI members the path towards the [OECD Council Recommendation on Water](#), which gather all the acquis on water produced by the OECD since the seventies. The Council Recommendation, adopted in December 2016, organised all policy perspectives in the water domain under the following headings: managing water quantity; improving water quality; managing water risks and disasters; ensuring good water governance with full integration of the [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#); and ensuring sustainable finance, investment and pricing for water and water services. As part of the ongoing monitoring of the implementation of the Recommendation, several directorates are working together to collect best practices and produce supporting tools. The WGI has contributed through the development of a self-assessment framework and peer-review of water governance stories, as well as lessons from policy dialogues in Argentina, Peru and Brazil. The OECD Environment Directorate is updating the [Database on Policy Instruments for the Environment](#) (PINE) that has tools for public action for the environment, with a focus on reference indicators for water policy. It is also collecting evidence of implementation from countries, along with other Directorates at the OECD.

Mr Cox updated delegates on the OECD activities on water for the G20, under the Saudi Arabian Presidency. He recalled the [Water and Agriculture Action Plan](#) developed under the Agriculture Track in the G20 under the German Presidency in 2017. He communicated that the OECD is contributing to the discussion on water towards the development of a G20 Water Management Action Plan, through two papers, jointly prepared with FAO and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis. During the group discussion, delegates welcomed the topic of water and the G20 meetings and asked for more information on the papers prepared by the OECD and shared with the Saudi Presidency.

On the road to the 9th World Water Forum, 2021, Dakar, Senegal

The **Chair** welcomed Mr. Abdoulaye Sene, Executive Director of the 9th World Water Forum in Dakar in 2021, and Ms. Danielle Gaillard-Picher from the World Water Council (WWC).

Mr Abdoulaye Sene, Executive Director of the 9th World Water Forum

Mr Abdoulaye Sene emphasised that this year is crucial for water and that the Forum should expedite the global agenda for water, as there are currently concerns about achieving SDG 6 by 2030. In order to do

so, it is necessary to mobilise funding and initiatives, which requires collective and collaborative action of all stakeholders involved at every level. As the Forum will take place in Sub-Saharan Africa, the ambition is to make it more effective, especially since water issues are critical in the region in terms of access, quality, delays in investment and protecting water resources.

The Forum will seek to keep in mind a series of commitments made towards Africa's development and towards international climate obligations. The Forum will be based on four priorities: water and sanitation security; co-operation; water in rural development settings; and innovative tools for financing, governance and more. The organisers would like to seek inspiration from the international agenda—the SDGs, the climate agenda and the Africa agenda—so that heads of state, ministers, parliamentarians, mayors and all other actors can collaborate. Additionally, the Forum will seek strategic partners, including international organisations or financial institutions, in order to have a broader consultation process to prepare for the Forum. The different working groups set up around the four aforementioned topics will collaborate to draft documents, proposals and initiatives that will be sent to the Forum in 2021. There is a need to continue to strive for good water governance. As co-lead of the Forum's priority "Means and tools of implementation", and dedicated coordinator of the governance action groups, the OECD should play a key role to identify stakeholders who can help draft documents, design sessions, and to choose speakers or leaders. The Forum is a chance to work together with the OECD to highlight and promote the Forum outcomes so that it is a contribution to the global water agenda beyond 2021.

Ms Danielle Gaillard-Picher, Director of Policy and Programs, World Water Council

Ms Danielle Gaillard-Picher reiterated some differences of this year's World Water Forum from previous Fora. In that respect, the World Water Forum will become a change process—not merely an event or meeting—but a mechanism to help progress towards a better situation for water; it is a milestone that catalyses positive action for the cause of water and sanitation in addition to a commitment to collaboration. She highlighted three objectives of the upcoming World Water Forum:

1. To focus on integration, move away from any silo approaches and unite different actors around priorities and actions;
2. To organise concrete action, with a focus on short- and long-term achievable outcomes;
3. To align closely with Agenda 2030—not only SDG 6, but on the entire range of SDGs

Ms Gaillard-Picher proposed to organise these objectives through the pilot groups that Mr Sene mentioned that align with each of the four priorities. The pilot groups will have a specific number of actions based on their priority and there will be action groups under each group. The objective is to determine what is achievable. There will be the opportunity to contribute to these action groups or to a broader consultative group that can help bring ideas and suggestion to these actions. The Forum will introduce new ideas and mechanisms to ensure representation from different stakeholders and that the program will be concise—with 100 or less sessions.

Group Discussion

Ms Susana Neto, Researcher, University of Lisbon, stated that the process before and after the event may be more important than the event itself. Therefore, it is important to share the agenda before anyone can contribute, specifically where drivers for change can be identified as well as the possibilities and impossibilities for change and what the process looks like before and after the Forum.

Mr Stefano Burchi, Chair of the Water and Wetlands Specialist Group, World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL), emphasised the commitment of the WCEL to contribute to the legal dimension of water management during the Forum.

Ms Yumiko Asayama, Japan Water Forum, asked Mr Sene about the specific responsibilities of the strategic partnerships and the advisory groups.

Mr Sene emphasised that the link between water and development is essential, especially regarding Africa. The working group on water for rural development, co-chaired by FAO, will take stock of all new initiatives and ones that can be planned in the future to allow work for water in this field. Mr Sene asked those organisations who are interested in this topic to join these working groups. Within the UN and other international fora, Senegal will continue to work with all the partners who want to support it to make sure that the outcomes of the Dakar Forum will continue to feed international action. Finally, Mr Sene encouraged the WCEL to get in touch with the Forum organisers so that they may participate in this regard.

The strategic partnerships have very specific responsibilities. Institutions, states or international organisations can participate in these partnerships by providing technical and scientific input, gathering different stakeholders (especially at a regional level), promoting sponsorship and understanding how different actors can contribute. These partnerships help organise the different sessions for the forum itself and make sure that there is a post-forum phase. They are involved in both the pre- and post-forum phases. A memorandum of understanding is usually signed between the Forum and the organisation of partnership.

WGI Contributions to Global Agendas: Key outcomes and developments¹

The **Chair** introduced the session as an update on the WGI contributions to global agendas and asked participants to state key outcomes and developments, and upcoming meetings.

Water Governance in Cidade da Praia, Cape Verde, 17 September 2019, University of Lisbon

Ms Susana Neto provided a summary of the [Plenary Session of the Symposium \(SILUSBA\)](#) in Praia, Cape Verde that occurred on September 16-20, 2019. She presented three different questions regarding the laws of the countries present there (Brazil, Portugal, Angola, Mozambique, Cape Verde, São Tomé e Príncipe and East Timor): Who should guide, execute and participate in water management systems, and under which institutional framework? What geographical scale and institutional level is appropriate for water governance in different contexts? How can we fund water management and what role should the private sector take in the global framework?

The keynote speaker of the session was Mr. Francisco Correia, who presented the OECD definition of water governance, including the 12 Principles on Water Governance. The objective of the session was to discuss different contexts, particularly those of the African countries who were present, and what could be learned from the implementation of the Principles. During the session, there was input from Cape Verde, East Timor, São Tomé e Príncipe and Brazil. The session concluded that there is a need for a good diagnostic of the context of each of these countries. The Principles cannot be effectively applied if the context is not understood and problems are not well equated; thus, tailored solutions have to be applied.

Ms Neto noted that the session called for more development of platforms to assemble the countries that have a common language as a powerful exchange mechanism. These lessons should be carried up to the level of decision-making in all of these countries.

¹ Please note that due to the COVID-19 pandemic that is currently being experienced in many areas of the world, some of the below events may have been postponed, cancelled or held virtually. Those events whose dates have already been postponed at the moment of the release of these Highlights have been marked with a footnote. Due to the uncertainty of the duration of the pandemic, and the extent of its impact, it is advised that readers independently confirm the dates of all future events announced during the 13th WGI Meeting and reflected in this report.

Mr Francisco Correia, President of the General Assembly, Portuguese Water Partnership shared perspective on the Principles and on Cape Verde, where the event took place. He mentioned that it is interesting to highlight these extreme conditions in terms of water management as, often, extreme conditions show the limits of what needs to be tested. Cape Verde presents an extreme condition to test concepts or frameworks for water management, which yielded an interesting debate. The Water Governance Principles developed by the OECD WGI proved to be effective and attracted a lot of attention. Even though Cape Verde is not an OECD country, with minor adaptations in the monitoring of the implementation, the Principles can be applied.

11th INBO World General Assembly, 30 September –3 October 2019, Marrakech, INBO

Mr Daniel Valensuela, Deputy Manager, INBO/OIEau (Office International de l'Eau), recapped the [INBO World General Assembly](#) that was held in Marrakesh, Morocco. This assembly is held every three years. This year, the theme was water security, covering five topics: the nexus between integrated management of water resources, energy and food; managing water and water governance in the context of climate change, in particular at the catchment level; sharing knowledge and information; water diplomacy and sharing transboundary water resources; and financing water security.

Mr Valensuela mentioned three key messages that came from the INBO World General Assembly:

1. Water security should not only be measured at country level, but at catchment level.
2. The need to establish priorities and to focus on basins that are most vulnerable to climate change.
3. The need to develop platforms and information systems on water. These platforms need broadening, since they often include energy, agriculture, cities, land planning and more. The interactions between these sectors and the water sector need to be thoroughly assessed.

25th United Nations Climate Change Conference (COP 25), 2-13 December, 2019, Spain, INBO

Mr Valensuela then spoke about [COP 25](#), which took place in Madrid in December 2019. INBO's main involvement was with the water action event, focusing mainly on nature-based solutions to improve water in the urban context. There were also round tables based on these issues and involving the SDGs, where SDG 6 and SDG 15 were highlighted. They looked at climate change in relation to water and biodiversity, as 2020 is planned to be the year of biodiversity, with the IUCN [World Conservation Congress](#) entitled "Biodiversity All Alive in 2020." INBO shared a number of projects and experiences during COP 25 and those that it shares with the WGI. One takeaway was that climate change is having an impact on the entire water cycle, which has a domino effect on other sectors, namely, important economic sectors that rely on water. It is thus key to establish an optimum and integrated management of water resources at all levels and, most important, at catchment and basin levels.

IWA Water and Development Congress & Exhibition, 1 - 5 December 2019, Colombo, Sri Lanka, IWA

Ms Carolina Latorre Aravena, Senior Officer, Water Policy & Regulation, International Water Association (IWA), outlined the 2019 [IWA Water and Development Congress](#) and the highlights. The Congress was culmination of a series of other activities aimed to promote and discuss good governance, specifically the importance of good policies and regulations. This work has involved a global network of regulators and officials related to the water sector and water services, as well as sanitation. IWA's main objective is to provide a channel for practitioners to translate principles, such as the OECD Principles on Water Governance, into operational terms. They also promote collaboration, as well as disseminate and consolidate good practices to facilitate peer-to-peer learning. Two regional fora were held to involve more

countries and stakeholders. IWA collaborated with the Association of Regulators of Water and Sanitation of the Americas (ADERASA) for the [XII Ibero-America Forum on Regulation in Cartagena, Colombia in October 2019](#). [The Asia-Pacific Forum](#) took place in Hong Kong on October 31 - November 2, 2019.

IWA gathered regulators again at the 2019 [IWA Water and Development Congress & Exhibition](#) in Colombo, Sri Lanka on 1-5 December 2019. There were 3000 water sector participants from 100 countries. Some key messages include: defining the role of regulators in improving water regulations and policies; promoting the understanding of climate and water challenges, which build on the OECD Principles on Water Governance; addressing water recycling and reuse, as well as cost recovery of services; and, collaborating and connecting water managers in urban and rural areas.

Ms Latorre Aravena concluded by inviting everyone to the 6th International Water Regulators Forum and the next [IWA World Water Congress & Exhibition](#), which will take place in Copenhagen, Denmark in October 2019 and will include an SDGs summit. The goal of the summit is to build on the already-established role of stakeholders in promoting the 2030 Agenda and ensure that actions are efficient.

IWRA XVII World Water Congress, 11-15 May 2020, Daegu, Korea²

Mr Callum Clench, Executive Director, International Water Resources Association (IWRA), announced the [17th World Water Congress in Daegu, Korea, May 11-15, 2020](#). The focus this year is on water security and resilience. This Congress will be an opportunity to connect with communities that are water insecure and/or do not have secure access to water and sanitation. There will be envoys from communities to come and be centre stage within the Congress. The aim is to take high-level discussions and connect them back to real communities and people, alongside impacts on daily lives. The proposal period is officially closed, but Mr Clench assured delegates that WGI members are still welcome. IWRA is working closely with colleagues in Korea (Ministry of Environment, K WATER, the Korea Water Resources Association and the City of Daegu). This Congress will run in parallel with [Korea International Water Week](#).

4th Asia-Pacific Water Summit, 19-20 October 2020, Kumamoto, Japan, APWF

Ms Yumiko Asayama, Manager, Japan Water Forum, announced the 4th [Asia-Pacific Water Summit](#) (APWS), organised by the [Asia-Pacific Water Forum](#) (APWF), an independent, non-profit network of a variety of international organisations, and the City of Kumamoto (the host city) as well as relevant ministries and agencies of Japan. The primary objective of the summit is to create opportunities for the heads of state of 49 countries in the Asia-Pacific region to recognise the need for strong leadership, regional collaboration and international cooperation, and to set a course of action for sustainable development in the region. The APWS has occurred three times, [most recently in 2017 in Yangon, Myanmar](#). The APWS will focus on sharing best practices and the latest science, technology and innovation and discussing implementation of concrete actions and solutions in the region. Water-related SDGs and promoting water-related infrastructure development in accordance with the G20 principle for quality infrastructure development will be focused on. Discussion will also involve ways to mobilise domestic resources and strengthen coordination and collaboration mechanisms among stakeholders to ensure sound water cycle management for each water basin. There will be discussion on how to achieve quality growth and promising futures for both the current and the next generations. The outcome documents of the summit are tentatively called the Kumamoto Declaration. The thematic scope of this summit has also been developed in accordance with the Asia-Pacific Water Development Outlook 2020, a joint initiative between

² Due to serious health concerns and newly imposed regional and international travel restrictions, IWRA and the Korean co-hosts have decided to postpone the IWRA XVII World Water Congress, previously scheduled for 11-15 May 2020 at EXCO in Daegu, South Korea, to the new dates 21-25 September 2020, at the same venue.

ADB and APWF. The OECD is currently working with ADB to conduct the finance and the governance message for the Outlook. The analysis of this will also be the basis for the thematic scope of the Summit.

Group Discussion

Mr Dirk Van der Stede, CEO, Flanders Knowledge Water Centre, informed delegates on the [International Water Dialogue Days](#) on April 21-22, 2020 in Brussels³. This is an initiative by Water Europe, UNESCO and the European Commission regarding the EU strategy for international cooperation. He suggested it would be a good opportunity for OECD and WGI members to participate because it will address developing countries as well as countries such as Iran and Japan.

Ms Lesha Witmer, Butterfly Effect/Women for Water Partnership, mentioned that on May 25-27, 2020, there will be a European Water Conference⁴ hosted by the Commissioner of International Partnerships and the High Commissioner for External Action of the EU. The Conference is aimed at all the newly elected and appointed officials within the EU system to make them aware of the state of the art in the water sector both within and beyond Europe. Therefore, it is a capacity development event organised by a variety of organisations. The event will gather 150 people, and the organisers want to have a large discussion on incorporating water into the Green Deal and mobilising more funding for water.

Ms Jovana Gojkovic, Senior Officer, External Relations, Aqua Publica Europea, announced that 2019 marked Aqua Publica Europea's 10th anniversary and a seminar was organised in Brussels to talk about the future of water with experts, including the main challenges and solutions. Governance was also one of the topics that was heavily discussed. The second part of the event involved circular economy and sustainability. Different sectors were brought to the table and two case studies were presented on multidisciplinary approaches to water. One of them focused on urban rainwater management and the other on sludge management. The two main conclusions were that these kinds of events need to happen more often and there are many good local examples that should be displayed to higher levels of government.

Mr Colin Herron, Senior Water Resources Management Specialist, GWP, highlighted that there is a tendency to be inward looking within the water sector, whereas water is a crosscutting issue, and not enough is being done to mobilise other sectors that have an impact water resources. He commented that in the presentations, there has not been enough information about ongoing processes such as supporting the UN member states in monitoring SDG 6.5. He suggested that more could be done to build these events into ongoing processes like this.

Ms Jiyeon Kang, Deputy Director, Ministry of Environment of Korea, gave delegates some information on the [Korea International Water Week](#)⁵ (KIWW), which will be held alongside the [IWRA World Water Congress](#), in which water governance is one of the key agenda items. In 2019, more than 10 ministers and heads of international organisations participated and more than 14 000 participants cumulatively from over 80 countries were involved. The major outcome of the KIWW is the annual leaders' declaration, the last of which was adopted by 34 water leaders from different institutions. One of the declaration's six main themes stated that water partnership and cooperation should exist at all levels to ensure good water governance. KIWW also hosts 15 thematic sessions named TIP (Technology, Implementation and Policy) Platforms.

³ Due to the Coronavirus (COVID-19) outbreak and the increased bans imposed on company travel, Water Europe has decided to respect the growing concerns of its network and cancel the International Water Dialogue Days.

⁴ Due to the Coronavirus pandemic, the European Water Conference has been officially postponed. Official dates are still to be announced.

⁵ Due to serious health concerns and newly imposed travel restrictions, the KIWW, previously scheduled for May 11-13 at EXCO in Daegu, Republic of Korea, has been postponed to the new dates of September 21-23 2020, at the same venue.

The upcoming KIWW will emphasise the importance of good water governance and will facilitate in depth discussion and share various cases of good water governance.

Mr Niels Vlaanderen, Coordinator of International Water Affairs, Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment of the Netherlands, stated that in 2019, the Global Commission on Adaptation launched a report on [The Year of Action](#). One of the tracks of this work is the water action track, which is relevant to the WGI's work. The Netherlands, the World Bank and the Water Resources Institute lead this track. On October 22, 2020, there will be a [Climate Adaptation Summit](#) in the Netherlands, which will include water sessions, which may be an interesting forum to present the WGI's work.

Ms Angie Saleh, Governance and Partnerships Specialist, Sanitation and Water for All, highlighted that Sanitation and Water for All contributes every three years to a ministers of finance meeting together with the World Bank⁶, this year meeting between April 16 and 19. The purpose is to highlight practical actions for ministers of finance to mobilise additional resources for the sector. The format of the meeting is to have ministers of finance present success stories to consider the water sector as a revenue-generating and finance-mobilising source, rather than a burden. Although the OECD is not yet a SWA member, Ms Saleh welcomed it to be part of the meeting.

Localising and Measuring the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The **Chair** introduced the session, whose main objective is to share with the members the work that the OECD is carrying out in contribution to the SDG agenda on the national, local and regional levels. During this session, three countries—the Netherlands, Israel, and Peru—shared their experiences of carrying out the national voluntary reviews, especially concerning SDG 6. This session also benefitted from the insights on data collection for the indicator 6.a.1, of which the OECD is co-custodian.

An OECD Action Plan on SDGs, OECD

Ms Romina Boarini, OECD Secretariat, provided an overview of the broader framework that the OECD developed to respond to the 2030 agenda and help countries achieve the SDGs. The [OECD Action Plan on SDGs](#) was developed by OECD members in November 2016 and provides four action areas:

1. Applying the SDG lens to OECD strategies and policy tools to mainstream the SDGs and the 2030 agenda within peer reviews and other ongoing processes.
2. Leveraging OECD data to help analyse the progress of SDG implementation by OECD countries, partners and non-members that work within OECD regional programs.
3. Using the OECD's support for integrated planning and policymaking at the country level to rethink how the expertise of the OECD can best be used to help countries implement SDGs within their own national development strategies.
4. Rethinking the OECD's external relationships—in particular its collaboration and strategic partnership with the UN system.

Ms Boarini highlighted a few examples of the implementation of the Action Plan, such as the OECD [Going for Growth](#), which focused on environmental sustainability and often referenced the SDGs framework in the 2019 edition; the OECD report on [Accelerating Climate Action](#) to help refocus policies through a wellbeing lens, which tried to understand and build a case for stronger and better climate policies on the basis that this ensures wellbeing for all; and [PISA](#), one of the OECD's main tools to assess educational performance. She also mentioned the latest report from 2019, [Measuring Distance to the SDG Targets](#)

⁶ Due to the evolving situation of the Coronavirus (COVID-19) and growing health concerns, the World Bank Group and International Monetary Fund (IMF) have agreed that the 2020 Spring Meetings will transition to a virtual format.

[2019: An Assessment of Where OECD Countries Stand](#). Results showed that OECD performance is uneven across SDGs and targets, between and within OECD countries. The main findings for SDG 6 show that on average, OECD performance is significant and encouraging compared to other SDGs. Ms Boarini emphasised that the OECD is actively contributing to multi-stakeholder activities such as the [Global Partnership for Effective Development Cooperation](#). The SDG work is also being integrated into the OECD's regional and country programs.

A Territorial Approach to the SDGs: the key role of Cities and Regions

Ms Aziza Akhmouch, Head of Division, Cities, Urban Policies and Sustainable Development, CFE, OECD Secretariat, emphasised that the 2030 Agenda is not only taken as a compliance agenda agreed upon by national governments, but also as a policy tool to help cities and regions revisit how they design local policies, prioritise investments and shape regional and local development strategies. The [OECD Programme on A Territorial Approach to the SDGs](#) aims at:

- Learning how the SDGs are used as a tool and how they help manage trade-offs across different goals so that advancement in one area is not detrimental to another;
- Measuring the distance of cities and regions against the targets for the SDGs where they have core competencies and see how they compare against their national average;
- Sharing and providing guidance for this better multi-level governance of the SDGs. The OECD has been working with nine pilot cities and regions, mostly in OECD countries.

Ms Akhmouch presented the indicator framework developed to measure the distance to the SDGs at local and regional level. By using the OECD metropolitan and regional datasets, 130+ indicators within a [comparative tool](#) show the distance to the SDGs of 600 OECD regions (state or provinces, etc.) and 600+ municipalities above 250 000 inhabitants compared against each other, and with their national average. The methodology for selecting the indicators and producing sub-national data relied on the global UN monitoring framework, out of which a double selection was made to identify targets and indicators that are i) OECD-relevant (namely for developed, advanced economies) and ii) place-relevant (namely with core underlying policy competencies for subnational governments). The overall objective is to provide granular data that can reveal territorial disparities within each OECD and partner country in order not to convey a misleading picture of the SDG progress based on national average only.

Ms Akhmouch highlighted that for SDG 6, there was a challenge in terms of data availability exacerbated further at local and regional levels. To account for this, trends in the change in water bodies, such as rivers, lakes and dams from 1992 to 2015 have been used as a proxy to see how water availability has evolved. Findings show that for over 95% of the cities in the sample, there has been an important decline in water availability over the past two decades and more than 90% of the regions in the sample have not met goal 6. Another indicator for water includes the percentage of households that are connected to quality wastewater infrastructure and within the same country, there is a spread between the best and least well performing city. The synthesis report [A Territorial Approach to the Sustainable Development Goals](#) contains a checklist to support national governments in their reporting process to engage with local and regional governments and to strengthen the multilevel governance of the SDGs, including for collecting and reporting data.

Spotlight on National Reporting of Sustainable Development Goal 6 on Water and Sanitation for all

Mr Niels Vlaanderen, International Water Affairs, Ministry of Infrastructure and Environment, Netherlands

Mr Niels Vlaanderen stated that the Netherlands has developed some tools regarding the SDGs, including benchmarking, measuring risks and impacts, strategy and reporting and a compulsory SDG exam of new regulation and financial support. He highlighted the horizontal co-ordination with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as well as vertical co-ordination, where high-level officers within each ministry coordinate with the 17 SDG alliances of existing platforms, coalitions and movements. The country has an SDG charter that was financed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with more than 500 members and stakeholders that set up a bottom-up process. SDG implementation in the Netherlands thus happens at three levels: national, EU and international. The national implementation of the SDGs works mainly through cooperation between the national government and the non-state actors and some of the local authorities. There is a post-2015 Charter of different sectors in society in the Netherlands. At the EU level, the 2020 strategy is used as an overarching framework. At the global level, there are several initiatives coordinated by the European Commission and UN Water. National progress is monitored on a regular basis and is examined through a wellbeing lens. Outcomes are sent annually to parliament and are subject to a parliamentary debate. On the monitoring side, the SDGs have global targets and indicators. In 2018, UN Water produced the synthesis report. The main message was that the world is not on track regarding SDG 6 due, in part, to limited data availability and that, by themselves, the global indicators do not lead to the implementation of measures to reach the water SDGs. Although UN Water helps countries to monitor the global targets, information and data is missing on a more detailed level to develop national or regional strategies.

Mr Danny Greenwald, Senior Deputy Director General of Regulation, Israeli Water Authority

Mr Danny Greenwald argued that most of the procedures to implement SDG 6 have already been completed over the past 60 years in Israel. Current implementation measures include IWRM, governance and regulation across all water sources (surface water, groundwater, sewage turned into treated wastewater, desalinated seawater/surface water). The Water Board combines various stakeholders from the government and the public and implements and designates responsibilities and prices. Efficient use comes through water metering and payment for all water. The development of existing and new resources is due to Israel's geographical location on semi-arid land, where water shortage has always been an issue. This has led to measures such as the use of conveyer systems to transfer water from rainy to dry areas or the use of treated wastewater in agriculture. In 2005, Israel added a large amount of water supply from sea desalination and this has led natural water use to decrease from 77% of total water to 35%. Additional amounts of water come through manufactured water (desalinated water or treated wastewater), which enables Israel to reduce the use of natural water sources and reconstruct ecosystems of these sources that were used in the past. Water quality has improved and as the country becomes less dependent on rainwater, water security has improved for the entire population. The use of treated wastewater (20% of Israel's total water supply) improves sanitation quality. In the past few years, Israel has improved the management of water-related risks through work with municipalities and local water suppliers to build resilience and maintain supply during periods of water scarcity.

Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Vice Minister for Strategic Development of Natural Resources, Ministry of the Environment, Peru

Mr Quijandría Acosta highlighted that in Peru, there is a complex system to report on SDG 6 that involves two aggregated efforts. The first one is implemented by the National Statistics Institute, which reports to the UN and leads information-gathering responsibilities of different institutions, namely the National Water

Authority (ANA). The second is conducted by the National Planning Centre to align the national development plan with the SDG indicators. Peru was one of the countries chosen to develop the project “Integrated Monitoring of the Goals of the Sustainable Development Goals – SDG 6 related to Water and Sanitation” (GEMI). It has worked to develop a countrywide pilot monitoring system focused on targets 6.3, 6.4, 6.5 and 6.6, co-ordinated by ANA. This monitoring system has been organised by the co-ordination of 50 different institutions (public, private and non-profit). However, Mr Quijandría noted that there was not enough participation of Indigenous communities, which means that other ways to gather this information must be implemented. In addition, information is scattered and often not well organised or available in time for decision-making. There is a need to institutionalise monitoring and follow up on indicators. For this, it is essential to establish a multi-sector approach for the construction of indicators, for information-gathering strategies for reporting and decision-making at the local, regional and national levels, and for coordinating between these levels of government. Mr Quijandría Acosta addressed the next steps and informed delegates that Peru is in phase two of GEMI, whose aim is to promote the national responsibility in constructing indicators. He informed delegates that Peru is looking for additional co-operation with other institutions to move forward on the integration and incorporation of indicators in decision-making and planning processes of new policies to come.

Measuring official development assistance in the water and sanitation sector

Ms Yasmin Ahmad, Manager, Data Collections Unit, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD Secretariat, mentioned that the OECD is the co-custodian agency for indicator 6.a.1, on the amount of water-related Official Development Assistance (ODA). The OECD’s data collection consists of information collected in a database on individual aid activities, called the Creditor reporting System (CRS). These activities cover individual transactions provided by the 30 members of the [Development Assistance Committee](#) (DAC), non-DAC providers and multilateral organisations (UN bodies, regional development banks, international financial institutions and others). Ms Ahmad defined ODA as a concept to measure flows to developing countries that are on a DAC list of developing countries. ODA flows are official in the sense that they are provided by official agencies or by executive agencies of the government.

The OECD collects information on legally binding agreements to provide funds to developing countries but also on disbursements, which are the actual expenditures that are taking place. ODA disbursements have increased by over 50% since 2000 to about USD 9 billion in 2016. However, from 2016 to 2017, they fell slightly by 2%. Ms Ahmad concluded by stating that there was also a large increase in commitments between 2016 and 2017. This is attributed to the tripling of commitments to agricultural water resources in South and Southeast Asia. However, water supply and sanitation also saw a substantial rise over that period from USD 7.5 billion to over USD 9 billion in 2017. There have also been large increases in ODA committed to the water sector in the policy and administrative management areas, and to large water supply and sanitation systems.

Group Discussion

Mr Bernard Barraqué, Research Director, CIRED-CNRS, expressed his doubts on the fact that the definition of good wastewater systems is often limited to connection to wastewater systems and sewerage works, and he stated that this level has been decreasing both in developing and developed countries. Therefore, he proposed that the focus should be on improving these systems. He emphasised the need to take advantage of existing experiences in various countries on decentralised sewerage to improve this indicator, as well as to expand the indicator beyond wastewater and sewerage connection and include the quality aspect of what is not connected.

Ms Aslihan Kerc, Directory of Strategy and Corporate Affairs, SUEN, asked Peru how they assessed the progress made since the first implementation of the GEMI programme. It would be interesting to know if what they assessed has been achieved, compared to the objectives set; how they measure the progress;

and whether or not the concepts have been properly implemented. Regarding the ODA, Ms Kerc stated that data collected, unfortunately, though including both OECD and non-OECD countries, did not cover all countries and that China, for example, is excluded from these statistics. She warned that if this data is used, caution must be exercised regarding its coverage.

Mr Manfred Matz, Head of the Tunisia Water Programme, German Development Agency (GIZ), contested that SDG 6 include water and sanitation, when, in fact, three out of the six indicators address water resources (neither water supply nor sanitation). He advocated to separate the two sectors from one another because they are two different issues. In Northern Africa and the Middle Eastern region, countries overuse water resources, but this is not accounted for separately in looking at the indicators. He suggested that in the Working Group on Indicators discussion, everyone should look further to develop indicators and link capacity building to water resource management and to water supply and sanitation in separate ways.

Ms Witmer, Butterfly Effect/Women for Water Partnership, supported the previous comment about the measurement of sanitation and sewerage. She believes there are two main problems: one is that eco-sanitation is not measured, which often yields unexpected results; the second is that decentralised systems are not evaluated, only the connection to sewerage systems. When looking at the difference between rural and urban areas, universal connection to a sewerage system is seemingly impossible. She advocated for the measurement of the impacts of decentralised wastewater treatment systems. Ms Witmer then asked about the discrepancy of disaggregated data, both about gender and between urban and rural areas, and proposed to look into developing how more citizens' data can be used, motivated and collected.

Ms Gaillard Picher commended the work that was presented by Ms Akhmouch on localising the SDGs in cities and regions as essential to address the achievement of the SDGs and as an example of how the OECD can help bridge the gap between the national and local levels.

Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta emphasised that the Ministry of Environment is working with the National Water Authority (ANA) to update the National Water Plan, which dates from 2015. The information provided by the indicators of the GEMI project are being included into the new plan that will be approved for the next five years.

Water Governance in African Cities

The **Chair** introduced the session and reminded the WGI members that during the [8th World Water Forum](#) in Brazil, the OECD Secretary-General received the [King Hassan II World Water Prize](#), recognising 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 seeks to leverage the prize money (100 000 USD) to catalyse more funds through partnerships and the findings from the programme will be released at the 2021 [World Water Forum in Dakar, Senegal](#).

Analytical framework and draft Survey, Ms Maria Salvetti, Policy Analyst, OECD

Ms Maria Salvetti, OECD Secretariat, updated delegates on the progress of the Programme since the previous WGI meeting. The scope of the regional survey on water governance has been refined to a city level because African cities are witnessing demographic changes that result in population and urbanisation growth, which in turn, lead to a greater need for infrastructure as well as a 5% annual economic growth in African cities within the past decade. This focus on the subnational level also seeks to take into account the comments from the previous WGI Meeting (Berlin, June 2019) where some members (including UN Water, WHO and GWP) had expressed preference not to overlap with national surveys ongoing in different monitoring processes. The African Development Bank assessed the need for water infrastructure to be

about USD 93 billion per year, including operational expenditure and capital expenditure. At present, infrastructure is either obsolete or absent. The megatrends within these cities exacerbate water risks such as floods, droughts and pollution. Thus, the survey aims to be a tool through which the exact nature and magnitude of the water risks faced by each city can be identified.

Ms Salvetti underlined various water-related topics to be surveyed at city level. These include the impact of decentralisation or recentralisation, urban versus rural development and fiscal constraints on the capacity of African cities to deliver drinking water and sanitation. The survey also seeks to focus on the way urban and rural policies—including land use, spatial planning and the relationship between urban and rural—might drive or hinder water security in those cities. Other policy questions include how to foster good urban water governance in the context of informal settlements and the economy, how mayors can champion water security, how cities engage with their hinterlands and understanding best practices. The survey aims to assess the main governance gaps against the OECD Principles on Water Governance and to cluster cities that face similar situations and challenges. The way forward is gathering information through a questionnaire comprising several building blocks, including key water risks, megatrends for water supply and sanitation and water resource management, frameworks and institutions, and governance gaps.

Ms Salvetti concluded that 40 cities in Africa will be surveyed. The list of specific cities and the draft survey will be shared with the WGI steering committee by the end of February. After some piloting, the Survey should be carried over the period April-May 2020; a webinar will take place after survey completion in June 2020; and preliminary findings will be presented at the next WGI meeting in October 2020.

Key messages of the OECD work on Urbanisation in Africa

Mr Philipp Heinrigs, Senior Economist, Sahel and West Africa Club, OECD

Mr Phillip Heinrigs, OECD Secretariat, presented the OECD work on African urbanisation dynamics. Africa's population is projected to double between now and 2050, and 70% of this population growth will be absorbed by cities (900 million people). The OECD has been working for the past ten years with E-geopolis to develop a database ([Africapolis](#)) that applies a homogenous definition across all 50 countries covered. It has two variables: population size, whereby urban includes any area above 10 000 inhabitants, and built-up area with less than 200 meters between buildings. It uses satellite imagery for the built-up area and the population figures come from census data.

The first result of this work is that in 50% of Africa's population live in one of the 7 617 urban agglomerations with more than 10 000 inhabitants. This is important because the most widely used database on African urbanisation is the world urbanisation prospects, which integrates 222 agglomerations in Africa (above 300 000 inhabitants)—only 3% of the total contained in Africapolis. For the remaining 97% of the agglomerations, there is no detailed data available in terms of how big they are and where they are located, though they account for 260 million people.

Urban planning managements are major developing challenges for Africa, which brings about a need to rethink the role of cities and local governments as actors of national sustainable development strategies. There is also the need to go beyond the urban-rural divide given the fact that with urbanisation at this pace, the interaction between urban and rural environments are also increasing and densifying, so more territorial approaches are needed to cover this dynamic. The OECD work has shown that there are differences across countries and within them, in terms of drivers and context for this phenomenon. These drivers and contexts are the basis of formulating good policy. The OECD has recently published a report on [Africa's Urbanisation Dynamics 2020](#), where all these different trends are analysed in greater depth.

Mr Arthur Minsat, Head of Unit for Africa and Middle East, Development Centre, OECD

Mr Arthur Minsat, OECD Secretariat discussed the links between water provisions in urban and rural areas and how water can be delivered safely through available mechanisms. While progress has been made, there is still a strong rural-urban divide: of the 462 million African people with improved access to water and sanitation, 311 million are in urban areas and, about half as many (150 million), are in rural areas. Rapid urbanisation may mean that access to water in cities may worsen; however, this may not always necessarily be the case. The [African Economic Outlook of 2016](#) showed that the urban population growth compared to the increase in the access to clean water sources in the urban areas differed amongst countries. Many countries have been able to cope with rapid urbanisation particularly well. However, there is still a significant number of premature deaths related to unsafe water and unsafe sanitation, totalling at almost 1 million people in 2013. The cost of this pollution of water was about USD 410 billion in 2013, which is about one-third of Africa's GDP and slightly lower than the cost of air pollution, at USD 448 billion.

The question can be posed of how to finance further and how to find new funds. The biggest providers are African governments, which provided 48% of the new investments in water sources. This links in to important work that the OECD is carrying out with the Centre for Tax Policy and Administration on comparing the domestic resources mobilisation (fiscal and non-fiscal revenues) across 26 African economies through the annual publication [Revenue Statistics in Africa](#). This research allows African countries to be compared to other regions such as Asia and Latin America. The work has shown that government funding is particularly important and that the private sector is still lagging behind. There is a large gap between the primary cities, the intermediary cities and the rural areas.

Group Discussion

Mr. Donal O'Leary, Senior Advisor, Transparency International, asked the number of questions that will be included in the survey, given the ambitious scope, and what methodology will be used to have the survey filled out (who will sponsor the survey in each country). He noted that the survey seeks to cover a wide area, beyond governance. Therefore, there may be a need to streamline the total number of questions, refocus the survey content on governance issues only, and reduce the length since the filling in the survey may be very resource-intensive in the targeted 40 cities.

Mr Andrew Allan, Senior Lecturer, Law, School of Social Sciences of the University of Dundee, thanked the speakers and asked Mr Heinrigs if there were similar demographic and urbanisation trends outside of Africa.

Ms Susana Neto, Researcher, University of Lisbon, suggested not to separate urban issues from rural issues so much, particularly in Africa. Ms Neto also wanted to better understand the choice of cities in Africa that will be requested to fill in the Survey because it is important to understand other parts of the world and other regions.

Mr Rui Godinho, APDA, asked the Secretariat why there were not any Portuguese-speaking countries such as Angola or Mozambique included in the survey. In response to Mr Minsat's presentation, Mr Godinho also expressed concern as to the appropriateness of evaluating African cities according to concepts such as digital revolution and smart cities because the very rapid urbanisation trends all over the African continent are leading to impressive poverty and migration rates. Therefore, smart cities may not be a priority in some of these places. Even if the digital revolution is relevant for all places around the world and represents an important global trend, attention must be paid to the risks of cyber-attacks, which African cities may be more vulnerable to.

Mr. Dirk Van de Stede, CEO, Flanders Knowledge Centre Water, asked Ms. Salvetti about the underlying resources to fund the studies in the African cities. He also inquired about the relationships between the SDGs and health, since what is apparent now is that there are more projects involving wastewater treatment to lead to water supply for irrigation and drinking water.

Mr Bernard Barraqué, CIRED-CNRS, highlighted the importance of discussing household waste management when speaking about urban water management and this is relevant in the context of African urbanisation because the more the population is concentrated, the more household waste is generated. If there is not an appropriate system for collecting and processing this household waste, then this will contribute to water pollution, which can therefore hinder water security.

Ms. Salvetti ensured that partners and counterparts in countries would do the collection of the data, with local governments being primarily targeted as the survey respondents. A balance is sought between the length of the questionnaire and the need to get enough data for the analysis. Regarding the fact that the scope of the questionnaire is quite large, it must be considered that governance is a means to an end—and the context of each African city has to be understood to really be able to tailor some messages to the specific situation. Ms Salvetti stated that the draft questionnaire will be shared with the Steering Committee for feedback. In response to the lack of Portuguese-speaking countries, the project originally included Cape Verde, but due to lack of time, they were not able to participate. Ms Salvetti also announced that she would be in contact with Angola through ERSAR. She expressed her interest in gathering more contacts from Angola and Mozambique through interested WGI members. Ms Salvetti also stated that the financing of the survey originates in the prize money from the King Hassan II World Water Prize, which would help support the OECD's partners in different countries to collect the data. However, the funding of each specific activity requires more resources and efforts are underway to catalyse the needed financing.

Mr Heinrigs specified that even though demographic and urbanisation trends elsewhere have been similar, what is very different in Africa is the number of people involved.

Mr Minsat concluded the session by stating that in Africa, urbanisation has lasted for 60 years, whereas in the OECD, it has lasted over 200 years. Africa is more comparable to Asia, where urbanisation also shows some startling numbers, especially in China and India. Mr Minsat argued not to separate urban and rural issues, giving importance to multi-level governance. This is also important when looking at fiscal decentralisation, because when there is an issue with water provision in the rural areas or the small cities, it is usually because there is not enough financial capacity. The issue of smart cities will be explored in the next edition of the Africa Development Dynamics Report, where digitalisation and the future of work will feature. Data access is an issue because over 90% of the labour force is composed of informal employment, and therefore, there is no statistical information on this. It is therefore the duty of the OECD and its partners in the African Union and other organisations to display as much of this information as possible so that countries can learn from best practices and policy approaches.

Water Governance in Asia

The **Chair** introduced this session with the aim of looking at the ongoing OECD and Asian Development Bank work to produce the 2020 Asia Water Development Outlook, which will include a chapter on water governance informed by the OECD Principles on Water Governance, as well as specific case studies.

The OECD/ADB Survey on the Asia Water Development Outlook, Ms Maria Salvetti, Policy Analyst, OECD

Ms. Salvetti explained that the megatrends in Africa mentioned earlier also affect Asian and Pacific countries with strong economic growth, which will induce an increase in water demand of 55% by 2050. More than 60% of the Asian Pacific population will be living in cities by 2050 with current urbanisation growth and Asia will host 22 megacities by 2030. It is also projected that 3.4 billion people could live in water-stressed areas throughout Asia. These megatrends exacerbate the aforementioned water risks: too little water, too much water, too polluted water and issues related to access to water supply and sanitation.

Ms. Salvetti stated that the ADB included governance in its new edition of the Asian Water Development Outlook. The [first edition of this publication](#) came out in 2007, followed by two updates, in [2013](#) and [2016](#). In 2016, the importance of governance for effective resource management and sustainable development was emphasised. The Outlook assesses water security using a water security index made of five key dimensions: household security, economic security, environmental security, rural security and resilience to water related disasters, all of which will be complemented by a chapter dedicated to governance. Part II will focus on the characterisation of the water challenges and the water issues that exist in the Asian-Pacific regions and countries, followed by a closer look at water security in Part III, by using the water security index. Part IV will include different key dimensions analysed for different regions and countries within the Asia-Pacific. Part V will include the governance chapter and a chapter on financing issues to be produced by the OECD Environment Directorate. The governance chapter will follow and focus on each of the 12 OECD Principles on Water Governance. Data and information collection is ongoing with a country survey and a literature review, with the aim to complete a broad descriptive analysis on water governance in Asian-Pacific countries. The information has been gathered for 20 countries out of 49. In addition to the macro-regional analysis on Water Governance in Asia, the OECD is also performing two short governance case studies in Timor-Leste and Karnataka (India). The final AWDO, comprising the water governance chapter, will be launched in August 2020.

Key messages from the OECD work in South East Asia

Mr Matthew Griffiths, Senior Programme Manager, Environment Directorate, OECD

Mr. Matthew Griffiths, OECD Secretariat, mentioned that the OECD Water Governance indicator framework helped shape an action plan and scorecard to support implementation of OECD recommendations on improving Thailand's water management and water security. This work was part of the multidimensional review of Thailand, in which water management has been identified as a priority. The OECD Environment Directorate led analysis and preparation of the chapters on water and identified a number of challenges. Fragmentation was identified as a key issue, with 31 ministerial departments under 10 different ministries involved in water management, which led to overlapping roles and responsibilities, issues with conflicting interests and poor coordination throughout central and local government. There were also competing priorities for the use of water and no common framework for the future of water management. Data and information sharing was poor and with regard to disaster management, floods and droughts caused problems both nationally and internationally. The recommendations encouraged Thailand to move towards risk management as their approach to water security. The OECD team came up with three clear recommendations:

1. Set a clear strategic vision and organisational structure with clear roles and responsibilities and empower regional actors to deliver their water management responsibilities.
2. Develop a robust and evidence-based decision-making and policy framework to prioritise regional action and move away from a "one-size-fits all" approach to water management.
3. Look at appropriate infrastructure solutions and ensure they are selected with adequate capital and operation and maintenance budgets allocated, with a focus on the financing and tariff issues.

Mr Griffiths shared that the OECD held government workshops to test these recommendations with Thai stakeholders from central and local government and river basin organisations in which the OECD Principles on Water Governance and the Indicator Framework were very useful.

Mr Tadashi Matsumoto, Head of Unit, Sustainable Development and Global Relations, CFE, OECD

Mr Tadashi Matsumoto, OECD Secretariat, shared recent urban work in Southeast Asia, which looks at national level policies on urban issues by doing country reviews in Southeast Asia. The [Urban Policy](#)

[Review for Viet Nam](#) was released in 2018 and another review is currently taking place for Myanmar. This one is especially important because one of the focus areas will be climate resilience, a very relevant issue. In 2016, a large study of five countries and five cities was carried out on urban green growth in Thailand, Indonesia, Viet Nam, Malaysia, and the Philippines. In the 2016 [Urban Green Growth in Dynamic Asia](#) report, six sectoral areas were identified that can contribute to urban green growth; water being one of these important areas. The key message is to integrate different sectors at the city level. Cities are well positioned to integrate different policy sectors, and one example is that water should be linked to land use, waste management, and other sectors. Their assessment shows that this sector integration is currently not well organised, especially at the national/ministerial levels. They also looked at innovative policy instruments and found that demand-side policies, including pricing policies are yet to be developed.

In 2018, a report was launched on [Building Resilient Cities](#). It contains an assessment of the disaster-risk management policies in Bandung (Indonesia), Bangkok (Thailand), Cebu (Philippines), Hai Phong (Viet Nam) and Iskandar (Malaysia). National policies that may support those local disaster-risk management policies were also examined. There are a few key messages: risk-sensitive land use is not well developed; there is a need to capitalise on the opportunities presented by urban infrastructure; financial measures, including insurance and financing mechanisms, need to be developed; and, in governance, horizontal coordination across municipalities is mostly lacking. It was recommended to apply the Principles towards disaster-risk management policies at the national and local level, proving the usefulness of the Principles as a tool for effective disaster risk management policies.

Group Discussion

Mr Stefano Burchi, WCEL, stated that Thailand has proven remarkably resistant and impermeable to change in terms of its governance structure for water resources, as it is one of the few countries in the world without a Water Resources Act. Mr Burchi asked Mr Griffiths if he had any indications on the effectiveness of this OECD work to spearhead change at the political level.

Mr Yonghwan Kim, Water Advisor, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Korea, expressed excitement for the launch of the upcoming ADB report in Korea later this year. Mr Kim asked the speakers what the next steps following the launch of the report would be, and suggested a more local and regional approach, given the size of the continent and the place-based nature of water challenges and risks. He urged the OECD to explore the possibility of cooperating further with regional water-specific specialised organisations like the Asia Water Council, which has conducted much work for regional water cooperation. It will also host the [Asia International Water Week](#) on October 12-15 2020, in Bali, Indonesia, which would be a good event to display at successive WGI meetings in the coming year.

Ms Barbara Schreiner, WIN, thanked the speakers for their very interesting presentations and asked Mr Griffiths if during their discussions with Thai officials, the issue of corruption and integrity failures came up.

Ms Maria Salvetti thanked the Korean counterparts for their valuable input into the work on the ADB questionnaire. There is room to design next steps with the donors to ensure the funding of the action plan and the policy recommendations formulated by the OECD jointly with national and local stakeholders for the different countries. Water governance is attracting growing attention in the Asia-Pacific region and it is one of the seven operational priorities of the Asian Development Bank until 2030.

Mr Griffiths echoed one of the comments regarding the Thai's governance attitude to change, alluding to the age of some of the tariffs still applied today. However, Thailand requested to go through this survey as part of challenging internal targets they are setting for the 2037 vision to move towards high-income status, so they were keen to take the OECD recommendations seriously. Thailand has requested that another region be analysed under the same framework, which is an encouraging sign. However, the issue of corruption did not come up in any detail as part of the review.

Peer-review of the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru

The **Chair** introduced the session on the peer-review of the ongoing National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru and welcomed the Peruvian delegation led by the Vice Minister of Strategic Development of Natural Resources of the Ministry of Environment of Peru, Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta. The session peer-reviewed findings from the Dialogue following two OECD missions to Peru in May and September 2019 to assess whether current water governance frameworks and economic instruments are adequate to cope with water risks in Peru in an integrated and coordinated manner.

Key findings, Ms Oriana Romano, Head of Unit, Water Governance and Circular Economy, CFE, OECD

Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat, presented the three pillars of the report: multilevel governance, economic instruments and economic regulation. Peru is facing significant water risks: between 2003 and 2014, 46% of total climate emergencies were caused by floods, with a concentration of these episodes in the southern coastal region of the country. Droughts are another important water risk, as well as pollution, due to untreated wastewater, inadequate management of solid waste in cities and informal and illegal mining. Finally, access to water and sanitation services and rural-urban imbalance represent relevant challenges in Peru for million citizens.

In terms of a multilevel governance system, there is a consolidated legal framework for water in Peru. In 2009, the Water Resources Law and implementing regulation, the legal framework for water management and the National Water Resources Management System (SNGRH) were established. The SNRH aims to guarantee the principles of participation, coordination and multi-sectoral management of water. The National Water Authority (ANA), within the Ministry of Agriculture, heads the SNRH. The ANA is a deconcentrated body, with 14 regional offices (AAA) and 71 Local Water Administration Authorities (ALA). There are also 29 planned River Basin Committees: twelve have been created and three others are currently in progress. The creation of these committees represents a positive example for other Latin American countries; however, there are some technical and financial issues to overcome.

In terms of regulation, **Ms Romano** noted that there is fragmentation of the market structure in the Peruvian water sector, resulting in limiting economies of scale and decreasing efficiency in the provision of water and sanitation services. There is a differentiation between how the services are managed in urban and rural areas. 50 water and sanitation service operators provide drinking water to 59% of the population in urban areas, whereas there are 20 000 sanitation service administrative boards in small cities and rural areas. This fragmentation is exacerbated by the financial instability and unsustainability of a majority of these service operators, which hinders adequate service provision even further. In fact, in order to monitor all service providers, SUNASS has transitioned from overseeing only the urban operators, to all operators in the country, which implicates a change in capacity that has to be met with sufficient resources.

Concerning economic instruments, the Payment for Ecosystem Service (PES) is a mechanism that has been established in Peru. The payment is a voluntary agreement that compensates communities to provide upstream services to protect biodiversity. However, concerns have arisen as to how to use this fund and how to make sure that all beneficiaries are accounted for within the mechanism.

Some of the preliminary recommendations include breaching the multilevel governance gaps to contribute to sustainable development, through sectoral policy coordination, improving the data and knowledge base, ensuring coordination between water management and access to quality water and services and contributing to capacity building. In relation to PES, some recommendations refer to the need to reflect the analysis of water risks in the basin in the calculation of the tariff. The system is currently based on affordability, so less funds are available for these kinds of initiatives. Furthermore, there is a need to carry out cost-benefit analyses to evaluate the appropriateness of PES actions and interventions as well as a need to distinguish between the use of this payment for grey and green infrastructure. In regards to

regulatory frameworks, the water service regulation could be enforced by guaranteeing that the regulator (SUNASS) is independent in both the urban and rural spheres by using budgetary measures.

Insights from the peer-reviewers

Mr Peter Gammeltoft, Expert, praised Peru's ambitious legal framework, though it still needs to be effectively implemented. Mr Gammeltoft stressed that PES is an area where Peru is particularly advanced. There is also an important monitoring network under construction. He underlined the need of further strengthening the governance recommendations of the draft report and he called for an improved version of the study, able to provide specific guidance to the country. The final version of the report should provide specific, context-based recommendations on governance measures, in order to address concrete challenges faced by Peru. Scarcity is one of the most salient issues in Peru, particularly in the Pacific basin. Other issues include pollution from mining, wastewater and solid waste and challenges in sanitation and fairness of the distribution of water between different categories of users. Mr Gammeltoft proposed that the report could build on concepts such as water balances and water accounts using the UN system, given the demographic pressure on water in the country and pressures from climate change. In areas of scarcity, such balances do for water management what balance sheets do for banks. Demand management is also essential in a situation of water scarcity. Tariff structures offer an incentive for water efficiency, but there is no assessment whether or not those tariffs are effective. In terms of horizontal or crosscutting issues, the most obvious deficiency is capacity, as the ANA, the basin committees and the municipalities responsible for sanitation do not have sufficient technical, administrative and financial resources to carry out tasks properly. Mr Gammeltoft emphasised that decentralisation in Peru has led to differing perceptions of water issues between the central authorities and many of the regional and local authorities. There is the need to consider how to stimulate local authorities to take on responsibilities, such as through conditions for funding, which have been successful in Europe. Finally, Mr Gammeltoft highlighted that the lack of enforcement and the lack of resources and financial planning render these difficulties even greater.

Mr Gonzalo Delacámara, Senior Research Fellow & Head of the Water Economics Department, IMDEA, stated that Peru is an example of how macroeconomic success may be reason for concern in terms of natural resources and water governance. Despite the slowdown in the global and South American economy, Peru has been growing at a stable rate because of the recovery of primary resources, which puts a lot of pressure on water resources. The National Water Governance Policy Dialogue is in line with conclusions from other dialogues in the region, where the need to move away from reactive approaches and towards more proactive action is patent. In Peru, the legal and institutional frameworks show some strengths, but implementation is lacking. High levels of decentralisation and devolution of powers would normally be considered an asset, but, in this case, there are overlaps and gaps. Some institutions tend to encroach on others' mandates: for example, the case of SUNASS with respect to water operators. Mr Delacámara emphasised that one significant asset is PES, which rides on the momentum for investment in natural infrastructure to complement conventional grey infrastructure. However, there are drawbacks, including the cycle of public investment and appraisal, capacity and implementation. Therefore, there is hesitation over who should lead these kinds of mechanisms. Finally, in terms of economic incentives and pricing schemes, there is a lack of legitimacy because of the lack of accountability. Water users are willing to pay but do not necessarily perceive that they get enough in exchange.

Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Vice Minister of Environment, Peru

Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Vice Minister of Strategic Development of Natural Resources, Ministry of the Environment, Peru, provided further information on Peru's water management and governance system. The Pacific basin holds less than 2 % of total available water resources, but almost 70% of the population. The basins are affected heavily by glacier retreat and in some areas, glacier runoff

accounts for about 25% of total available water during the summer. There is agri-business activity established in the coastal desert, which is dependent upon water resources. Though it has been modernising in recent years and using efficient irrigation systems, it puts significant pressure on water resources.

In terms of water risks, water shortages happen mainly in the highland areas in the South, which are prone to drought and suffer effects from *El Niño*. However, there is a heavy concentration of mining activity in this area, which mean there are opportunities for the mining sector to become the champion for climate-based adaptation. As for floods, these events are not only related to *El Niño*, even though it does cause the most catastrophic floods and the government must reconstruct destroyed infrastructure. In terms of water quality, this issue is related to traditional use of mining in the highlands, but it affects the water quality of coastal cities. There is the risk of undermining the resilience of freshwater systems (glaciers, wetlands, and Andean forests), which are under serious pressure, though the government is working on conservation efforts.

The Ministry of the Environment does not have direct responsibility over water management, given that ANA, the head of the National Water Resources Management System (SNGRH), depends on the Ministry of Agriculture. To introduce the cross-sectoral view in water management, the Ministry of the Environment has been working to convince the Ministry of Finance that ecosystems are part of the solution to manage these water risks and therefore should be subject to public investment. The Ministry of Environment has identified 4 million hectares that have been affected by desertification, deforestation, etc., that should be the focus of public investment in order to recover the capacity of ecosystems to provide enough good quality water. However, there is a clear challenge in aligning water management and environmental policy.

Water is clearly a priority in Peru's climate change agenda, because it is a major threat in terms of adaptation, and threatens Peru's agricultural and energetic capacity: 50% of energy is generated by hydropower and many hydropower plants are located in areas suffering from glacier retreat. Therefore, the Ministry of the Environment is working with Ministry of Energy and Mines to improve the management of energy and close the gap in energy provision to rural communities.

In terms of PES, the government has been very successful in "selling" the idea of funds to recover watersheds, but not in deploying these resources. This is due, in part, to rigidities in the use of public resources, identifying the ecosystems, and lack of capacity of the water utilities to advance the implementation of projects in rural development and Andean forest conservation. The Ministry of the Environment is working with cooperation agencies to generate information for decision-making in terms of strong data and evidence on how natural infrastructure can provide attractive and sustainable solutions. Some investment mechanisms for natural infrastructure that have been envisioned include the '*Obras por Impuesto*' (Work for Taxes). The '*Certificado Azul*' (Blue Certificate) is an interesting and successful experience whereby a wide variety of companies take steps to reduce the impact of their water use.

Many actors were involved in the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue, and the Ministry of the Environment is engaged with the three pillars identified by the OECD. There are clear challenges to handle ambitious management established by the national Water Law and the basin management committee scheme, including their relationship with ANA and other authorities. Other challenges include working at different territorial levels in terms of water culture; integrating sectoral attitudes; working with other users for the establishment of PES; generating the financial mechanisms to carry out conservation efforts; and generating more evidence on how implemented solutions are faring.

Group Discussion

Mr Donal O'Leary, Senior Advisor, Transparency International, asked if there had been discussion in the report on the Odebrecht affair, in which many politicians in Peru have been implicated. Furthermore, Mr O'Leary asked how the role of civil society in the water sector in Peru is being treated in the report.

Ms Barbara Schreiner, Executive Director, WIN, suggested that the report could integrate some messages on how Indigenous water rights are recognised in Peru, so that the report adds greater value.

Ms Lesha Witmer, Steering Committee Member, Women for Water Partnership, asked for clarification in terms of how the basins are organised, who is responsible and how the Committees liaise with each other. Ms Witmer praised the I International Symposium on Transboundary Waters in Latin America that took place in Peru, and asked to know more about the outcomes of the meeting. Furthermore, she expressed interest in the Blue Certificate initiative and suggested that the report provide more information. She also suggested that Peru look into the different hydropower assessment tools to help advance the Ministry of Environment's argument with other Ministries regarding the role of water in energy policy.

Mr Colin Herron, Senior Water Resources Management Specialist, GWP, asked the Peruvian delegation if they felt that the policy recommendations met Peru's needs, how implementable they see the policy recommendations, and what will be the follow-up mechanism. Mr Herron also asked how the OECD is coordinating with other international organisations working in Peru, such as the 2030 World Resources Group and GWP, in order to have a streamlined approach, and if there is any hard data or evidence on the implementation of these kinds of recommendations in countries subject to similar policy Dialogues in the past.

Mr Michael Eichholz, Policy Advisor, Federal Institute for Geosciences and Natural Resources, BMZ, noted the importance of water to Peru's exports market and echoed comments regarding Indigenous water rights, considering the share of Indigenous populations in Peru, especially in the Andean highlands.

Mr Teun Bastemeijer, Expert, noted that the Peruvian water sector was complex due to the diversity of the country, the immense variety of climates and the difficulties for internal travel. He suggested to examine how the diversity of situations can be strengthened in the report, and to see if, in the follow-up of the report, facilitating dialogue at different local levels, including with Indigenous people, can be evaluated, as a top-down analysis will not deliver the right solutions.

Mr Rob Uijterlinde, Project Leader, Dutch Water Authorities, congratulated the OECD colleagues and the Peruvian delegation for the report and commended the wealth of issues and the agenda for change that the report proposes, as it did in the [Netherlands](#) in 2014. Mr Uijterlinde stressed that the question is how to prioritise the recommendations and how to make the governance of the recommendations workable. To support the implementation, Mr Uijterlinde reminded delegates that there is cooperation between the Netherlands and Peru streamlined under the Blue Deal, in which two basins have been prioritised (Tumbes and Chira-Piura). This report may help the progress in these basins, and Mr Uijterlinde was optimistic about the progress made and future actions.

Mr Erik Van Lith, Strategic Advisor for Drinking Water, Water Chain and Water Systems, Royal Haskoning DHV, stated that one of the new water policy approaches is water efficiency, however, in Peru, several sectors, such as the agricultural sector, are not efficient. Mr Van Lith asked how these sectors could be stimulated to use water more efficiently.

Ms Monica Altamirano, Financial and Institutional Expert, Deltares, informed delegates that Deltares is currently working in Peru with the Government of the Netherlands in the [Valuing Water initiative](#). Ms Altamirano praised the work on embracing ecosystems as critical infrastructure in Peru since 2015, representing a real paradigm shift in public investment. However, there has been a focus on increasing demand, but not on ensuring the capacity to supply nature-based solutions. Ms Altamirano asked what the different authorities are doing to create a market out of nature-based solutions, how this transition will be financed and who will be responsible for it. Ms Altamirano recommended a basin-level approach to ensure more systemic change.

Mr Gabriel Quijandría Acosta, Ministry of the Environment, Peru, thanked the delegates for their comments that will be very useful to implement the report, and thanked the OECD for their invaluable work during the missions and subsequent drafting of the report. The Ministry of the Environment is convinced

that the report should have similar effects as the [Environmental Performance Review](#) carried out in 2016 by the OECD, which is to put certain issues on the public agenda. Mr Quijandría Acosta agreed that the report could better integrate the water management roles of civil society and Indigenous populations and how the state structure can reflect those experiences in several regions. Mr Quijandría Acosta confirmed that the 29 prioritised basins by ANA are those that are located in the Pacific watershed, due to the water scarcity issues. He voiced the need to work on securing more transboundary agreements in the Atlantic watershed, such as on the border with Brazil, as the Amazon is still uncharted territory for water managers. He stated that the creation of a National Commission made up of different Ministries with relevant competencies is planned to ensure that the recommendations are implemented effectively. During the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue, many actors were involved, including the 2030 Water Resources Group and GWP. However, perhaps the dialogue spaces could be aggregated more effectively, so that all existing initiatives could be scaled up and aligned.

Mr Gérard Bonnis, Environment Directorate, OECD, asked the Vice Minister about the state of public financial support to protect biodiversity and said that recent work of the Environment Directorate is to consider the opportunity of private financing. Regarding the system of payments for ecosystem services (PES) in place in Peru, Mr. Bonnis asked the Vice Minister to what extent the system could be extended, by including other actors such as branches of industry, instead of only the public water supply and sanitation sector. Mr Bonnis also recommended that Peru undertake a study of agricultural policies and examine the extent to which agricultural support distorts irrigation water management, with reference to questions on how to make the agricultural sector more water-efficient. He noted that some discussions have already taken place between Peru and the OECD regarding the possibility of undertaking such an agricultural policy review. Mr Bonnis said the simplest tool to deal with the ineffective use of water in agriculture is to reassess the rate of the abstraction charges applicable to the agricultural sector, given that it is much lower than the rate applied to other sectors (as is the case for the majority of countries). The rate should reflect the water risks and not only serve to raise revenue for ANA. Another problem is the subsidy to electricity for pumping groundwater and the inconsistency this generates between national and regional policies. For example, in Ica, which is one of Peru's most important agro-export regions, the central government charges for water withdrawal, while the local government subsidises the pumping of groundwater. This is a clear example of the need to seek policy coherence.

Ms Oriana Romano stated that the OECD Principles on Water Governance were used in the report to carry out the analysis and determine the solutions; however, a [pilot test of the Indicator framework](#) was also carried out by ANA in 2017. Regarding the need to reflect the diversity of the situations, the report includes three case studies (Ica, Olmos and the Metropolitan Area of Lima) to reflect the different challenges and the maturity of the institutional system in relation to the creation and the functioning of the River Basin Committees.

Upgrading, Governing and Financing Water Infrastructure in Brazil

The **Chair** introduced the next session, which examined the engagement of the OECD and Brazil in a Third National Water Governance Policy Dialogue that aims to support the implementation of the recommendations given during the first and second Dialogues in 2015 and 2017, respectively, with a specific focus on infrastructure in the findings.

Key Findings, Ms Oriana Romano, Head of Unit, Water Governance and Circular Economy, CFE, OECD

Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat, recounted that this is the third phase of the OECD work and is focused on implementing the OECD's suggestions from the first ([Water Resources Governance in Brazil](#), 2015) and second phases ([Water Charges in Brazil](#), 2017), as part of a capacity development strategy,

based on a series of workshops that started in 2019 and will continue in the following year. The first one was on upgrading, governing and financing water infrastructure held in October 2019. There will be second one on regulating drinking water supply and sanitation, looking specifically at ANA's new role. The third and fourth workshops will look at river basin management in the Piancó-Piranha-Açu River Basin in northeast Brazil.

The methodology followed throughout these workshops encourages exchanges between ANA and international practices within the OECD area in order to help in the effective implementation of the National Water Security Plan. This Plan was drafted in 2019 and is based on the need of infrastructure to face water risks that have been accounted for and diagnosed through a methodology developed by ANA. The National Water Security Plan benefits one third of the 74 million people living in water-stressed areas in Brazil and proposes 27 billion BRL in capital investment. However, more guidance is needed to understand the governance tools and systems that can help to implement it effectively.

The four-day workshop included four main themes and involved 30 stakeholders from different levels of government, international organisations and private and public stakeholders. The workshop included discussion on water governance infrastructure through examples in the UK, multi-level water governance in Spain, good infrastructure through resilience across scales and users and improved financial support for water infrastructure--which is a key element of the São Francisco case study. Furthermore, discussions were held on how to go beyond infrastructure to manage risks and forecast demand. Some key issues that were brought to the table: the funding of transfers, the distribution of benefits, the lack of understanding of the level of risk of poorly maintained infrastructure, limited stakeholder involvement in infrastructure projects, and weak coordination between land and water planning, especially at municipal level. At the end of the workshop, some actions were suggested in the form of an Action Plan that looked at the entire cycle of water infrastructure to understand who does what.

Insights from the peer reviewers

Mr Ian Barker, Expert, highlighted four issues in particular:

There is an emphasis on water infrastructure as a solution to provide water for economic growth. This hides a potential problem, which is existing infrastructure suffering from lack of financial resources and human capacity for maintenance, leading to progressive deterioration and loss of performance. In this sense, ANA has carried out a comprehensive technical assessment with sobering reports. Mr Barker recommended ANA to ensure adequate maintenance and efficient operation of existing infrastructure, rather than focusing exclusively on the construction of new infrastructure.

Infrastructure may take a long time to plan, construct and implement and is inflexible; therefore, a more sustainable approach to water security should include both revenue and capital solutions. For example, using more adaptable and scalable solutions through revenues (better control of leakage, green infrastructure and emphasis on water demand management and water efficiency). These options are often cheaper and more responsive to uncertainties and changes, and can occur in parallel to the development of large-scale infrastructure. Having more options ensures greater resilience. To ensure funding for these two types of investment, effective charging of both water operator customers and those who abstract directly from rivers or canals is important. There is currently some charging, but not enough to provide the needed funds to invest in infrastructure and other solutions.

With effective charging for water, there will be greater expectations as to the level of service. Therefore, explicit policy decisions must be made on the level of services expected (expectable frequency of failure), which then determines the scale or cost (affordability trade-off). Lack of resilience can result in failure, but a resilient system minimises the iteration and magnitude of failure and ensures that it can bounce back quickly. Mr Barker recommended ANA to think more about resilience, in particular climate change scenarios, because current planning is based on inadequate data and limited territorial scope.

Other organisations and government departments in Brazil need to catch up with ANA. Apart from the ANA, there is a lack of understanding of the impact of water and its importance to policy and operational decisions. This integration would ensure that beneficiaries pay their fair share and take sound policy decisions in line with sustainable water policies.

Mr Oscar Cordeiro Netto, Director of ANA, Brazil

Mr Oscar Cordeiro Netto highlighted that the National Water Security Plan sets investment in infrastructure according to relevance, priority and effect on water security problems in Brazil between 2019 and 2035. One of the main problems is the lack of response to existent and future water demands. The Plan aims to tackle this with an integrated perspective of interventions, totalling 7.5 billion EUR in projects, constructions and studies, and 275 million EUR in operation maintenance. Furthermore, the largest infrastructure construction, the São Francisco Water Transfer Project, is about to be completed. It is the biggest water transfer project in South America and will benefit 12 million people in the northeast region of Brazil, providing water to regions in four Brazilian states through 470 km of channels and pumping stations.

Mr Netto emphasised that the São Francisco Water Transfer Project is a pioneering experience because it involves a new type of governance between different levels of government, private users and civil societies. These activities demonstrate the importance of infrastructure and funding; how to maintain and operate them; how to make them financially sustainable; and how to design an appropriate governance model. Considering Brazil's size, complexity and level of development, there need to be more efforts to unify efforts in planning and implementation, and there are challenges with charging beneficiaries to demonstrate the value of water and recover the cost of operation and maintenance. Furthermore, Mr Netto expressed the need for Brazil to promote green infrastructure with clear legislative and budgeting support.

Mr Netto reiterated his pleasure and gratitude to work with the OECD to promote sustainable development in Brazil and expressed his belief in the importance of these workshops to reach these objectives.

Governing public investment across levels of government, Ms Dorothee Allain-Dupré, Head of Unit, Decentralisation, Public Investment and Subnational Finance, CFE, OECD

Ms Allain-Dupré contextualised that making the most of public investment is not just a question of financing, but that it is also about the capacity of different levels of government to design and implement the right public investment strategies. Subnational governments are in charge of, on average, 57% of all public investment in OECD countries. In federal countries, the rate is much higher (closer to 90%). This means that vertical coordination and coordination across jurisdictions are essential dimensions for the outcomes of public investment.

The OECD [Principles on Effective Public Investment across Levels of Government](#) (2014) are organised around three pillars: coordination across sectors, levels of government and jurisdictions; subnational capacities to make the most of public investment; and framework conditions (fiscal relations, integrity, procurement, and regulatory framework). The implementation of these Principles has been monitored (through a [toolkit](#) and country reviews) and a [full monitoring report](#) was published in 2019. Ms Allain-Dupré mentioned the initiative of the [World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment](#) with UCLG in which data is collected on subnational finance and investment in more than 100 countries at the aggregate subnational level (data on public expenditure, revenue, debt and qualitative information on the type of multilevel governance systems that exist that facilitate horizontal and vertical coordination across jurisdictions). Furthermore, the OECD has adopted a [Framework on the Governance of Infrastructure](#), which has turned into a Council Recommendation to be submitted to OECD ministers in May 2020. One of the dimensions of this framework is the multilevel governance dimension. The framework has 10 guidelines on best infrastructure management practices. The framework has been endorsed by the

G20. However, countries need to move toward the effective implementation of the tools that can make a difference.

Group discussion

Ms Barbara Schreiner, WIN, raised the need to involve civil society to a greater extent. The oversight of civil society organisations on procurement processes and implementation of infrastructure projects has potential to deliver better results and reduce corruption and mismanagement, and provides government with a broader vision of what is happening. Ms Schreiner concluded that it would be useful to evaluate how one engages with civil society as a partner for the effective delivery of good quality infrastructure.

Mr Stefano Burchi, WCEL, emphasised the importance of the role of Indigenous Peoples and wondered if they would have standing in this improved governance system for water infrastructure in Brazil.

Mr Gonzalo Delacámara, IMDEA, highlighted that OECD countries are not addressing the issues of asset management, project financing, water pricing, and conservation of natural water supplies and aquatic ecosystems. Furthermore, he called for the need for new assessment criteria for appraisal and prioritisation in investment, as this may have practical implications for many countries.

Mr Bernard Barraqué, CIRED-CNRS, informed delegates of his work for the World Bank on assessing the additional costs of climate change, which involved studying extreme events in large cities in the world. This study showed some appalling results. Mr Barraqué recommended the report authors to consider being more aggressive on climate change.

Mr Donal O’Leary, TI, asked Ms Dorothée Allain-Dupré if there is more of a risk of leakage of resources for large infrastructure projects when more organisations are involved in their development. He stated that one of the issues is that in some countries there is not enough technical capacity to staff many decentralised organisations.

Mr Rui Godinho, APDA, underlined the interest of highlighting major examples of transboundary basins in the world, such as the Tagus River and the Danube, which is an especially interesting case, as it poses a lot of problems in relation to the Water Framework Directive as well as the political problems stemming from the implication of 10 EU countries and 1 non-EU county (Serbia). This transboundary strategy in the future is one of the major problems faced today and in the future because of the problems that are expected related to the strong influence of climate change on floods and droughts.

Mr Pierre-Alain Roche, ASTEE, highlighted the importance of the issue of maintenance and upkeep quality of existing infrastructure, a problem in many countries. There is lot of energy and goodwill in discussing new infrastructure, but experience has proved that there is a failure to address the issues with already-existing infrastructure. Mr Roche asked Mr Netto what the concrete steps are to improve on existing infrastructure once pinpointed in Brazil.

Mr Cordeiro Netto recognised the work that is ahead for Brazil, but reiterated ANA’s commitment to search for new and improved solutions. Concerning the question of the involvement of civil society, Brazilian law recognises the participation of civil society in all phases of water resources management. There are also many river basin committees where at least 30% of membership is comprised of civil society. Indigenous People are usually present in committees in areas where they live. Regarding the funding of existing facilities, Mr Netto assured delegates that ANA has been carrying out a thorough evaluation of the situation and has developed some ideas regarding potential solutions. However, solving the issue will involve enacting legislation.

Ms Allain-Dupré acknowledged that decentralisation can entail fragmentation and the risk of multiplication. The impact of this on corruption has been widely debated. The OECD is neither for nor against decentralisation, but recognises it is a trend and considers that decentralisation outcomes in terms of development and corruption depend on how decentralisation policies are implemented and managed.

The OECD has published ten guidelines that determine the success of decentralisation reform. In countries with poorly designed decentralisation policies, the impact on corruption is negative, whereas in countries where decentralisation policy has been implemented through a systemic approach with a strong focus on performance monitoring of subnational government, the impact of decentralisation on corruption is positive.

Water Governance for Indigenous Peoples

The **Chair** welcomed Katherine Taylor and Sheri Longboat, the authors of the article [“Whose Rules? A Water Justice Critique of the OECD’s 12 Principles on Water Governance”](#) published in the journal *Water* in April 2019. He reminded delegates that one of the strong outcomes of the [WGI Satisfaction Survey](#) was members’ interest in promoting thematic work in innovative and crosscutting areas. This Meeting has thus dedicated a session on Indigenous People. The **Chair** also thanked Mr José Enrique Garcilazo, Head of Unit of Regional and Rural Policy at the OECD, for his presentation on key messages from the OECD’s Work on [Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development](#).

Key messages from the authors

Ms Katherine Taylor informed delegates that the article “Whose Rules? A Water Justice Critique of the OECD’s 12 Principles on Water Governance”, written in collaboration with Mr Quentin Grafton (Australian National University), looks at two subjects: water governance and Indigenous people’s water rights and responsibilities. The authors used the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (hereafter, “UNDRIP”) as the benchmark for contextualising Indigenous Peoples’ rights. The article explores how these rights may or may not be integrated into the OECD Principles on Water Governance and makes some suggestions for the WGI to consider.

Professor Sheri Longboat stated that the foundation of the article is the understanding that Indigenous Peoples are distinct societies and have retained social, cultural, economic and political systems. The population of Indigenous People is estimated to be approximately 370 million worldwide across 90 countries. Within this context, Indigenous territories are ancestral lands. Colonisation and colonial institutions continue to impact Indigenous Peoples, who are generally marginalised and often have little to no formal role in water governance within the dominant society.

However, **Professor Longboat** insisted that Indigenous Peoples have water rights and responsibilities, which have been increasingly recognised in international and domestic law relating to governance. UNDRIP defines and protects the rights of the Indigenous Peoples and sets the minimum standard around water and water-related rights as it relates to Indigenous territorial, cultural and political rights, related to self-determination, the control of resources, political and legal institutions and, most importantly, participating in decision-making. Rights typically include those defined and afforded under international law, which are often attributed by Western law, or the dominant law of nation states, and involve political, cultural and territorial rights related to water. However, responsibilities are often an element asserted by Indigenous Peoples as their inherent obligations that emanate from creation, not from Western institutions, and are codified in Indigenous law or knowledge systems. These are sacred responsibilities to fulfil obligations for caretaking, stewardship and maintaining relationships with water.

There are increasing examples of the recognition and assertion of Indigenous rights, and new co-governance models are arising. The Martuwarra Fitzroy River Council (Australia) and the Cowichan Watershed Board (Canada) are two examples where Indigenous Peoples engage in co-governance schemes, resulting in a greater incorporation of Indigenous law and the recognition of Indigenous rights and responsibilities. These co-governance models have numerous benefits: reducing conflict, increasing financial certainty, reducing overall risk, distributing shared benefits and contributing to economic and environmental sustainability and to the survival and self-determination of Indigenous Peoples. One

question that arises is how to recognise Indigenous rights and responsibilities in governance and how to implement them in existing structures. Professor Longboat exemplified the efforts carried out in this direction through the interviewing of the Indigenous Peoples of the Great Lakes Anishinaabe. They have communicated the Seven Grandfathers Principles, which are fundamental indigenous teachings. These documents contain the Indigenous principles of respect for water and all of nature, recognising that water is its own entity, and that humans should be respectful of all beings that rely on water.

Ms Taylor explained that implementation of UNDRIP is still being developed alongside the concept of co-governance. Almost every country that endorses the OECD Principles on Water Governance has also ratified UNDRIP. A discourse analysis was carried out on several documents related to the OECD Principles on Water Governance which showed that UNDRIP was not mentioned in them, whereas in other agreements, such as the Agenda 2030 and the Paris Climate Agreement, it was. In the OECD Principles on Water Governance, Indigenous Peoples tended to be framed as underrepresented stakeholders rather than self-determining peoples with their own water governance laws and institutions and water is portrayed as a resource rather than a spiritual ancestor.

Professor Longboat and Ms Taylor stated their belief that there is benefit for all member states and Indigenous Peoples to harmonise the OECD Principles on Water Governance with UNDRIP. This harmonisation could include a review of the existing Principles, identification of cases under different institutional and governance arrangements or consideration of water justice that aligns with the beliefs inherent to Indigenous Peoples.

Indigenous Peoples and regional development: lessons from the OECD's work

Mr José Enrique Garcilazo, Head of Unit, Regional and Rural Policy, CFE, OECD Secretariat, updated delegates on the work on economic development outcomes of Indigenous Peoples in OECD countries, through specific case studies. The project was launched in 2017 in Canada and it consists of several elements: a global thematic report, [Linking Indigenous Communities to Rural Development](#) (July 2019); a first case study, [Linking the Indigenous Sami People with Regional Development in Sweden](#) (January 2019); a second case study, [Linking Indigenous Communities with Regional Development in Canada](#) (January 2020); and a third case study for Australia, (forthcoming 2020). The work on [Linking Indigenous Communities to Regional Development](#) focuses on four thematic areas: data and governance; entrepreneurship and small businesses; land and economic development; and implementing a place-based approach.

Mr Garcilazo emphasised that on many occasions, the OECD acts as a broker between the federal governments and Indigenous Communities. One of the focuses of the project is to build a data and evidence base, because there is currently not enough data to inform policy decisions. In this sense, data management is critical because Indigenous Peoples measure well-being differently from traditional statistical offices. A number of barriers in terms of development were identified, such as access to land, information, finance, governance and management issues, and the duty to consult. In terms of land and water, the spiritual value that Indigenous Peoples attach to these, beyond monetary value, is a significant challenge. There are tools to activate and support development from planning authorities such as joint management models, land acquisition and leasing of land, the ability for Indigenous Peoples to participate in the decision-making process--both through financial and technical support—, incorporating traditional knowledge, presenting alternatives, and including mechanisms for benefit-sharing agreements.

Group Discussion

Mr Donal O'Leary, Transparency International, expressed his interest in considering the testing of the Principles in terms of Indigenous Peoples as well as the inclusion of a separate Principle on Indigenous Peoples. Mr O'Leary suggested looking at the [Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol](#), which

includes a specific heading on Indigenous Peoples. Mr O’Leary finished by stating his interest in the work and learning from the many experiences around the table.

Mr Erik Van Lith, Royal HaskoningDHV, highlighted that the subject is a political issue related to how much private initiative is recognised by each country’s legislative framework. In Europe, the right of challenge exists but this means that the government has to invite groups of people or businesses to come up with alternative proposals, so that projects can be effectively executed.

Mr Kevin Collins, The Open University, suggested that climate change would require some new thinking and new practices and the way that we live across the planet. He posed the question of to what extent does climate change mean that Indigenous Peoples, their historic rights, requirements and expectations can no longer be met or recognised. He also asked to what extent Indigenous Peoples understand and want to contribute through a specific role towards climate change, so that sustainability is ensured.

Mr Francisco Nunes Correia, Portuguese Water Partnership, asserted that the important issue of Indigenous People is not excluded or precluded from the Principles. There is an explicit reference recognising the need to pay attention to underrepresented categories, including Indigenous Peoples. He established that the Principles were formulated in a general way. The Principles call for the representation and recognition of all constituencies and all segments of the population in formal mechanisms for water governance, which also applies to Indigenous Peoples. He suggested that the Principles be used as a basis for this very specific problem and to enumerate where, when and at what level these should be considered. He volunteered to participate in this process if considered appropriate as a future area of work.

Ms Lesha Witmer, The Butterfly Effect, commented on the Hydropower Sustainability Assessment Protocol that has looked explicitly at the criteria, indicators, processes and procedures around the duty to consult Indigenous Peoples. However, consulting carries different meanings for different groups. The protocol examined the concept of consultation, which is important in investment, decision-making and location and what it means in terms of processes and procedures to actually live up to its promises. When the WGI discussed the OECD Water Governance Principles, there was a lot of background documentation, including the ILO Convention and UNDRIP. The Principles were formulated and published in a general sense, to ensure widespread access and uptake. She suggested that the authors look at [Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance](#) to understand the background ideology of the Principles.

Mr Stefano Burchi, WCEL, highlighted that the issue is a very topical issue in contemporary water legislation and there are many examples of how contemporary water laws have addressed the coexistence of formal and informal frameworks. The OECD Principles on Water Governance are general enough that they can accommodate these concerns. However, he suggested the possibility of carrying out a commentary on the Principles to illustrate their full scope and potential impact, catering to and accommodating the interests of Indigenous Peoples in the discourse of water governance.

Ms Barbara Schreiner, WIN, emphasised that the question is not so much about stakeholder involvement, but rather about legal pluralism, because Indigenous Peoples have a right to governance over their own water under UNDRIP. She reminded delegates that the Principles are not set in stone, and may need updates in the future.

Mr Greg Leslie, University of New South Wales Global Water Institute, emphasised the consideration of putting economic value on ecological services, given that about 5% of the world’s Indigenous population lives on 20% of the land containing 80% of the world’s biodiversity. In areas where Indigenous Peoples are involved in the stewardship of resources, there are better ecological outcomes across a range of indicators. Furthermore, the allocation of rights and legal personality to rivers may present opportunities for these services. If a monetary value is given to rivers, Indigenous People may have the opportunity to improve their situation. The Principles might have to shift in 10 or 20 years due to these changes.

Mr Teun Bastemeijer suggested not to distinguish amongst minorities, but considering “water for all”.

Mr Pierre-Alain Roche suggested the need to consider measuring stakeholders' and minority populations' engagement as part of a virtuous governance process. However, in many cases, these groups do not desire to work within the established governance system; therefore, the universality of the Principles is limited. Some thought needs to go towards adapting the process to certain contexts or to consider that the Principles are not applicable in some cases. It is important to take into account how the Principles are considered from other cultural points of view.

Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat, highlighted that the OECD Principles on Water Governance were designed under the assumption that governance is not only about governments, and that water governance is a shared responsibility not only across levels of government, but also public, private and non-profit sectors. It was a 2-year process that required trade-offs across interested parties, and while several countries had explicitly endorsed references to Indigenous Peoples (which currently feature under principle 10) a few objected more in-depth developments. Ms Akhmouch proposed two options for future action. First, water governance dialogues in countries where the Indigenous issue is high on the Agenda, could feature in consultation with and analysis on Indigenous Peoples more systematically. Second, in the same fashion as [floods](#) and [groundwater](#) were previous applications of the OECD Principles on Water Governance, specific research could seek to apply the Principles to Indigenous communities should there be interest from WGI members.

The **Chair** closed the floor by thanking the authors for presenting the topic and reinforced that they have planted a seed for future discussion on the Principles, especially through the Working Groups. He welcomed them to participate in future WGI meetings and reminded them that the network is an open initiative, to which anyone can join.

Professor Sheri Longboat thanked the WGI for their time and comments. She valued the time and effort put into the development of the Principles. She highlighted the importance of academics in bridging the communities involved in water governance and expressed her hope to assist the WGI again in the future.

Ms Katherine Taylor thanked the WGI members for their interest and appreciated all of the comments, acknowledging the difficulty of making the Principles broadly applicable.

Day 2: January 10, 2020

The **Chair** welcomed the delegates to the second day of the meeting. He outlined the sessions for the second day, wherein delegates presented key research and analysis, the OECD Horizontal Water Programme and the sessions for the Working Groups.

Key Research and Analysis on Water Governance

Joint water governance studies in Africa (Mali and Niger), Waterpreneurs and Action Contre la Faim

Dr Jean Lapègue, Senior Advisor WASH, Action Contre la Faim (ACF), introduced the work that ACF have been engaging in since 2015, which is composed of nine self-assessment exercises (Philippines, Kenya, Djibouti, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, in refugee camps of Uganda, and most recently with Waterpreneurs in Borno State (Nigeria) and in Mali). The governance studies and self-assessment exercises are conducted in the humanitarian context, considering it as an opportunity to rebuild water governance. The objective is to provide recommendations and capacity building to the institutions and partners, or to develop advocacy to improve the governance of the sector. To develop this exercise, the OECD Principles on Water Governance were applied with other frameworks, in a blended governance approach, especially through the methodology proposed by the IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. A manual in English and French has been produced by ACF in 2017 to support missions and partners in conducting governance self-assessment exercises in developing countries.

Mr Brioux Michoud, Managing Partner, Waterpreneurs, discussed the different governance studies carried out in Mali and in Nigeria. By using this blended governance approach, knowledge has been leveraged to evaluate governance in these different contexts. One of the studies' focus is the transition between emergency situations to development, specifically involving the private sector within the national water governance system. The ACF Manual is based on the OECD Principles on Water Governance, and it is a comprehensive tool with a strong methodology to evaluate the national and local governance systems. The [IRC 9 Building Blocks](#) approach, which complements the Principles, is particularly adapted for emergency situations because it provides very operational recommendations. Following this request, in Nigeria, these two approaches were combined. The same approach was replicated in Mali. Mr Michoud briefly introduced "[Innovate 4 Water](#)" marketplaces, as an example of a multi-stakeholder platform that can be used to highlight local situations, including those for better governance. Six of these forums are planned for 2020, in which solutions are gathered from the private sector, governments and NGOs and dialogue between these sectors is facilitated. Mr Michoud concluded by informing delegates that the next "Innovate 4 Water" marketplaces are being planned in Australia, the Philippines, Bangladesh, Zambia, Kenya, Uganda and Lebanon.

Water Integrity Global Outlook in 2021, Water Integrity Network (WIN)

Ms Barbara Schreiner, WIN, gave a brief update on progress on the [2021 Water Integrity Global Outlook](#) (WIGO). In 2016, WIN published a [Global Outlook](#) to capture global water integrity and corruption issues in the water sector, some of the key issues and some options to deal with them. Since then, this has

become a triennial flagship publication. The next one will be released in 2021. The 2021 WIGO focuses on integrity and corruption issues in urban areas. To date, a draft literature review has been completed and many organisations have given input. However, Ms Schreiner asked delegates for further input in case there is more interest, especially regarding case studies around data and analysis. Furthermore, Ms Schreiner announced that WIN is interested in developing a corruption index for the water and sanitation sector using big data techniques. She asked interested delegates to approach her on this subject.

Improving Water Governance in Norway using the OECD Principles on Water Governance, Norwegian Environment Agency

Mr Anders Iversen, National Water Coordinator, Section for Water Management, Norwegian Environment Agency, presented a brief example from Norway, where a self-evaluation of the river basin management planning processes was done to see how it has adapted to the implementation of the European Water Framework Directive between 2010 and 2015. The study by the National Committee of Agencies for Water Management, was based on an extensive survey of water managers at all levels. Supporting studies were carried out by the office of the Auditor General, the Institute for Urban and Regional Research and a peer-review from Sweden and Finland. This evaluation coincided with the publication of the OECD Principles on Water Governance in 2015. These were used as a reference.

Mr Iversen presented the results of this evaluation in relation to some of the Principles and the two main governance issues detected through this evaluation. The first is confusion over roles and responsibilities of different authorities, which caused varying levels of involvement of sectoral authorities in the river basin management planning process. The second issue is that in the evaluation of Principle 3, even though new coordination mechanisms were established, there were strong sectoral interests preventing an integrated approach due to a lack of policy guidelines and coherent ambition level between sectoral ministries. Therefore, the 2014 national guidelines on hydropower and water management helped to initiate a review of licenses, but it came too late to have an impact on what was evaluated in 2015. However, the national policy guidelines published in 2019 set ambitious levels for water protection and restoration in a number of sectors, which were higher than those held by sectoral authorities. Mr Iversen concluded by announcing to delegates that another round of evaluations is planned for 2021.

Virtual Campus as an innovative platform for delivery of capacity development, Cap-Net

Ms Yasmina Rais El Fenni, Capacity Development Analyst, Cap-Net, provided an overview of one of Cap-Net's main delivery mechanisms in water governance over the past several years, which is [Cap-Net's virtual campus](#). This is an innovative online platform tailored to partners' needs, priorities and target audiences to respond to demands in the face of growing financial constraints. Ms El Fenni highlighted that the interest in online courses has expanded significantly and mentioned Cap-Net's partnership with GWP and UNEP-DHI to work on developing capacity at country level to collect data on SDG 6.5.1. Cap-Net has been collecting lessons learned in case studies over the past several years that feed into the new courses or are used to revamp existing ones. Online education does not aim to compete with or replace face-to-face education, but to complete it. She concluded that this online campus has expanded Cap-Net's outreach dramatically, and has contributed to break silos and improve delivery in water governance. She extended the invitation to delegates to expand their partnerships in this area and make use of the platform that is readily available to WGI members and will soon be able to deliver MOOCs⁷.

⁷ A MOOC is a 'Massive Open Online Course'.

Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice, World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)

Mr Stefano Burchi, Chair of the Water and Wetlands Specialist Group, WCEL, presented the [Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice](#), created on the initiative of the WCEL. Mr Burchi emphasised that the judiciary plays a vital role in ensuring good water governance from a legal perspective insofar as it interprets the laws and regulations, applies them in civil, administrative and criminal cases, adjudicates disputes and eventually delivers justice through the implementation and enforcement of the laws. The WCEL took the initiative of convening judges from different jurisdictions of the world. This group conceptualised and drafted the Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water Justice, it then gathered at the 8th World Water Forum in Brasilia where it discussed, debated and eventually adopted this declaration. The Brasilia Declaration invites judges to take into account a number of widely recognised principles of water resources governance, and to pay attention to the broader ecosystem ramifications of their function. The Declaration is now being disseminated in a number of fora for the information and for the education of justices.

Group Discussion

Ms Yasmina Rais El Fenni, Cap-Net, asked the representative from WCEL what the follow-up may be to the IUCN Congress, as there seems to be a proposal to discuss the Brasilia Declaration there.

Mr Stefano Burchi, WCEL, confirmed that there would be a dedicated stream to the Judges Declaration on Water Justice at the next [IUCN World Environmental Law Congress](#), which will be held in Rio de Janeiro in March 2020, and then later on at the [IUCN World Conservation Congress](#) in Marseille in June 2020.

Mr Bernard Barraqué, Research Director, CIRED-CNRS, suggested that the Declaration should also contain a reference to resource costs in addition to the polluter pays principle, which corresponds only to environmental costs, but a user pays principle might rather correspond to user costs. Mr Barraqué concluded that litigation occurs more frequently regarding quantity rather than quality.

Mr Burchi thanked Mr Barraqué for the useful suggestion and stated that it will be kept in mind and internalised in future revisions of the Declaration.

Mr Manfred Matz, Head of the Tunisia Water Programme, German Development Agency (GIZ), asked Mr Burchi what the impact of this training is and how the judges are selected for training.

Mr Burchi, WCEL, responded that there was no selection as such and that the training relies on a voluntary process: judges expressed interest at the instigation of WCEL, especially the WCEL Chair, who is a justice himself. He rallied interest and support from a number of justices from around the world. Insofar as training, the [Global Judicial Institute on the Environment](#) has been set up in conjunction with this Declaration at the initiative of IUCN and WCEL. This Institute engages in training on the judicial angle of the governance spectrum.

Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat thanked ACF and Waterpreneurs on the work in Mali and Nigeria as interesting examples of how the OECD Principles on Water Governance can apply in non-OECD countries.

Dr Jean Lapègue, Action Against Hunger, stated that ACF's utmost concern is that people, wherever they are, have access to human rights and that governance means bringing human rights to people. He emphasised that the Principles around governance and engagement of the population are very strong and should be applied even in critical contexts. Places where governance systems are underdeveloped present an opportunity to start from scratch, which is often easier than to try to change existing systems.

Mr Bernard Barraqué, CIRED-CNRS, asked the Norwegian delegate if there is some more documentation including case studies that illustrate the evaluation process.

Mr Iversen confirmed that there is documentation on the evaluation process; however, it is in Norwegian. Mr Iversen offered to prepare a more extensive presentation on the topic in English, if there is interest.

Mr Teun Bastemeijer, Expert, commended the experience provided by the Norwegian delegate and highlighted the interest of applying the OECD Principles on Water Governance to a specific country and to be able to follow up with the results of the evaluation. Mr Bastemeijer also commented on the other presentations regarding local engagement and building capacities, and suggested the need to change methodologies for further engagement with stakeholders, for example, by using different types of language and involving different types of intermediaries. He suggested that this could be a topic for future work towards the World Water Forum, because it seems that the local bottom-up processes, which work alongside the national top-down processes, need more attention at this moment. The several initiatives that have been presented, could, together with other capacity building vehicles, be an important point in this effort. Mr Bastemeijer also echoed the importance of water governance for climate resilience.

Mr Manfred Matz, German Development Agency (GIZ), highlighted the interesting presentation from Norway, which shows that all countries can improve their governance systems. He echoed previous comments on the interest to receive further documentation on the evaluation, either in English or in French.

Updates from the OECD Horizontal Water Programme

The **Chair** introduced the next session and reminded delegates that the benefits of the WGI Meeting taking place at OECD Headquarters include exposure to other OECD work on water, not only on the governance aspect but also through the Horizontal Water Program. The session included inputs from members of the Public Governance (GOV), the Agriculture and Trade (TAD), Environment (ENV) and Development Cooperation (DCD) Directorates to share their work on water with the members.

Mr Guillaume Gruère, Senior Policy Analyst, Trade and Agriculture Directorate, OECD

Mr Guillaume Gruère, OECD Secretariat, gave delegates a snapshot of one of the projects from 2017-2018, which concerns reforming water policies in agriculture. In 2017, the G20 Agriculture ministers met and made a declaration and action plan to commit to work more on water. The OECD evaluated eight relevant and significant past reforms and policy changes. This resulted in the paper [Reforming water policies in agriculture: Lessons from past reforms](#). Some dialogues have complemented the OECD's work on water policies in agriculture. Two workshops were organised wherein different stakeholders participated. The first workshop on [Pathways to policy change on water in agriculture](#) was hosted by the European Commission's Directorate-General for Agriculture (DG AGRI) and the second one on [Facilitating policy change towards sustainable water use in agriculture](#) was hosted by the World Bank Water Group. Mr Gruère concluded by stating that when governance elements are in place and a need for reform occurs, the successful reform processes that were evaluated all had elements in common. These include: evidence-based definition of objectives and evaluations; compatibility of policy change with governance institutions; strategic stakeholder engagement and trust-building, which is crucial in the agricultural sector; rebalancing of economic incentives (not only monetary ones) to enable policy change; and adjustable and smart reform sequencing. These five elements involve four types of policy changes: pricing water in agriculture; better cost recovery in agriculture; regulating groundwater use; and reducing subsidies to agriculture that can be harmful to water. Some examples of each of these conditions under each type of policy change were then presented and can be found in the paper "[Navigating pathways to reform water policies in agriculture](#)".

Ms Anna Pietikainen, Senior Policy Analyst, Regulatory Policy Division, GOV, OECD

Ms Anna Pietikainen, OECD Secretariat, introduced the work of the Regulatory Policy Division within the Public Governance Directorate of the OECD, which includes the [Network of Economic Regulators](#) (NER), which brings together economic regulators from utility sectors, including water, energy, communications and transport. The network promotes work on crosscutting themes of interest in sectors linked to governance, performance, use of new tools, behavioural insights for better regulation and better regulatory delivery. Ms Pietikainen presented two areas of NER's work that could be of interest to the WGI:

- In-depth work with water regulators: there has recently been work with Ireland in collaboration with the economic regulator for water and energy in Ireland (Commission for Regulation of Utilities) and the Environmental Protection Agency. A country review will be launched in March 2020 in response to this collaboration. There is also ongoing work with the Water Industry Commission of Scotland to document a strategic review of prices that is currently taking place. The division has also been working alongside CFE on the National Water Governance Policy Dialogue with Peru.
- Data collection on the governance of sector regulators: the data collection took place in 2018. The areas studied include the independence of regulators, their accountability, their scope of action (the extent of their powers), the types of activities they carry out and their functions. 38 countries were covered through this study, published in a [2018 database](#), which will be updated with information from non-OECD countries stemming from funding from the French Energy Regulator, which will survey 12 francophone energy regulators in West Africa.

Ms Piera Tortora, Co-ordinator, Sustainable Ocean for All, Development Co-operation Directorate, OECD

Ms Piera Tortora, OECD Secretariat, thanked the delegates for the opportunity to present the work on [Sustainable Oceans for All](#) on behalf of the Development Co-Operation Directorate (DCD) of the OECD. This is a new initiative launched by the OECD in 2019 and it is a horizontal project between DCD, the Science, Technology and Innovation (STI) and Environment Directorates of the OECD. In 2016, the OECD produced a report [The Ocean Economy in 2030](#) showing that the global ocean economy is rapidly expanding: between 2010 and 2030, the global ocean economy is expected to double in size, at a faster rate than the rest of the global economy. In 2020, a new report will be launched at the [High-Level Conference on Oceans](#) to be hosted in Lisbon. Ms Tortora highlighted that the second deliverable of the initiative are country diagnostics on the sustainable ocean economy. The results from these diagnostics will feed into the main report. After these diagnostics, the objective is to engage in policy dialogues with these countries. She highlighted that the OECD initiative is contributing to a number of policy discussions, both at the national, regional and international level on the sustainable ocean economy. It is important to work closely with other partners on this area, so the OECD is collaborating with some UN agencies, the World Bank, many member countries and with the [High-Level Panel on the Sustainable Ocean Economy](#). The [High-Level Conference](#) in Lisbon in June is set to be one of the most critical events, but the ocean will also feature prominently at the Glasgow COP 26 and a number of other events. The OECD has hosted a [Private Finance for Sustainable Development Conference](#) between the 28th and the 30th of January 2020. Two sessions were organised specifically on finance for the sustainable ocean economy.

Ms Lisa Danielson, Policy Analyst, Environment Directorate, OECD

Ms Lisa Danielson, OECD Secretariat, overviewed the current range of work focused on the themes of water financing, water quality, country-specific topics and on water and climate change adaptation. On the topic of water financing, her team recently co-convened the fifth meeting of the [Roundtable of Financing Water](#), a global public-private platform established by the OECD, the Netherlands, the World Water Council and the World Bank. Ms Danielson informed delegates that there are a number of recent and forthcoming

reports on water finance. An OECD report on Water-Related Financing Needs and Capacities in Europe will be launched promptly, which connects to an ongoing project with the DG of Environment of the European Commission and covers water supply, sanitation and flood management. The team is also contributing to a chapter on water finance in the 2020 Asia Water Development Outlook, in coordination with the chapter on water governance developed by CFE. In the fall, a new report was released on [Making Blended Finance Work for Water and Sanitation](#) in collaboration with the DCD Directorate at the OECD, which explores how development finance can be leveraged to attract commercial finance for water-related investments. On the topic of water quality, an OECD report on [Pharmaceutical Residues in Freshwater](#), released in November 2019, warns of the risks from increased pharmaceutical residues in the environment and examines different policy responses. Of particular relevance to water governance is the key issue of policy coherence between the health and the environment sectors. A new regional initiative is set to start in Asia with Korea and the [Asia Water Council](#), focusing on financing and innovation, with one country in the region set to be selected for work in 2020. Ms Danielson outlined that a report on [Responding to Rising Seas](#) looked at how current institutional arrangements may not be well suited to the dynamics and increasing risk of sea-level rise and how policies can manage this change in landscape and included case studies from the UK, New Zealand, Germany and Canada. Other work includes nature-based solutions for water-related risks—specifically, on what needs to shift in the enabling environment to scale up these responses. Finally, a conference on 16-17 January 2020 occurred on the theme of [adapting to a changing climate in the management of wildfires](#).

Group Discussion

Mr Claude Ménard, Professor Emeritus of Economics, University of Paris-Sorbonne, considered that capacity building at the intermediate level is also a key issue for local authorities because of the often-decentralised nature of water and sanitation. He asked about the modalities of organisation at the micro-level given that there are many experiments occurring through a more decentralised approach in the delivery of water and sanitation, particularly in developing countries. These raise many questions about how to monitor, coordinate and regulate them to make decentralisation and decentralised solutions sustainable.

Mr Andrew Allan, Senior Lecturer, University of Dundee, asked Mr Gruère if by “windows of opportunities” he meant only in the agricultural sector, or if they can also arise across policy sectors.

Mr Kevin Collins, Senior Lecturer of Environment & Systems, The Open University, outlined his experience on an Agricultural Advisory Project in Europe working on improving agricultural advice. Farmers mostly trust their advisors; however, they tend to be very fragmented. Therefore, no matter how good the policies are, if the micro-level institutions are fragmented, very little progress is possible.

Ms Laura Tanco Ballesteros, Head of Technical Service, Júcar River Basin Authority (Spain), congratulated the speakers on their work, and highlighted the importance of educating agricultural ministries about their influence in water, especially regarding pesticide consumption patterns, which cause serious pollution issues. Therefore, it is important for agricultural ministries to recognise their responsibility and to compel the ministries to make efforts to change policies.

Mr Erik Van Lith, Royal HaskoningDHV, asked Mr Gruère how more efficient water use can be stimulated amongst agricultural users by other stakeholders involved (private sector, governments, etc.).

Mr Callum Clench, Executive Director, IWRA, asked Ms Tortora about the links between the work on oceans and freshwater, and if the initiative included ‘from source to sea’ programs.

Mr Guillaume Gruère responded that with regards to the windows of opportunities, though this study was carried out on the links between agriculture and water, more generally, windows of opportunities could be expanded to include crises such as droughts or large pollution events, which may trigger change. He thoroughly agreed with the point made about agricultural advisors, and emphasised that in some cases

where policy change was not working, the environmental agencies visited the farms in person, which had potential to make a large difference. In this sense, the question is not just about drafting legal documents, but also about finding ways to render policy changes deliverable. Mr Gruère emphasised that though there is some impetus and goodwill at the global level, the agricultural sector remains weary to change. On the farmers' side, there are many policies already perceived as too constraining, so the key is to work with their advisors and with the farmers to find convenient ways to promote clean water. As for promoting water use efficiency, there are some potential means, but this is complex, as technical options are not applicable in every case.

Ms Tortora thanked the delegates for their questions and highlighted the importance of local authorities in considering source to sea programs, even though in most countries, governance of the ocean economy happens mostly at the centralised level. Though the official OECD definition of the ocean economy excludes the concept of freshwater, it is looking at the nexuses between land and ocean, especially in terms of water treatment and mismanagement.

Advancing WGI Working Group on Indicators

Key proposals for measuring water governance impact, OECD Secretariat

Ms Akhmouch emphasised that the first mandate of the WGI (2013-2015) focused on developing the [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#) and the second mandate of the WGI (2015-2018) developed the [Indicator Framework](#) that supports the dialogue among stakeholders for self-assessment of water governance. The current mandate of the WGI (2019-2021) focuses on the further implementation of the Principles and the Indicator Framework through the evaluation of their impact and the building of capacity development around these tools.

Ms Akhmouch underlined that the webinars in October and November helped contribute to this discussion. The four objectives that the Working Group agreed upon are as follows:

1. Facilitate the uptake and use of the indicator framework. This includes aspects of communication and dissemination that also link to the Working Group on Capacity Development.
2. Learn from past and new self-assessments.
3. Propose a methodological framework for impact measurement.
4. Facilitate dialogue on the multi-level governance of SDGs reporting.

Ms Akhmouch stated that today, the focus of the Working Group is the third objective—the framework for impact measurement—and outlined what the OECD has been working on in preparation for the session. She emphasised that there is need to take stock of what already exists in the literature and to ask countries as well as WGI members how they have already tried to measure the impacts of water governance. The OECD has looked at economic, social and environmental impacts and has drafted an inventory. A comprehensive framework to measure the impact of water governance does not exist, meaning that there is a value-added of this group working on one. However, there is a big issue around data. To move forward, the Principles have been linked with potential impacts and these hypotheses are on the posters on the wall. An example of these hypotheses is does the existence of a river basin organisation make a difference in terms of managing water risks? Does the existence of a sophisticated, up-to-date water information system minimise risks of floods and droughts?

Spotlight on an example: measuring the impact of metropolitan governance on productivity

Mr Joaquim Oliveira Martins, Deputy-Director of CFE, OECD Secretariat, started by noting that governance is about delivering co-ordination and co-operation, involving synergies and interactions across policies and encouraging complementarities. This system needs to be applied across stakeholders and sectors (policy, economy, levels of government) to deliver this higher level of coordination. The problem with governance discourse is that it is often a qualitative discussion and it can be difficult to convince mainstream economics audiences about the importance of investments in institutional infrastructure. Generating indicators on governance systems identifies the governance premium associated with a better governance system in terms of productivity, different types of outcomes, better water systems, etc. More effort at the OECD and elsewhere has been put forth to translate these institutional settings into metrics, where different situations can be compared in order to help achieve policies.

The growing effort of the OECD to generate these composite indicators to compare and measure institutional settings involves a large survey of these policies across OECD countries and a discussion among experts and government figures to understand the architecture of the indicator. When focusing on product-market regulations, three main pillars were identified. One focused on the involvement of the public sector in the economy, another on barriers to entrepreneurship, and a third on barriers to trade and investment. If there are different levels of indicators, there needs to be a scoring method to translate qualitative information into numbers.

Mr Oliveira Martins gave some examples of this approach, such as the product-market regulation indicator of the OECD or the employment protection legislation of the OECD. One of the most prominent examples of this was a test to identify the impact of the governance of a metropolitan area on the performance of local economy. A simple indicator of governance, the degree of fragmentation of governance in metropolitan areas, was used and measured by the number of municipalities in a metropolitan area, which was also defined statistically. After running econometric tests, cities that were more fragmented in their governance systems delivered less agglomeration economies. Fragmentation can be related to the institutional setting of the metropolitan area governance as a social dimension because there is proof that metropolitan areas that are more fragmented are also more segregated. This is important because there is a need for productive discourse on inclusive growth, which means having both efficiency and equity for more inclusive societies, and efforts must be made to ensure a complementary relationship between them. These governance indicators show that more fragmented cities are less productive and more unequal. The indicators introduced the role of governance into discourse of inclusive growth, making it possible to assess how to address the fragmentation problem.

Group discussion

Mr Teun Bastemeijer, Expert, remarked that it seemed that with these indicators, there is a lot of theory involved. However, he suggested that there is a lot of fragmentation in the transport system in Paris.

Mr Gonzalo Delacámara, Senior Research Fellow and Head of the Water Economics Department, IMDEA, commented that it is not only important to ask how water quality and quantity will be improved by improved governance, but also to see how meeting water policy challenges and targets will contribute to long-term water security and enhance resilience for climate change adaptation. In addition, it is important to see how having long-term water security and better adaptability to climate change connects to other sectors. Mr Delacámara highlighted that there is a need to go beyond complying with European Directives and to show how complying with them yields additional benefits for society in terms of wellbeing, etc.

Mr Manfred Matz, Head of the Tunisia Water Programme, German Development Agency (GIZ), displayed a report on the [Status of Implementation of CSD-13 Policy Actions on Water and Sanitation](#) published by the UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs that monitored the implementation of the

policy actions discussed at the CSD-13 meeting in 2005. These indicators used by the report were evaluated and then were linked to impact indicators that were taken from other sources for 35 countries in the world. He highlighted that, in Tunisia, his team has realised that there is a big gap between principles, capacity building and impact. This gap might differ from country to country and context-specific hindrances to good governance must be identified. An approach has been developed to encourage communication to create political will to achieve decisions that will have real impact.

Mr Oliveira Martins responded to the questions by emphasising that the integration of the governance of the transportation system has a strong impact in terms of delivery and accessibility within the metro area. When surveys are carried out on the perceptions of the population about the quality of the system, citizens seem more satisfied with service provision when governance bodies are in place. In Paris, at least for the transportation sector, there is an integrated structure. The problem is that it is not only about the transport sector, since there are other dimensions to keep in mind such as regional development, spatial planning and water provisions. He used this example to explain the difference between inputs, outputs and outcomes. If outcomes are the focus, there is a need for governance systems. Without these governance indicators, it is very difficult to talk about outcomes rather than inputs

Advancing WGI Working Group on Capacity Development

Key proposals to build water governance capacity, OECD Secretariat

Ms Oriana Romano, OECD Secretariat reminded delegates of the objectives set in the Scoping Note:

1. Disseminate the OECD Principles on Water Governance and the Indicator Framework. The question is how to scale up this work and ensure that the Principles and Indicators are being seen, understood and used properly.
2. Facilitate access to existing toolkits and materials: an implementation strategy on the OECD Principles on Water Governance was produced to make them easier and faster to read and a small guide on the work on indicators, including the 10-step methodology, is available online. However, the WGI may need to improve these materials and make sure they are accessible to all.
3. Partner with training and capacity institutions: the survey showed that there seemed to be wide agreement on this point, and the possibility to engage in partnerships.
4. Developing material for capacity development where needed. Possible options include creating a PowerPoint compendium, a toolkit and other guidelines.

A survey disseminated by the Secretariat between October and December 2019 amongst WGI members, informed the OECD that most WGI members have experience in capacity development (92% of respondents) and that there is a significant uptake and use of the OECD water governance framework and Principles when delivering capacity-building programs and initiatives (72% of respondents).

Ms Romano emphasised that the inventory made after the survey showed that there are several initiatives for specific dimensions of water governance, but there is not a universal framework for capacity building. In the medium-term there needs to be a better sense of output material for the World Water Forum in Dakar. There are several options, such as producing a short video on the Principles and the use of the Indicators on the self-assessment exercises for communication purposes. Another option is to produce a facilitator's guide 'training of trainers' for those who are carrying out a self-assessment, or to produce a MOOC or any additional material toolkit deemed necessary. In the Scoping Note, the Water Governance Capacity Lab is mentioned but Ms Romano suggested that this would be a candidate for longer-term work, and asked the WGI to focus on what can be done now and through to the World Water Forum.

Ms Romano encouraged delegates to share their views on the following questions for discussion:

1. What do you think about the use of a video? Can you advise on any other form of appropriate communication medium to further disseminate the water governance framework?
2. Would you expect any additional outputs from the Working Group?
3. Who should be the target audience for this capacity-development material?

Spotlight on an example: raising awareness on the OECD Principles on Urban Policy

Ms Soo-Jin Kim, Head of Unit, Urban Policies and Reviews, CFE, OECD Secretariat, thanked the WGI for the inspiration their work had on other OECD groups, such as the [Working Party on Urban Policy](#), which she serves. It was created in 1999, and as they approached their 20th anniversary, they felt it was the right moment to compile the lessons that had been learned. The goal was to consolidate this evidence on the main pillars of work, including the data and indicators that measure how cities work and perform economically, socially and environmentally, rather than how they were drawn on paper. Ms Kim highlighted that the Working Party also had reports and reviews for more than 30 cities around the world and 10 OECD countries, which resulted in many lessons to be added to the compilation from specific case studies. The OECD Principles on Water Governance were used as an example to engage in this incremental process, whereby a mapping of what other organisations were doing on urban policy was carried out.

Ms Kim noted that one of the most striking types of innovations imported from the WGI to the Working Party was the co-production process. Through this interactive method, the Working Party delegates were asked to vote, provide drafting suggestions and debate on concrete terms. The result of this exercise were the [OECD Principles on Urban Policy](#), organised around three 'S's': scale, strategy, and stakeholders, welcomed by mayors and ministers at their [7th Roundtable](#) in Athens in March 2019, and endorsed by all ministers in charge of regional policy the following day. Another initiative inspired by the WGI is the [multi-stakeholder pledge on the OECD Principles on Urban Policy](#). Two support materials were developed: a [brochure](#) illustrating each principle and subprinciple and a [brochure](#) summarising the main messages from the stocktaking exercise mentioned earlier. Both brochures are [available](#) in different languages. Another type of visual developed were two videos: the [first video](#) was built on interviews conducted to mayors and ministers at their Roundtable about the main challenges in their cities and countries and addressed how the OECD Principles on Urban Policy can help address them. The [second video](#) is a motion video that summarises the stocktaking process.

Group Discussion

Ms Joannie Leclerc, Dialogue and Societal Impact Director, SUEZ was surprised that only 28% of the respondents to the Survey that lead capacity development activities use the OECD Principles on Water Governance and asked the delegates why this is so. Ms Leclerc also suggested the creation of a LinkedIn Group for the WGI so that potential trainers or contact points are more visible to the broader community.

Ms Yasmina Rais El Fenni, Capacity Development Analyst, Cap-Net, highlighted the importance of knowing who the target is for communication strategies, which will feed into the design. She suggested the creation of a MOOC, which would serve as a "Training of Trainers" so everyone is on the same page of understanding and applying the Principles. A forum-type platform is a potentially enabling environment where people feel comfortable to express questions, answer questions and share experiences. It can act as a repository or database containing valuable information. As for the candidates for trainers, Ms Rais El Fenni suggested participants be carefully considered, as they must be in the position to apply the knowledge in practice as well as disseminate knowledge. She emphasised that it is not about collecting the material and giving it to the trainers, but rather to focus on customising the objectives.

Dr Jean Lapègue, Senior Advisor WASH, Action Against Hunger, proposed the creation of a cartoon to be able to target a very young audience and communicate on an often-dry subject. An e-Learning tool could also be useful. A repository is needed so that the community can quickly access information.

Mr Stefano Burchi, Chair of the Water and Wetlands Specialist Group, WCEL, praised the video of the OECD Principles on Urban Policy, and highlighted the need to distinguish between water resources management and the provision of water and sanitation services. He also suggested that when making a video on the OECD Principles on Water Governance, to avoid portraying water operator CEOs to avoid polarisation.

Ms Gari Villa-Landa Sokolova, Head of International Affairs AEAS, suggested it would be a good idea to do a similar video as the one done for the Principles on Urban Policy. She also suggested going back to the water governance stories that are on the website to see what lessons could be drawn to support the communication efforts. Ms Villa-Landa Sokolova also asked delegates for advice not only on how to communicate but also on the material to develop on mentoring and training. In response to the question on target audience, she suggested to go back to the pilot cases as a starting point to see who is carrying out these kinds of processes.

Mr Bernard Barraqué, Research Director, CIRED-CRNS, emphasised the importance of distinguishing the law, economics and governance of water supply and sanitation and water resources management, because they often do not work on the same scale and do not pertain to the same legal systems in developed countries. In developing countries, when a significant proportion of the population has poor access to water and sanitation, they become dependent on water resources. This leads to the attitude towards water and sanitation services as if they were resources: they think water and sanitation services should be free because water resources are free in most cultural systems in the world. However, in large metropolises, the impact of these cities on water resources becomes so important that they have to manage the resources if only to be able to improve or diminish the costs of their water supply and sanitation systems. This phenomenon takes place in large cities in developing countries, which creates the possibility to amalgamate water supply and water resources. Therefore, a meta-governance necessity is emerging when to distinguish between services and resources in some cases, and when to amalgamate in others.

Mr Teun Bastemeijer, Expert, emphasised that water governance is contextual and is linked to priorities in the context to which it will be specifically applied to. These priorities mean that local stakeholders know what impact they desire and they define it, not the SDGs framework. In that context, it would be useful to have guidance that prioritises a set of specific indicators, which would link to SDSs, so that local decisions are a part of the global agenda. However, he suggested that the WGI has a top-down approach, which is a methodology that permits theorisation and abstraction, but which may not be appropriate to impose on the external world. This local context should be taken into account when communicating because many people do not understand the complexity of water governance, which requires a different language and another set of tools. Climate change will inevitably affect governance structures and he suggested that answers might be found in a report entitled [Adapt Now: A Global Call for Leadership on Climate Resilience](#), published in 2019 by the Global Commission on Adaptation and the World Resources Institute.

Mr Bruno Tisserand, President, EurEau, suggested working with other actors such as IWA or ISO, which are developing a standard on the governance of water services, or the European Union. The opportunity may arise to discuss with a wider range of actors the different angles from which governance can be considered and provide tools and solutions for different aspects for implementing good governance.

Mr Barry Greig, Senior Policy Advisor/Hydro Nation Manager, Scottish Government Water Industry Team, informed delegates that the Scottish government and UNITAR have been hosting an online course on translating global water issues into local solutions. He gave a set of practical observations on the courses in terms of how participants reacted. There is an issue around certification, which raises questions of cost. He also noted the importance of setting clear intentions about the structure and management of the course, with a necessity of keeping the material up to date; requiring a significant effort to reflect on the material used and recast it in ways to be even more effective. He concluded by emphasising how these kinds of online training initiatives tend to be resource-intensive processes.

Mr Kevin Collins, Senior Lecturer Environment & Systems, The Open University, suggested developing a clearer understanding of the situation of potential learners so that they recognise the value of the framework and the Principles. There needs to be an emphasis on defining the learning outcomes of this process: what to expect that the person engaging with the material will learn. With respect to the accreditation or certification issue, he agreed that this was important and shared that The Open University has designed an electronic badge for its self-taught courses, which provides the course content to third parties. He echoed that videos, including animations, can be useful and highlighted the importance of social media, as students that are developing material and exemplifying their experience wish to put it somewhere. As for the use of the Principles, if materials are being designed for learning, it is important to maintain a critical view of the framework and allow the students to make sense of that for themselves. With regard to the question on trainers, he suggested that it would be important to define who the trainers should be and what skills or capacities they have or should develop before they can tutor somebody else.

Ms Lesha Witmer, Steering Committee Member, Butterfly Effect/Women for Water Partnership, warned against using a similar video for the WGI because it focuses more on advocacy for the Principles than on capacity development. She suggested an animated video to bring a new audience, which also may be cheaper to produce. She suggested The [Water Room Series](#) by UNESCO as an example of a successful cartoon on governance. She informed delegates of a WfWP/UNECE training on watercourse conventions that operates through a dual approach, by inviting people who know the content and then training to teach others, then pairing them with people to train. This approach could work as the WGI has a good group of potential trainers. She recommended reaching out to existing training institutes in different countries as some of them already do MOOCs but also train trainers, as well as universities and schools for vocational training. She suggested outreach to interested parties and highlighted the potential of operational managers as intermediaries. Finally, she seconded the idea to create an online repository of the already available material.

Mr Francisco Nunes Correia, President of the General Assembly, Portuguese Water Partnership, seconded the point made by Mr Burchi and Mr Barraqué and emphasised that it is dangerous to confuse the urban cycle and water supply and sanitation with water resources management. Water resources management is like a binding set of restrictions, which requires the balance of different uses; however, water supply and sanitation is considered from the viewpoint of a very important and specific use, but which rarely goes beyond 10-20% of the overall picture. This is why the Principles on water governance were originally designed to cut across water uses and foster such a holistic approach.

Ms Lesha Witmer disagreed with the previous statements for two reasons: people in capacity developing courses should be able to decide what the scope of their responsibility is and what kind of water management they operate; and justice is not being done to the Principles by not respecting the allocation of roles and responsibilities established by each country's water regulation.

Mr Manfred Matz, Head of the Tunisia Water Programme, German Development Agency (GIZ), gave importance to targeting communication efforts accordingly. In capacity development enterprises, communication usually targets trainers in technical areas like governance. However, this approach overlooks the gap between the capacities and their impact, as this may be determined by factors such as political will, vested and individual interests, which may hinder the implementation of good governance structures. It is thus important to communicate to the wider public, such as schools and households, especially at times of regulation change, to achieve an impact after having trained the technicians.

Ms Aziza Akhmouch, OECD Secretariat, highlighted three points:

1. The building blocks proposed by the OECD in terms of what can be done in the short- and medium-term seem to be acceptable by all WGI members with regards to the dissemination of material, training the trainers and longer-term objectives. However, there are varying views in terms of how to shape them. The OECD can communicate bilaterally with those who hold conflicting views, but she highlighted the usefulness of the takeaway.

2. The feedback seems to echo the discussion on distinguishing between water resources management and water supply and sanitation services that took place during the very development of the Principles five years ago. The final trade-off to design principles as a holistic framework for different uses does not preclude the possibility to have tailored (and sub-sector specific) capacity tools to implement them in practice. The takeaway from the discussion is that there are specific work streams on different subsectors, but the vocation of the Principles is to maintain a holistic view that considers water management and governance as a driver to sustainable growth.
3. In the survey, a number of members signalled interest to work on certain dimensions of capacity development. These delegates will be contacted bilaterally. Members who would like to play a more significant role in this topic were invited to volunteer. A more focused taskforce would be useful especially when considering how to shape the video script to address the necessities and specificities of the WGI, developing an online course and thinking about the benefits of a repository, or shaping the communication material.

Conclusions of the Meeting and Next Steps

The **Chair** informed delegates about the report that is currently underway by a UN Special Rapporteur on the topic of [privatisation and the human rights to water and sanitation](#) to be completed by the end of the year and submitted to the Commissioner on Human Rights and the UN General Assembly by October. An open consultation is taking place through the end of January for state and non-state parties.

The **Chair** stated that, while some members may have already participated in the consultation process, the Steering Committee has suggested that the WGI send a short letter to inform the Commissioner and the Rapporteur of the WGI's existence, activities and messages on water governance. Such a letter would reference that the UN High-Level Panel has endorsed and embraced both the initiative and the OECD Principles on Water Governance. The letter will be prepared by the OECD Secretariat and the WGI Steering Committee, but may be revised by interested members once it is finalised.

Mr Bernard Barraqué asked if the letter would go out on behalf of the WGI. He shared that he had very strong feelings against the report's process and encouraged that the WGI communicate its viewpoint.

The **Chair** confirmed that he would sign the letter as the Chair of the WGI after consultation of its members.

Ms Witmer expressed her agreement with the proposal. She informed delegates that the questionnaires contain leading and biased questions and alluded to concerns about the report process.

Mr Barraqué informed delegates that Ms Satoko Kishimoto expressed this same position at the 8th World Water Forum. Mr Léo Heller, the Special Rapporteur, organised a workshop where many were in favour of this position. He also informed delegates of the total European consensus on the idea that water resources could or should not be privatised because they were considered public or common pool resources. However, no such consensus was reached for water supply and sanitation. He insisted that this is so in Europe because it is possible to separate water resources management and their system of legal and economic functioning from water supply and sanitation because most people are connected to the public grid and pay their water bills. Therefore, water in Europe is not a commodity, but rather a club good with social and economic constraints that have to be respected by the service provider, whatever the stage of privatisation.

The **Chair** thanked the delegates who intervened and the rest of the WGI members for their trust and reminded them that each organisation can also react individually on their own accord to this issue. The Chair expressed his satisfaction of the meeting and highlighted the importance of disagreement for fulfilling debate. He mentioned that membership is constantly changing and expanding, but that the meetings serve to transfer knowledge and activity, which is positive in the effect it can have on the community. The Chair looked forward to the WGI's activities on the road to Dakar in March 2021, and reminded delegates that

two more WGI Meetings would take place beforehand. He made a call for volunteers to host the next two meetings.

The **Chair** officially closed the meeting by thanking the interpreters for their work and the Water Governance team at the OECD for their tremendous job, including Ms Aziza Akhmouch, Ms Oriana Romano, Ms Elisa Elliott Alonso and Ms Colette Ashley. He also thanked Ms Mia Gruget for her invaluable contribution by providing logistical and technical support during the entire meeting.