7th MEETING OF THE
OECD WATER GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

23-24 June 2016, Hotel NH Den Haag, The Hague, Netherlands

HIGHLIGHTS

The OECD Water Governance Initiative (WGI) is an international multi-stakeholder network of around 130 delegates from public, private and not-for-profit sectors gathering twice a year in a Policy Forum to share on-going reforms, projects, lessons and good practices in support of better governance in the water sector. It was launched on 27-28 March 2013 in Paris. Since its creation, the WGI has gathered 7 times (7-8 November 2013, Paris; 28-29 April 2014, Madrid; 24-25 November 2014, Paris; 26 May 2015, Edinburgh; 2-3 November 2015, Paris and 23-24 June 2016, The Hague).

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 scaling up best practices and contributing to the development of indicators; and
5. **Foster continuity** on governance discussions between two World Water Forum (every 3 years), in particular by supporting the Governance Implementation Roadmap of the 7th World Water Forum (Korea, 2015) up to the 8th World Water Forum (Brazil, 2018).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

1.   The 7th WGI meeting was held at Hotel NH Den Haag, The Hague, Netherlands and gathered 93 participants (see the list of participants). In all, 16 countries were represented as well as major stakeholder groups and organisations within and outside the water sector. The 7th meeting of the WGI had the following objectives (see the agenda):

- **Update** WGI members on developments after the 6th WGI meeting (2-3 November 2016)

- Discuss the implementation of the **OECD Principles on Water Governance**

- Carry out bottom-up consultations on water governance **indicators** and **best practices**

- Discuss contribution to **Global Agendas**: SDGs, Habitat III, COP 22 & World Water Forum

- **Peer-review** analytical work on flood risk governance

- **Share knowledge and experience** on water governance, reforms, research and events

2.   Delegates **WELCOMED** the extension of the WGI activities over the period 2016-2018 and the achievements since the 6th meeting:

- WGI structure (Chair, steering committee, working groups) and objectives (advise governments, policy forum, implement the OECD principles, peer review, global agenda) remain unchanged for the coming three years. Adjustments were made for working groups, which are now organised around outputs (best practices and indicators) rather than themes. Membership has expanded with 132 delegates, including 46 new members.

- Delegates were updated on progress vis-à-vis the OECD (draft) Council Recommendations on Water and on Public Integrity, on which the WGI was consulted. The former seeks to consolidate four current water-related legal instruments into one and to update them with the latest guidance and work of the Organisation. WGI members expressed their satisfaction with the fact that the OECD Principles on Water Governance currently feature in a dedicated section of the draft recommendation. A third draft is expected by the end of June for a last round of iteration with member states, and the final version should be submitted to the OECD Council by the end of 2016. The draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity abrogates and replaces the 1998 OECD Recommendation on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service. It promotes a comprehensive and coherent progressive integrity framework that is applicable to all stages of the policy cycle. The draft is expected to be adopted in summer 2016.

- The two working groups (indicators and best practices) held webinars on 25 April to kick off their activities and prepare for the 7th meeting. The webinars gathered respectively 37 and 29 participants from 13 countries. Participants agreed on the scope and approach proposed for the identification of indicators and best practices, based on preparatory documents provided by the coordinators of the working groups.

- The launch of the OECD "Water Governance in Cities" report at the Cities and Water Conference, in Leeuwarden, on 11 February 2016, and a scientific paper published in the Journal "Water" applying OECD thinking on stakeholder engagement to the WGI. Both publications provide a good illustration of the synergy between RDPC's tools and WGI's sectoral approach.

3.   Delegates **DISCUSSED**:

- The opportunities to raise the profile of water in the Habitat III and COP22 processes. Delegates called for an explicit reference to water in the Habitat III Declaration and COP22 process. The

WGI could play a key role in this endeavour, by building on its networks to spread the good words and foster linkages between water, climate, urban and SDGs agendas where possible. WGI members were invited to join a network event on Delta Cities that the Netherlands will organise in Quito and join a campaign called "Climate is Water", which involves 34 institutions to raise the profile of water in the climate agenda. Several WGI members also asked to redefine the concept of justice, especially in regards to the "Water Security for Climate Justice" conference to be held in Rabat on 11 and 12 July 2016.

- How to foster the implementation of water-related Goals in the 2030 Agenda, notably through the OECD Action Plan for Sustainable Development Goals, the High-Level Panel on Water, the Global Water Architecture and the Global Monitoring Framework.

  - The *OECD Action Plan* foresees 1) mainstreaming an SDG lens to the OECD's strategies and policy tools; 2) improving the evidence by leveraging OECD data to help track progress in the implementation of the SDGs, 3) upgrading the OECD's support for integrated planning and policy-making at the country level and provide a space for sharing experiences; and 4) engaging with global stakeholders and non-members.

  - The *High Level Panel on Water* was launched at the World Economic Forum, Davos on 20-23 January 2016. It is convened by the UN Secretary General and the World Bank President and established for a two year-period. The WGI contributed through producing a framing note on "Water Governance" for consideration of the Sherpas of the HLP.

  - The ongoing discussion on the *Global Water Architecture* is geared towards the creation of a UN intergovernmental body on water to follow-up on and review the implementation of water-related goals and targets, and provide key thematic inputs to the High Level Political Forum.

  - The *Global Monitoring Framework* provides a set of 230+ indicators to track progress on the 169 targets included within the 17 SDGs. Three main initiatives, to be progressively aligned, address SDG 6: WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) (targets 6.1 and 6.2), Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation related SDG targets (GEMI) (targets 6.3 to 6.6), and UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) (targets 6.a and 6.b). WHO, OECD, and UNEP are co-custodians of targets 6.a and 6.b and WGI will contribute to the "local participation" target.

  - Progress was shared on the Implementation Roadmaps of the 7th World Water Forum and the preparation of the 8th World Water Forum. The first stock-taking of progress in April showed that in the WGI-led Governance theme, 25 actions out of the 31 listed in the Implementation Roadmap have already been completed, which makes the WGI the most advanced and successful contributor to the overall process. A kick-off meeting of the 8th World Water Forum preparatory process will be held on the 27 and 28 June 2016 in Brasilia to consult a broad range of stakeholders on the thematic process of the Forum. A second consultation will take place in April 2017 to define the sessions, the keynote presentations, speakers' list and invitations.

- The paper "Flood Risk Governance: A Shared Responsibility" proposes a checklist to assess whether framework conditions are in place to manage identified risks. In all, 18 WGI members provided comments during the peer-review, most of which related to the five stages of flood management identified and to specific aspects of flood governance such as transboundary implications. WGI members also provided examples and advised to go beyond the EU-centric focus of the paper. Next steps will consist in incorporating these new comments, collecting case studies and making a comparative analysis in order to draw hypothesis on what works best and

where. An OECD working paper will be released by the end of 2016, followed by a potential scientific contribution.

- Working Groups discussed the methodology to be used to identify and/or develop water governance indicators and the draft template and collection process for the (best) practices. On indicators, delegates advised to redefine the water management functions suggested in the preparatory document (e.g. adding the global scale and distinguishing between urban and rural areas) and clarify key terms (indicators, outputs, impacts, etc.). On (best) practices, there was a consensus on the need for an online database to be easily updated and accessible. The sequencing for collecting examples (i.e. before or after the definition of indicators) was discussed, with delegates advising to start with a mapping of existing knowledge, publications and practices on each of the principle on water governance to see where value can be added.

4.   Delegates **SHARED** experiences, views and knowledge related to water governance from:

- Recent and forthcoming **events on water**: the STAR-FLOOD Conference (4-6 February 2016, Brussels, Belgium); the 3rd ICPDR Ministerial Meeting (9 February 2016, Vienna, Austria); the Water Economic Forum (8 April 2016, Madrid, Spain); the Adaptation Futures 2016 Conference (10-13 May 2016,Rotterdam, Netherlands); the 10th INBO International General Assembly (1-4 June 2016, Merida, Mexico); the NARBO IWRM Training (14-16 June 2016, Bangkok, Thailand); the International Conference on Water Security for Climate Justice (11-12 July 2016, Rabat, Morocco); the Africa Water Week (18-22 July 2016, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania); the 2016 World Water Week (28 August – 2 September 2016, Stockholm, Sweden); the 3rd International Water Regulators Forum (10 October 2016, Brisbane, Australia); the Korea Water Forum (19- 22 October 2016, Daegu, Korea); a seminar on water affordability organised by Aqua Publica Europea (20 October 2016); a training course for change facilitators organised by IRSTEA (7-18 November 2016, Marrakech, Morocco); the Budapest Water Summit (28-30 November 2016, Budapest, Hungary); the Fourth Istanbul International Water Forum (10-11 May 2017, Istanbul, Turkey); and the XVIth IWRA World Water Congress (29 May-2 June 2017, Cancun, Mexico).

- Recent **research, reforms, projects, and publications** on water governance, including the second edition of the book "Building Blocks for Good Water Governance"; various social sustainability mechanisms used in the urban water sector in Spain; the booklet "Applying Water Governance to Humanitarian Projects"; the report "Drinking Water and Sanitation: at which price?"; the Strategic Planning for Alpine River Ecosystems (SPARE) Project; the Global Water Studio as an initiative of the Netherlands to promote innovation in water governance; SUEZ Materiality Survey, which can be used as a governance and assessment tool; UNDP Water Governance Facility's latest activities on integrity, the Building River Dialogue and Governance (BRIDGE) project and the enlargement of the Delta Coalition, currently including 12 delta countries, to other governmental and non-governmental organisations.

NEXT STEPS

- **30 August 2016**: Informal gathering at the 2016 World Water Week (Stockholm, Sweden)

- **September 2016**: Revised scoping notes on indicators and best practices focus groups

- **September- December 2016**: Finalisation of the Flood risk governance paper (case studies, empirical analysis, discussion in relevant OECD bodies, and publication of the working paper**)**

- **October-November 2016**: Webinars and Working Group Activities

- **12-13 December 2016:** 8th Meeting of the WGI, Rabat, Morocco

SUMMARY RECORD

Welcoming Remarks

Introduction by the Chair

5.	Peter Glas, Chair of the WGI, welcomed delegates and thanked the Netherlands for welcoming the 7th WGI meeting and for its longstanding support to the WGI. The Chair expressed his satisfaction with the renewal process of WGI for a second phase over 2016-2018. The Highlights from the 6th meeting are available online in English and French. The steering committee held a meeting on 23 March 2016 to follow up on the 6th meeting of the WGI. The Terms of Reference for the period 2016-2018 were approved by the Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC) on 26 April 2016. The two working groups (indicators and best practices) held webinars on 25 April to kick off their activities and prepare for the 7th meeting. The Chair also updated delegates on the recent launch of the Water Integrity Global Outlook (WIGO) in Berlin (22 March 2016). The report captures a growing recognition of the need for good governance and actions to eliminate corruption and improve sector performance. WIGO emphasises the need for transparency, accountability and participation to achieve SDG 6 and other water-related goals and makes multiple references to the OECD Principles on Water Governance.

Water governance in the Netherlands

6.	Roald Lapperre, Deputy Director General for Spatial Development and Water Affairs in the Dutch Ministry of the Environment and Infrastructure, shared two examples of concrete steps that have been undertaken following the OECD Policy Dialogue with the Netherlands in 2014. He recalled that 60% of the country is subject to the risk of submersion and that more than half of the population lives flood-prone areas, which also represent two-third of the economic activity. These conditions make water management a matter of national importance and a national security. The OECD report pointed out an awareness gap by Dutch citizens regarding floods. No major disaster has occurred in the last 50 years and many citizens take current levels of security for granted, and do not know the basics of evacuation policy. In response, the government has invested in further communication and launched an "water awareness week" every second year during which citizens can visit water management projects in their neighbourhood and see what role they can play themselves. A website[1] was also set up to raise awareness on water risks. In practice, anyone can enter its postal code and note whether its property will be at risk of flooding; and what to do in case such an emergency takes place. In addition, the Minister gave several public interviews on the topic, television shows are screened for kids and a water museum was open. Another OECD recommendation on which the government followed up relates to the coherence between water, land use and spatial planning. In 2012, the Directorate General for Spatial Development and Water Affairs was created out of the merger of two previous (separate) directorates, which in itself reflects the interdependence and needed integration between these areas. Integration was also achieved within the measures of the broad Programme "Room for the River", such as moving a dyke 350 meters towards the hinterland, thereby helping drain the river during extremely high water seasons and creating an urban river park for recreation, culture, water and nature. However, until now, these innovative projects have too often been subject to factors such as chance and leadership of individuals. The Environmental Planning Act, that passed parliament in March 2016, is also expected to further stimulate structural coherence between water, land and spatial planning.

---

[1] www.overstroomik.nl

Update on RDPC activities

7.   Joaquim Oliveira-Martins, Head of the OECD Regional Development Policy division congratulated WGI members on the achievements of the first phase of activities (2013-2015), which culminated with the adoption of the OECD Principles on Water Governance endorsed by OECD Ministers on 4 June 2015. The WGI, which operates within the Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC) of the OECD, has organised its activities around three main output areas: maintaining a policy forum on water governance through biannual meetings; supporting the implementation of the Principles through the development of indicators and a best practice database, and fostering peer-review and policy dialogues on water at different levels to provide tailored guidance to government through evidence-based assessment. The latest prioritisation exercise carried out by OECD countries showed greater support to water than in the previous biennium. The implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance was ranked as a medium or high priority by over 60% of countries. The attendance of the WGI Chair at two RDPC meetings and his contribution to the Policy Forum section of the 2016 Regional Outlook of the OECD also contributed to reflect a greater importance of water within the RDPC Programme of Work. The WGI, as an institutional innovation within the OECD's architecture, has also become a source of inspiration on "how" to work at the OECD through greater stakeholder engagement to be in a better position to shape policy guidance and advise governments. The RDPC is currently exploring the possibility to apply in other sectors the instruments and participatory processes developed within the WGI, in particular given the momentum provided by the SDGs in post-2030 Agenda.

Publications since the 6th meeting of the WGI

8.   The OECD report "Water Governance in Cities" is a good illustration of the synergy between RDPC's tools and WGI's sectoral approach. The report assesses trends and gaps in water governance in 48 metropolitan areas (42 OECD, 6 BRICS) and suggests policy responses to bridge them. It was launched at the Cities and Water Conference, in Leeuwarden, on February 11th, 2016. The report shows that even if significant progress has been achieved in the last two decades in terms of managing water in cities, current levels of service delivery and water security should not be taken for granted. Pressing and emerging threats are jeopardising the capacity of governments to manage too much, too little and too polluted water in several developed and emerging economies now and in the future.

9.   A scientific paper "Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance "Practicing What We Preach" with the OECD Water Governance Initiative" was published in the journal "Water" in May 20165. The paper is rooted in the consideration that at the core of inclusive growth is inclusive policy making. There is a significant role for sub-national governments and multi-level governance to ensure that under-represented groups participate in the policy process. Such efforts are instrumental to promote greater trust in government and greater local capacity to improve public services and investment. The paper is also an opportunity to share with a wider audience the achievements of the WGI as well as its way of operating and outreach capacity.

Update on WGI 2016-2018 Strategy and Activities

WGI renewed membership

10.   Aziza Akhmouch, Head of the OECD Water Governance Programme, updated members on the renewal of WGI membership over 2016-2018. Following the results of the satisfaction survey carried out in May 2015, a strategic paper was drafted to take stock of the main achievements of the WGI over 2013-2015 and pave the way to the second phase. The five objectives of the WGI remain

unchanged: 1) raise the profile of governance in the Global Water Agenda, 2) Advise governments in taking the needed steps for effective water reforms, 3) Provide a policy forum to share knowledge, experience and best practices, 4) Support the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance and 5) Peer-review technical work. Membership has expanded with132 members to date, including 46 new members. Part of the membership gap pointed out in the strategic paper was bridged (e.g. nature-based organisation, and UN institutions), but the challenge to engage cities and local administrations is still prominent for the current phase.

WGI structure & working groups

11.   WGI structure remains unchanged for 2016-2018, with a Chair and the Steering Committee, composed of ASTEE, INBO/OIEau, Suez, WIN, SIWI and Transparency International. The main change lies in the shift from thematic working groups (stakeholder engagement, governance and performance of water services, basin governance and integrity and transparency) to output-based working groups (best practices and indicators) in order to support the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance. WGI members made very concrete in-kind contributions in terms of their commitment to share knowledge and experience (95%), to disseminate the Principles to their members and networks (86%), to take part in one or two working groups (82%), to peer-review technical work (70%), to collect best practices (70%), to disseminate findings in their events, media or networks (60%), to foster synergies with their own activities (57%), to provide a platform to discuss indicators (36%), to host a working group meeting (25%) or a plenary meeting (11%). Two members of the WGI offered a financial contribution. Such financial contributions provided in the past by the Netherlands, Spain, Korea were the stepping stones for WGI creation.

WGI consultations on OECD (draft) Recommendations

12.   WGI members have recently been consulted on the (draft) OECD Council Recommendations on Water and on Public Integrity. The former seeks to consolidate four current water-related legal instruments of the OECD into one and to update them with the latest guidance and work of the Organisation (the last Water Recommendation dating back to 1989). In all, 24 WGI members contributed with written comments, which overall called for a more ambitious stance building on the EU Acquis (Water and Flood Directives) especially on issues related to pricing, conjunctive management of surface and groundwater, and the implementation of international standards or resolutions (e.g. on the human right to drinking water and sanitation, on transboundary water courses etc.). WGI members also expressed their satisfaction with the fact that the OECD Principles on Water Governance currently feature in a dedicated section of the draft recommendation. A third draft is expected by the end June for a last round of iteration with member states, and the final version should be submitted to the OECD Council by the end of 2016. The OECD Secretariat (Environment Directorate) will revert back to WGI members individually with feedback on how comments received from the stakeholder consultation have been taken into account in the draft and if not, why.

13.   The second draft Recommendation on which WGI members were consulted related to public integrity. The draft Recommendation of the Council on Public Integrity abrogates and replaces the 1998 OECD Recommendation on Improving Ethical Conduct in the Public Service. The revisions to the 1998 Recommendation are extensive, as the new Recommendation incorporates new insights. The draft Recommendation specifically promotes a comprehensive and coherent progressive integrity framework that is applicable to all stages of the policy cycle. Comments received call for a clearer distinction between integrity and corruption, and pointed out the need for sector specific examples. A revised draft Recommendation including comments received at the meeting of the Senior Public Integrity Officials (SPIO) on 18 April 2016 and at the Symposium of the Public Governance is

currently open to comments by OECD countries and SPIO delegates until 8 August, and the final draft is expected to be approved by Council by the end of 2016.

WGI dissemination & outreach

14.   Since the last meeting of the WGI on 2-3 November 2015, the OECD Secretariat has been active disseminating the Principles on Water Governance to ensure broader outreach and buy in. These events consisted in international conferences, general assemblies, networks' meeting mostly organised by the WGI members. The Principles were disseminated in several recent water events including STAR-FLOOD Conference (Brussels, 4-5 February), Water Economic Forum (Madrid, 8 April), Adaptation Futures 2016 conference (10-12 May 2016), 10th INBO International General Assembly (1-3 June, Merida), SPARE kick-off meeting (Innsbruck, 15 February), Water, Megacities and Global Change conference (Paris, 1 December), Cities and Water Conference (Leeuwarden, 10-11 February), World Water Tech (London, 23 February), Water Governance Centre Sunset symposium (Amersfoort, 10 March), Netwerc H20 General Assembly (Pisa, 17 March), IWA young water professional UK Annual conference (Norwich, 31 March), Water in the Urban Agenda conference (European Parliament, 6 April), the 8th European Conference on Sustainable Cities & Towns (Bilbao, 27-29 April), ASTEE 95th Congress (1-3 June), CEEP water task force meeting (Munich, 1st June), Citizen Observatories for water management Conference (Venice, 9 June) and the International Conference on Adapting to Climate Change (Lisbon, 21 June).

Raising the Profile of Water Governance in the Global Agenda

Habitat III Process

15.   Joaquim Oliveira Martins shared some remarks about the Habitat III Conference and OECD's tools to support the New Urban Agenda. Habitat III is the third United Nations Conference on Housing and Sustainable Urban Development. This conference is organised every 20 years and the final event will take place in Quito, Ecuador, from 17-20 October 2016. The New Urban Agenda which is expected to be agreed at Habitat III is a critical opportunity to support the achievement of the SDGs in particular through the lens of cities and communities. The preparation of the New Urban Agenda was shaped around 10 policy units carrying out thematic discussions, each of which consists of 20 experts nominated by the member countries and other stakeholder organisations. The OECD co-chaired the Policy Unit 3 on National Urban Policies, together with UN-Habitat. In that context, the OECD produced a policy paper in February 2016 as a contribution to the drafting process of the New Urban Agenda. All policy units also met at the European Habitat meeting in Prague last March and at the open-ended consultation meeting of the New Urban Agenda in New York City last April. OECD's strategic focus relies on promoting a National Urban Policy, promoting good urban and metropolitan governance, developing subnational finance and advancing other global agendas through urban policies. The organisation has a number of tools to achieve its strategy: National Urban Policy Reviews (completed in Poland, Korea, Chile, Mexico, and China, on-going in Kazakhstan and planned for Vietnam); a programme to support NUPs including three main pillars (country advisory services, knowledge management, and capacity development); OECD Metropolitan, Regional and Well-being Databases; Urban Green Growth studies (currently focusing on rapidly urbanising Asian cities in Bangkok, Iskandar, Haiphong, Bandung and Cebu); the OECD Recommendation on Effective Public Investment; a worldwide Observatory on sub national finance (under creation) and the Water Governance Initiative. Habitat III provides a critical opportunity to link the water and urban agendas, which are often disconnected. Several WGI members, including GWOPA, WWC and IWA are involved in Habitat III through the organisation of side events or networking events. The new zero draft of Habitat III released recently is an opportunity to strengthen the efforts to bring water closer to cities' discussions and vice-versa. WGI members are invited to join a network event on Delta Cities

that the Netherlands will organise in Quito. The OECD will take part in Habitat III meeting in Quito, and convey WGI's voice regarding the missing link between urban and water policies.

COP 21 Paris Declaration & Pact

16.   Eric Tardieu, Deputy Director of the International Office for Water, presented the "Paris Pact on Water and Adaptation: Strengthening Adaptation in Basins of Rivers, Lakes and Aquifers". The Pact, spearheaded by INBO aims to raise the profile of water in the COP process. It has been supported, along with other water-related initiatives, by the Lima-Paris Action Agenda (LPAA). The LPAA is a Joint initiative of the French and Peruvian presidencies of the COP20 and COP21, the Executive Office of the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Secretariat of the UNFCCC aiming at the development of climate actions by civil society actors. To date, the Paris Pact has been signed by 348 organisations from 94 countries, including four Ministers in charge of water management (Benin, France, Morocco and Peru) and the Executive Secretary of UNECE. It targets basins at all scales, from transboundary to local. The purpose is to accelerate integrated water resources management strategies and plans that are better adapted to the current and future effects of climate change. The Pact insists on the needed awareness, action and commitment of all stakeholders in the basin, including national and transboundary basin organizations, governments, local authorities, civil society, private companies, donors and international organisations. It includes four priority commitments: capacity development and knowledge, basin management planning, governance and adequate financing. Implementation of projects will be followed up through reports on actions undertaken within existing networks, including the WGI. Two strategic actions are currently being explored regarding the reporting system of the Paris Pact: organising events to present the projects in basins and gaining more attention from donors and financial institutions. Examples of actions of relevance for WGI involvement include water information systems, performance indicators and stakeholder participation. Several events have already taken place and more are planned on the road to COP22 in Marrakech from 7-18 November 2016. One key milestone is the "Water Security for Climate Justice" conference to be held in Rabat on 11 and 12 July 2016. The conference includes four thematic sessions: 1) Vulnerability of Water to Climate Change, 2) Water and the Implementation of the Paris Agreement and Sustainable Development Goals, 3) Alliance: "Water-Energy-Food Security-Health-Education" and 4) Water and Climate Change Finance Mechanisms. It aims to promote four key messages for COP22: create a political momentum and call for action for water, mainstream water inside climate discussions, follow-up on commitments and link SDGs implementation to water resilience in Africa. The focus on Africa is a political choice made by Morocco. Considering the geographical context, all African countries will have to take strong measures to cope with the issue of climate change in the future. WGI members who have not yet signed the Pact and contributed with projects are invited to do so, especially within the two priority focus areas: monitoring networks and information systems.

Group discussion on Habitat III and COP

17.   WGI members were invited to react to the two presentations based on two guiding questions: "How do your institutions contribute to the climate and urban agenda?" and "How can the WGI help raise the profile of water in these areas?".

18.   The Butterfly Effect informed delegates about a campaign called "Climate is Water", which involves 34 institutions to raise the profile of water in the climate agenda. The first event took place in Paris during the COP21 and three more events are planned back to back to forthcoming major water events in Rabat (11-12 July), Stockholm (late August) and Budapest (late November). The campaign does not limit its actions to COP but has a broad approach to any opportunity to mainstream the "water

language" into climate agreements. To this end, it is expected that the negotiators of such agreements will also be approached.

19.   WBCSD called for an explicit reference to water in the Habitat III Declaration. WBCSD shared its disappointment that the word "water" does not feature in the Paris Agreement that concluded COP21 in December. WBCSD is working together with the Government of Morocco, ICLEI and the Sustainable Development Solutions Network on organising a three day conference "Low Emissions Solutions Conference" to be held during COP 22 (14-17 November). The event aims to accelerate the implementation of solutions under the Paris Agreement by showcasing low carbon solutions in cities and agriculture and to highlight the importance of water in low carbon solutions.

20.   GWP recalled the organisation of a meeting in Barcelona on 1st February 2016 in the frame of the Habitat III process. The meeting gathered many stakeholders (OECD, Morocco's National Water Office, UNDP Water Governance Facility, UNESCO-IHP, Water Aid, GWP, etc.). A list of recommendations emerged from the meeting inviting UN Habitat to push water in the urban agenda. As another milestone, a (3rd Preparatory) meeting of Habitat III will take place in Surabaya on 25-27 July 2016. This is a unique opportunity to convey such recommendations again and ensure they are fully part of the final declaration. A similar approach could be fostered for COP 22.

21.   WIN warned against a silo approach in considering the COP and Habitat III agendas since they are mutually reinforcing; this implies thinking carefully about the leverage that the WGI can play in these areas, building on its networks to spread the good words and foster linkages where possible.

22.   Peter Gammeltoft underlined the overlap between the climate, urban and SDGs agendas, especially for cities which will have to address issues related to drinking water, sanitation and flood protection, and where climate change impacts will affect water efficiency and water allocation, among others. IWRM is the lens through which integration of the climate and cities agendas can best happen since this relates to the question of scale at which problems occur and need to be solved.

23.   Turkey called for a systemic approach when looking at SDGs as several goals, beyond SDG 6, are in practice water-related and require a holistic approach. Discussions then pointed to the need for limiting fragmentation across competent agencies given the strong interdependencies and linkages, which all require good governance to happen in practice.

24.   UN Water reminded their coordinating role for water and sanitation in the SDGs framework and process. UN Water members and partners are currently producing an analytical brief on water-related interlinkages across UN Agencies which should be launched during the Stockholm World Water Week in August. Coordination is a challenge but each agency has its own mandate and, therefore, is contributing to the implementation of selected aspects of the SDGs within their mandate, and monitoring and reporting accordingly. For issues such as water, energy, oceans and others, coordination is more complicated as there is not a single, dedicated UN agency with a holistic mandate on these issues. This is where the coordination mechanisms within the UN come to play.

25.   IRSTEA wondered to what extent justice would be addressed in the LPAA and the "Water Security for Climate Justice" conference. Although the word justice is included in the title, it seems to be missing in the content of both processes while there is much room to include justice principles in the governance framework and support their implementation, especially at the community level. Many agreed that the concept of "justice" should go beyond that of "equity" (AIDA, Utrecht University, IRSTEA, and OECD) and the Rabat conference is an opportunity to dig deeper, including in terms of how to manage trade-offs between people, places, policies and over time. The dimensions of formal

justice and related mechanisms is often a missing link and weak spot in the legal spectrum of considerations that must be brought to bear in facilitating IWRM.

26.   Action Against Hunger proposed for the Steering Committee to discuss on how the WGI could engage in the Climate is Water Initiative as a group or through the OECD.

Fostering the Implementation of Water-related Goals in the 2030 Agenda

OECD Action Plan for Sustainable Development Goals

27.   Aziza Akhmouch introduced the OECD Action Plan for Sustainable Development Goals. The OECD has a long history of engagement with major UN processes on human development and well-being, financing for development, environmental sustainability and climate change. At their Ministerial Council Meeting (MCM) in 2015, OECD ministers acknowledged both the importance of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, and the potential for the OECD to contribute to its implementation. A new development is that SDGs do not target only developing countries. For water in particular, the OECD has long argued that current levels of service delivery and security should not be taken for granted in OECD countries. Pressing and emerging challenges also hinder the capacity of developed economies to keep the level of universal coverage in water and sanitation and to manage too much, too little and too polluted water. In that context, some lessons can be drawn from the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). First, the interconnectedness among the various SDGs has to be taken into account. The improvement of one SDG may have a negative spill over on others. Second, even though SDGs were adopted by national governments, their implementation is a shared responsibility. The implementation and funding mobilisation for many of the SDGs' policy areas have been decentralised to cities and regions. Third, data needs to be disaggregated. National averages can mask disparities while disaggregated data such as OECD metropolitan database can help address these disparities.

28.   The OECD Action Plan for SDGs seeks to support member and non-member countries in reaching the Goals and targets, and has three objectives. First, helping countries identify where they currently stand in relation to the SDGs, where they need to be, and propose sustainable pathways based on evidence. In this way, the OECD will be an important contributor to the "GPS" (global positioning system) the international community will need to achieve the Goals. The second objective is to reaffirm its role as a leading source of expertise, good practices and standards in economic, social and environmental areas of public policy that are relevant to the SDGs. The third objective is to encourage a "race to the top" for better policies that can help deliver the SDGs, through the use of hallmark OECD approaches (e.g. peer reviews and learning; monitoring and statistical reporting; policy dialogue; soft law).

29.   The Action Plan is structured around four areas for action: 1) mainstream an SDG lens to the OECD's strategies and policy tools; 2) improve the evidence by leveraging OECD data to help track progress in the implementation of the SDGs, for example by widening the geographical coverage or scope of indicators and increasing the analytical thinking on what needs to be done to get there; 3) Upgrade the OECD's support for integrated planning and policy-making at the country level (to foster a "whole of government approach"), and provide a space for governments to share experiences on governing for the SDGs; and 4) Engage with global stakeholders and non-members and reflect on the implications of the SDGs for OECD external relations.

High-Level Panel on Water & Global Water Architecture

30.   Kim Moolenaar, Policy Advisor in the Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment, introduced two initiatives aiming at mobilising effective action to accelerate the implementation of SDG 6 and its targets: the High-Level Panel on Water and the Global Water Architecture.

31.   The idea of convening a High-Level Panel on Water stems from the United Nations Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation (UNSGAB) final Journey Report which highlighted a mismatch between the 2030 vision of freshwater and sanitation management and the international political structures available to contribute to its implementation. The Report recommended to convene a Heads of State Panel on Water and to establish a UN Intergovernmental Committee on Water. The High Level Panel on Water was launched at the World Economic Forum in Davos on 20-23 January 2016. It is convened by the UN Secretary General and the World Bank Group President and established for a two years period. Each panel member has appointed a Sherpa for day-to-day matters. A "Friends of the Panel network" (including the OECD) was created to encourage a voice for all and learn from existing knowledge. Panel members, their Sherpas and the Panel Secretariat should be interacting with a broad range of stakeholders over the two-year mandate. This should be an opportunity for WGI members to contribute. The mission of the Panel is to motivate effective action and advocate on financing and implementation. The Sherpa's of the Panel are currently working on the Action Plan which will determine the activities and targets of the Panel for the coming two years. The Panel has a mandate to help effective action by changing the narrative, by showing examples of institutions and programmes that have proved successful and help the world in this path, and by promoting efforts on raising funds and innovative partnerships. The OECD produced a Framing Note on "Water Governance" for the HLP, which is expected to feed the discussions among the sherpas during their meeting early July to devise the action plan for the Panel.

32.   The second initiative aims at providing adequate water architecture for the 2030 Agenda in a different way than the High Level Panel. The Panel is focusing on boosting the implementation of the SDGs while the Global Water Architecture looks at raising the profile of water in the other 16 SDGs and UN discussions. The Global Water Architecture foresees the creation of a dedicated UN Intergovernmental body on water to follow-up on and review the implementation of water-related goals and targets and provide key thematic inputs to the High Level Political Forum. It is an initiative of a growing group of countries (including the Netherlands, France and Hungary), supported by a secretariat and linked to ECOSOC. A flyer was prepared to explain the goal and missions of the body to promote an integrated approach, account for inter-linkages and make coordination possible. The presentation ended with some challenges in setting up the new body, including coordination of monitoring inputs on water-related SDGs, bureaucracy and high administrative costs and involvement of relevant stakeholders.

Status of the Global Monitoring Framework

33.   Federico Properzi, Chief Technical Adviser at UN-Water, and Marina Takane, Technical Officer at the World Health Organisation, updated WGI members on the status of the Global Monitoring Framework. The Global Monitoring Framework has come up with a set of 230+ indicators to track progress on the 169 targets included within the 17 SDGs. National Monitoring Teams include representatives from governmental agencies, civil society and stakeholders. The final data delivered for the publishing of the monitoring report will be public, and could be used by stakeholders to hold governments accountable if necessary. Eleven global indicators were identified for the monitoring of the eight SDG6-related targets. The monitoring of the SDGs rely on a number of principles, including country ownership, the importance of integrated data, harmonisation across different monitoring

initiatives and building on what is already available, progressive monitoring and leaving no one behind, which translates into a call for data disaggregation.

34.   The three main initiatives addressing SDG6 monitoring cover different targets: the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) focuses on drinking water, sanitation and hygiene (targets 6.1 and 6.2). For the new targets on wastewater treatment and water quality, water use and use efficiency, integrated water resources management and water-related ecosystems (SDG targets 6.3 to 6.6), a new global monitoring initiative called the Integrated Monitoring of Water and Sanitation related SDG targets (GEMI), is currently being developed based on existing monitoring initiatives. And finally, the monitoring of the means of implementation (SDG targets 6.a and 6.b are expected to build on the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) and the GEMI reporting towards target 6.5 on integrated water resources management (IWRM), which is based on the existing UN-Water IWRM status reporting. The three mechanisms - JMP, GEMI and GLAAS - will be progressively aligned to ensure a coherent SDG 6 monitoring framework. GEMI promoted the pilot testing of draft methodologies in a small number of countries including Senegal and Uganda, Bangladesh, Netherlands, Peru, Jordan and Fiji (to be confirmed). Regarding targets 6.a and 6.b, UN-Water has published a report in 2015 on the means of implementation for Goal 6, setting out requirements to meet the goal under the seven means of implementation building blocks. WHO, OECD, and UNEP are co-custodians of these two targets, and the WGI in particular is expected to contribute to target 6b on "local participation". WHO has developed a methodological note proposing a monitoring framework for these targets, with WGI forthcoming indicator on local participation being a potential candidate for target 6.b.1 building on the measurement underway of Principle 10 on stakeholder engagement of the OECD Principles on Water Governance. Questions included in the GLAAS report have been revised to better monitor 6.a.1 and 6.b.1. A survey was launched in May 2016 targeting all countries. Data collection will run until October 2016. The GLAAS 2017 report will focus on WASH financing but includes elements on transparency as well as on legal and institutional frameworks.

On the road to the 8th World Water Forum (2018)

35.   Jean Lapegue, alternate governor at the World Water Council, and Aline Machado da Matta, Advisor at the Brazilian National Water Agency shared progress on the Implementation Roadmaps of the 7th World Water Forum and the preparation of the 8th World Water Forum to be held in Brasilia on 18-23 March 2018.

36.   Implementation Roadmaps (IRs) are a key result of the 7th World Water Forum, where emphasis on implementation and continuity was identified as a high priority. The purpose of the roadmaps is to create continuity between Forums, to demonstrate that discussions are followed by real actions and to show that progress is being made, thanks to the efforts of the water community. These efforts should then be shared at the 8th World Water Forum and contribute to longer term goals, such as the SDGs. Sixteen IRs were launched during the thematic concluding sessions in Daegu last year, each relating to one of the 7th World Water Forum's thematic areas. For each theme a champion organisation (or group organisations) has been identified to review, monitor and update progress at least every six months on the Action Monitoring System, which is the public online platform serving as a monitoring tool and accountability mechanism for the anticipated objectives defined in the IRs. The champion organisations will also participate in an annual Review Meeting hosted by the Republic of Korea to monitor progress and share the lessons learned from their experiences with the global water community.

37.   The WGI is championing Theme 4.2 on "Effective Governance: Enhanced Political Decisions, Stakeholder Participation and Technical Information", which is organised around three

focus areas corresponding to the three clusters (effectiveness, efficiency and trusts and engagement) of the OECD Principles on Water Governance, 12 objectives corresponding to the 12 Principles, and a total of 31 Actions. The first stock-taking of progress in April showed that 25 actions out of the 31 listed have already been completed, showing great progress and making WGI the most advanced and successful contributor to the overall process.

38. The kick-off meeting of the 8th World Water Forum preparatory process will be held on the 27 and 28 June 2016 in Brasilia. It aims to consult a broad range of stakeholders on the thematic process of the Forum (framework, theme/issue and topic coordinators). A second consultation will take place in April 2017 to define the sessions, the keynote presentations, speakers' list and invitations. In parallel, ANA (Brazilian Water Agency) will propose to the Forum Steering Committee a project to organise an online global consultation to discuss sessions for the Forum in an inclusive and bottom-up fashion, to generate proposals on how to implement the water dimension of SDGs and on how to achieve better results from the IRs. Results of the discussion could be summarised in a special session to be held during the 8th World Water Forum. The kick-off meeting of 26-28 June will be composed of three parts: an opening plenary session, working sessions on each of the four processes (thematic, regional, political and sustainability citizen forum) and a closing plenary. For the moment, six overarching themes have been identified (climate, people, production, waste, ecosystems and governance) together with three cross-cutting issues (sharing, capacity and stakeholders). WGI members can contribute to this process in three main ways: by providing contributions during the two rounds of consultation, by attending the 8th World Water Forum and by contributing to the AMS online platform and the Online Global Consultation if put in place. Another option could be to consider the organisation of a dedicated meeting of the WGI in Brasilia in 2018, back to back with the 8th World Water Forum.

Group discussion on SDGs, HLP/Global Architecture, World Water Forum

39. WGI members were invited to react to the two presentations based on three following guiding questions: "How are you currently involved in the 2030 Agenda?", "Which global mechanism(s) for supporting water-related goals?" and "What are the main local and national initiatives to foster implementation of water-related SDGs?"

40. A number of interventions related to the SDGs. The Butterfly Effect also called for European and Pan-European countries to have a close look at the SDGs in their own countries. This was the key message which stemmed out of the two meetings organised in the past six months in Bremen, Germany and Brussels, Belgium among 50 European-based NGOs and CSOs. The Butterfly Effect advised the European Commission to maintain the European Water Initiative, which is the only water governance stakeholder platform existing in Europe. The Water Youth Network offered to contribute with the identification of best practices since the organisation is involved and working with partners on the Budapest Water Summit and the road to Brasilia. Deltares invited members to look at their global assessments on floods, droughts, investments and other topics. These assessments support the implementation of the SDGs. AIDA outlined the importance of giving consideration to the legal frameworks that enable the achievement of the SDGs. IWA advocated for a more inclusive approach to implement the SDGs which would include professional bodies, businesses, and civil society and not only intergovernmental mechanisms, given that the level of awareness among citizens regarding the Goals and their implications is rather low at present.

41. Action Against Hunger informed delegates that the closing meeting on the WASH Architecture in New York revealed that 20 UN agencies are working on water. UN Water could take the lead. ACF also noted the limited number of donors and business representatives in the WGI, both being most needed to contribute to the SDGs. The Secretariat explained that WGI membership

currently includes five donor agencies and WBCSD, which can individually and collectively reach out to their constituencies. The issue is to find a balance as not all institutions can be seated around the WGI table. So far the strategy has relied on a mix of individual membership and umbrella organisations which can have a multiplier effect vis-à-vis broader networks and individuals.

42.   Vlakwa drew the attention of members on a document presented by the Water Supply and Sanitation Technology Platform (WssTP) on "The value of water". The document promotes the adoption of new governance models which would involve public authorities, users, and the natural environment. It includes a part on water smart economics, resilience and governance. The Strategic Innovation and Research Agenda (SIRA) also includes a part on non-technical aspects, such as Smart Living Labs Pilots. The consultation on the document will last until September and it is an opportunity for WGI members to provide comments.

43.   Several delegates raised the issue of financing for SDGs. The Butterfly Effect stressed that MDGs were financed creating silos and small projects which resulted in many agencies, NGOs and other players not working together. This should not be repeated. GWP outlined that many audits and evaluations of water projects have shown that even well-intended infrastructures do not always reach expected beneficiaries, so investments are not always as effective as they are thought. GWP invests first in Stakeholder Strengthening within the SDGs framework in order to create an enabling environment for investments to be effective. Hence, GWP focuses on the interface between SDG17 and SDG6. Peter Gammeltoft mentioned that estimates on the amount of money required to reach water and sanitation for all and water security vary. OECD estimates the budgetary need at 25 trillion USD while McKinsey provides an estimate of 13 trillion USD, which corresponds roughly to the annual GDP of the EU. Careful thinking need to be put on the governance required to collect this budget. Turkey outlined that the main finance issue is the size of the official development assistance. Full implementation of the SDGs will not be reached as long as this problem is not solved.

44.   Several interventions related to the High Level Panel and Global Monitoring mechanisms. Brazil suggested inviting representatives from South America in the High-Level Panel on Water. The Butterfly Effect agreed for the need to establish an intergovernmental commission on water as soon as possible. It could be a functional commission from ECOSOC. UN Water could fill in some of the operational gaps of this commission but not all of them. It is also essential that stakeholder involvement is initiated upfront.

45.   Some interventions focused on the implementation framework for SDGs. The Open University reiterated the need to teach and promote knowledge on water and on the global agendas. Germany stressed the importance of policy coherence among water, food and energy. Germany also outlined the need for a harmonised approach regarding the monitoring of the SDGs, particularly between the Joint Monitoring Programme and the Global Environmental Management Initiative. Korea mentioned the ongoing Policy Dialogue carried out with OECD and how the use of the OECD Principles on Water Governance in a flexible way can support reform implementation in countries. The European Commission is committed to engage stakeholders in the implementation of the 2030 Agenda through a step-by-step approach. The European Commission will publish this year a communication on SDGs where the links between EU policies and SDGs goals will be mapped. This will enable to highlight the value-added of the EU on the SDGs. In the area of water this link is very clear through the work that has been conducted with member states. Moreover, the revised version of the European Consensus on Development, which is a policy statement that commits the EU to eradicating poverty and building a fairer and more stable world, is currently under preparation and will also include a pillar on water. Since the adoption of the Water Framework Directive, the Common Implementation Strategy formed by EU member countries and stakeholders has provided insights on

the implementation of water-related policies, which can now contribute to the mapping of EU policies with SDGs goals.

46.   UN Water explained that indicators are being discussed by statisticians, while goals were developed and discussed by Ministers of Foreign Affairs; this means that the disconnection between technical and political approaches needs to be addressed in some cases. This holds particularly true as some indicators that might not be statistically meaningful could still be useful for the monitoring. Though the issue of legal frameworks is not explicitly stated in SDG6, it is at the core of SDG6.5 on IWRM and the two targets on means of implementation. All countries will report every year to UNDESA in order to publish a monitoring report. These global indicators do not prevent countries from using other, more local, indicators as appropriate. WHO pointed out that the global monitoring is translated in-country by an entire process at lower scales. For example, GLAAS is a global initiative that is trickled down at country level through promoting the use of multi-stakeholder platforms to discuss the questionnaire. Governments are therefore encouraged to include diverse stakeholders in the monitoring process.

Sharing key messages on water governance from recent and forthcoming events

STAR-FLOOD Conference

47.   Utrecht University shared the outcomes of the STAR-FLOOD Conference held in Brussels, Belgium on the 4-6 February 2016. The conference celebrated the end of the Strengthening and Redesigning European FLOOD risk practices: towards appropriate and resilient flood risk governance arrangements (STAR-FLOOD) project. The project assessed flood risk governance arrangements from a combined public administration and legal perspective, with the aim to make European regions more resilient to flood risks. The project included six consortium countries and 18 case studies across these countries (Belgium, England, France, Poland, Sweden and The Netherlands). It investigated five strategies for dealing with flood risks in each vulnerable urban region: risk prevention, flood defence, flood mitigation, flood preparation and flood recovery. The project concluded that a diversification of strategies could enhance flood resilience but warned that diversification may also lead to fragmentation in roles and responsibilities and emphasised the importance of bridging mechanisms in that respect. Even though all OECD Principles on Water Governance can be applied to flood risk management, the STAR-FLOOD project focused on some of them, which were considered more prominent in flood-prone contexts: roles and responsibilities, appropriate scales, policy coherence, financing, regulatory frameworks, innovative governance, stakeholder engagement, trade-offs and monitoring and evaluation. Key messages include the importance of taking into account the national legal, social, physical, political and economic context when managing flood risks as there is no 'one size fits all' solution. The project also recognised the variety and intensity of stakeholder participation processes within and across sample countries.

3rd ICPDR Ministerial Meeting

48.   The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) held its 3rd Ministerial Meeting on the 9 February 2016 in Vienna, Austria since the creation of the ICPDR in 1998, the two previous ones dating back to 2004 and 2010. The Danube River Basin is the "most international river" as it extends into the territories of 19 countries. It is among the best coordinated transboundary river basins with 15 contracting parties, a permanent secretariat, eight expert groups and four task groups. The 3rd Ministerial Meeting adopted the 2016 Danube Declaration and ministers endorsed politically the updated Danube River Basin Management Plan and Danube Flood Risk Management Plan. Countries reiterated their commitment to further reinforce transboundary cooperation on sustainable water resource management within the Danube region through the

Declaration, which provides guidance beyond the working programs (plans) and adds political priority and weight to specific aspects of ICPDR's work. It is of high relevance as not all Contracting Parties are Member States in the European Union.

Water Economic Forum

49.   The 1st Water Economic Forum was organised in Madrid on 8 April 2016 with the objective to gather a Nobel prize in economics, Finn E. Kydland from Norway, renowned experts on the topic and to reach out to the wider public through journalists in order to raise awareness on the importance of sound water economics as key elements of water governance. The OECD Principles on Water Governance were presented by the OECD at the first event (a 2nd and 3rd forum will be held in July and November). They all convey the idea that governance is essential to provide the enabling conditions for sound water management. The April Forum presented lessons learned in advanced countries and regions (e.g. Australia, California) which have faced significant challenges to properly manage their water resources despite advanced technologies and knowledge. These experiences provide a useful basis for the discussions of WGI working group on (best) practices. Another key message was on sequence and reforms. Sometimes reforms do not work, not because the reform is bad or the instrument is wrongly designed, but simply because it comes at a bad timing. This message is also linked to the idea of factoring in transaction costs. Discussions also highlighted the critical need to redefine the role of the public and private sectors and to reassess their compatibility, especially for innovations. Macroeconomic conditions are currently favourable to invest in replacing assets in cities but hindered by financial consolidation efforts and related constraints. The issue of water security was also brought up as a cross-cutting element in all these discussions. This stems from the recognition that there can be situations (e.g. in Peru or the Pacific Coast) where water utilities are working optimally but with no water to serve. Finally, the Forum identified the need to take into consideration certain challenges that are invisible in countries with universal coverage and therefore tend to be overlooked, as is the case of WASH in Spain for example.

Adaptation Futures 2016

50.   WIN presented a session that was organised on the OECD Principles on Water Governance during the Adaptation Futures 2016 conference which took place in Rotterdam on 10-13 May 2016. This edition was the 4th international climate change adaptation conference. The aim of the conference was to move climate change adaptation forward by promoting solutions across sectors, borders and communities. Overall, the conference welcomed more than 2500 participants. The session on the OECD Principles focused on the trust and engagement cluster. It identified promising approaches for adaptive water governance and key areas of learning linking the implementation of the principles to building climate resilience. After a brief presentation of the OECD Principles on water governance, various country practice cases as well as research findings were briefly presented showing the relevance of different principles as building blocks for good policies in different contexts. The participants joined case-inspired round table groups to debate the potential benefits of using the OECD Principles as a common framework.

51.   The conclusions relate to the need for the structural inclusion of integrity in integrated water resources management in river basins, and in climate adaptation more broadly, to help mitigate devastating impacts of drought and floods whilst ensuring trade-offs between users with fairness and equity. There was also a call for identifying and sharing good practices around OECD principles on trust and engagement. This would allow developing a holistic approach encompassing water infrastructure, food, and energy security and ultimately better adapt to climate change. It was outlined that trust and engagement was essential to support climate change adaptation strategic agreements, but that focusing on trust and engagement could become more difficult when budgets get tight, time gets

scarce and decisions have negative impacts on certain stakeholders. Another key message was that aligning with people's own priorities for project ownership and sustainability increases cost effectiveness of measures, provided that accountability between state, citizens and services providers is well organised. It was recognised that corruption is a disease that most harms children, women, the poor and the powerless. It undermines the global ability to provide food, water and energy security for all, to achieve the SDGs and to adapt to climate change.

10th INBO International General Assembly

52.   INBO presented the outcomes of its 10th International General Assembly which took place in Merida, Mexico from 1-4 June 2016. The General Assembly was divided into four roundtables on adaptation to climate change; mandate, composition, roles and means of basin councils and committees; sustainable basin management planning and funding; and participation of the economic sector and citizens. The four tables all addressed issues of food security, health security, water security and water governance. The key event resulted in a call for action to create a special task force on water management at basin levels linked to the High Level Panel on Water; to integrate and strengthen water management at river basin level; to commit to international cooperation in order to address water security in high level; to commit to solidarity and ethics principles to ensure good water governance of the basins facing increased risks; and to create regional networks for sharing knowledge, innovations and technologies. The final resolutions of the meeting were to strengthen regional networks to become real resource centres; to endeavour access to international resources to reduce gaps in institutional/infrastructure developments; to build national, regional and international capacities seeking the gradual implementation of new models; to promote modernisation and efficient operation of monitoring systems; to create water information systems and to improve results indicators on sustainable basin management, especially within the WGI.

NARBO IWRM Training

53.   NARBO has disseminated the OECD Principles on Water Governance through workshops and training courses on IWRM in Asia. The trainings helped collecting views and good practices from IWRM practitioners in the field and identifying obstacles to IWRM implementation. Based on these insights, NARBO developed the "IWRM Indicator" based on UNESCO's "IWRM Spiral". The indicator aims at assessing the status of IWRM implementation in countries and is expected to contribute to achieve the IWRM target in the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One training course was held in Bangkok, Thailand on 14-16 June, 2016 on the topic "IWRM under Climate Change". Approximately 50 government officials from eight countries joined. In-depth discussions took place on how to use the Principles to overcome the obstacles to IWRM implementation. NARBO is playing the role of an "interpreter" to link international discussions, such as WGI plenary meetings, with voices from the field. WRM practitioners present at the meeting were eager to know how to use indicators and good practices to actually implement the Principles on the ground and identify water governance gaps and ways forward. Such feedback from the field could be useful to feed discussions within WGI working groups and ultimately achieve SDGs targets on water.

2016 World Water Week

54.   SIWI introduced the 2016 World Water Week to be held in Stockholm, Sweden from 28 August to 2 September 2016 under the theme "Water for Sustainable Growth". Several events will be related specifically to water governance. A full day seminar will take place on the 31 August on "Good water governance for inclusive growth and poverty reduction". The seminar is convened by the Water Research Commission from South Africa, IWMI, the Catholic University of Chile, and the OECD, The seminar will be organised around three main blocks on tools and methodologies, case

studies and indicators for good water governance. Other water governance events include sessions on city-wide sanitation services; bridging marine and freshwater SDGs; women's invisible water work; realizing SDG's through sanctions, rewards, and learning from experiences; enhancing water governance and integrity for sustainable growth in Middle East and North Africa; and accountability for sustainable delivery of water sanitation and hygiene services in Fragile States.

Budapest Water Summit

55.   Hungary informed delegates about the Budapest Water Summit to be held in Budapest, Hungary on 28-30 November 2016. The 2013 Summit was instrumental in fostering the inclusion of a dedicated water SDG in the 2030 Agenda. The 2016 Summit will take place half way between the Daegu 2015 and the Brasilia 2018 World Water Fora. Thus, the Summit will be a crucial milestone in the implementation of SDG6 and water-related aspects of the Paris Climate Agreement. To do this, a pragmatic, solution-oriented approach is advocated, open to innovative and cost-efficient technologies and methods which can be operationalised through bankable projects as soon as possible. Other aims of the Summit include linking political decision-making and technology development, financing and public perceptions on sustainable water management, and facilitating the reform of the international institutional architecture supporting cooperation on water. To this end the Budapest Declaration 2016 is expected to summarise viable proposals for the High Level Panel on Water, the United Nations, the World Bank Group, regional development banks and other relevant actors and international fora. The Summit includes six thematic plenary sessions, each introduced by three keynote speeches to be delivered by representatives of a developing country, a developed country and an international organization/NGO. Keynote speeches will be followed by Davos-style discussions with distinguished panellists. Parallel events will include a Science and Technology Forum, a Civil Society Forum, a Youth Forum, a Women's Forum and a Sustainable Water Solutions Expo. Registration to the Summit is upon invitation.

3rd International Water Regulators Forum and Water Scarcity and Drought Summit

56.   IWA introduced the Third International Water Regulators Forum which will take place as part of the IWA World Water Congress and Exhibition 2016 from 9-14 October 2016 in Brisbane, Australia. The Congress focuses on providing new networking and business opportunities and ensuring maximum exposure to leading practices, innovations and solutions. The Water Regulators Forum will take place on the second day of the Congress, 10th of July. The forum provides a platform for regulatory authorities from all over the world for exchanging experiences, transferring skills and building new partnerships. This year, high level water services regulatory authorities and their interlinks with public health and environmental regulators will meet their peers from related sectors, to build the foundations of an effective strategy for resilience in the provision of these services and progressing the principles as articulated in the Lisbon Charter for their application in the context of resilient water systems. Three themes will be offered: regulatory and enforcement regimes for future quality service, balancing resilience while ensuring affordable services, and governance for sustainable urban environments. Another event which will take place in the frame of the IWA Congress is the Water Scarcity and Drought Summit. The Summit is expected to deliver the following outcomes: exchange and cooperation amongst leading professionals, and policy and decision makers on water scarcity and drought management; an initial consensus on measuring water scarcity supporting the implementation of SDG 6.4; and participants' endorsement for a "Global Drought Initiative" to strengthen international co-operation and financing to tackle water scarcity and drought. To support the Regulators Forum's focus on resilience, a working group has been established to look at resilience through a regulatory lens, to identify which resilience regulatory functions are in place and detect the gaps, especially within the interfaces between environment, health and economics. Interested WGI members are welcome to join the working group.

XVIth IWRA World Water Congress

57.   The [XVIth IWRA World Water Congress](#) "Bridging Science and policy" will take place in Cancun, Mexico from 29 May to 2 June 2017. The first congress took place in Chicago, USA in IWRA congresses are meant to be a global meeting place for water stakeholders and professionals to share experiences and present new knowledge, research results and developments. The Congress also supports the identification of major global themes concerning the water agenda and the development and implementation of policy decisions. The XVIth Congress includes six themes (water, sanitation and health; water quality, wastewater and reuse; water security in a changing world; water policy and governance; water ecosystems and physical regimes; water and sustainable growth) and three cross-cutting issues (bridging science and policy, building capacity and stakeholder participation). Abstracts and special sessions are to be submitted by 1 September 2016, while full papers are expected by January 1st 2017. Deadline for Side Events proposals is November 1st 2016. Registration will open in September 2016 and results for Side Events approval will be provided in February 2017.

Group discussion on recent and forthcoming water-related events

58.   Some members drew the attention of WGI delegates on other important events to be held in the coming months where water governance should feature. The [Fourth Istanbul International Water Forum](#) will be organised by the Turkish Water Institute (SUEN) on 10-11 May 2017. The Forum takes place every three years. This year's theme will be "peace and water", in relation to the proximity between Turkey and Syria. The focus will be on the implementation of the SDGs in war-torn areas, water governance and peace building, migration and access to water and sanitation in overcrowded cities. Further detailed information will be available in the upcoming months. The first announcement will be made by the end of the summer. The OECD is welcome to have a special event as it did during the 3nrd Forum in 2014. Korea will host the Korean International Water Week from 19 to 22 October 2016. An [International Conference on Water Security for Climate Justice](#) will be organised in Rabat, Morocco on 11-12 July 2016, and include a session on Climate Change Finance Mechanisms to be moderated by the OECD. The [Africa Water Week](#) will also take place from 18th to 22nd of July 2016 focusing on SDGs monitoring and climate issues. Aqua Publica Europea will organise a seminar on water affordability on 20 October 2016, presenting a mapping of affordability approaches in the European water sector. IRSTEA will hold a training course on facilitating adaptation of catchment and water management strategies to climate change as a side event of COP22. The 4-day course is based on a south-south approach to equip local actors working on climate change adaptation with innovative tools. One of the issues that will be addressed is how the OECD water governance principles can be implemented at local level in developing countries.

59.   The Netherlands announced that a new [Coalition of 12 delta countries](#) (the Netherlands, Bangladesh, Colombia, Egypt, France, Myanmar, Indonesia, Japan, Mozambique, the Philippines, South Korea and Vietnam) was launched during the Adaptation Futures climate conference in Rotterdam in May 2016. The intention is to broaden the Delta Coalition to other governmental and non-governmental organisations. The aim of the Delta Coalition is three-folds: 1) work together to put the urbanising delta on the worldwide agenda; 2) facilitate exchange in knowledge; 3) promote practical implementation and co-operation between those delta countries.

Peer-review: Applying the OECD Principles to the Case of Floods

Flood Risk Governance: A Shared Responsibility

60.   Emeline Hassenforder, from the OECD, presented the draft paper prepared by the Secretariat "Flood Risk Governance: A Shared Responsibility". The paper is part of a broader project aiming to

support the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance in interested countries, through more specific guidance in the different sub-sectors of water management.

61.	Floods affect OECD countries, their policies and their economies. Today, between 100 and 200 million people per year are victims of water-related disasters. Almost two-thirds of the victims can be attributed to floods. Economic losses due to water-related disasters are estimated to range between USD 50-100 billion per year between 1980 and 2009. Other losses may include damage to the environment and to the cultural heritage.

62.	Countries face four types of challenges when managing water resources: too much water, too little water, too polluted water, including the disruption to freshwater systems, and access to water and sanitation services. This paper focuses on the "too much water" component and aims at supporting the transition from crisis management to risk management. It applies the OECD Principles to the case of floods, building also on the guidance from the OECD Recommendation on the Governance of Critical Risks and the OECD "Water Security for Better Lives" report. It also integrates reflections from regulations and good practices such as the EU Floods Directive, the EU Water Framework Directive, STAR-FLOOD project as well as from basin flood risk management plans like the Danube and the Rhine.

63.	The paper has four main targets and added-values. First, it provides detailed guidance on how to implement the Principles in a specific subsector. The paper includes a checklist for each principle to assess whether framework conditions are in place to manage identified risks. Second, it looks at stakeholders' roles as shared responsibilities for dealing with "too much water" and thus complements the guidance provided to central governments, in particular ministries in charge of civil protection by looking at the role of local authorities, citizens, insurance companies and other stakeholders. Third, the paper supports the discussion on indicators under the development by the WGI for selected water management functions. Finally, this paper also contributes to the collection of good practices on flood risk governance.

64.	The paper considers five stages of flood risk management: anticipation, prevention/mitigation, preparation, response and recovery. The stages proposed are a combination of the classification proposed by the EU Floods Directive, the OECD Recommendation on the Governance of Critical Risks, insights from literature, and the experience of OECD (non-EU) countries. The prevention/mitigation – preparation – response – recovery framework, also known as "comprehensive flood management", is recognised globally, including by UNISDR. It was developed more than three decades ago by the United States and adopted globally thereafter. The framework has since then encountered criticisms, one of them being that flood managers are unable to "prevent" floods, which is why "mitigation" is sometimes preferred to "prevention". The second criticism is that this framework omits "anticipation" or "foresight", which is why it was decided to include it in this paper as a fifth stage.

65.	For each principle, the paper proposes a checklist which includes three main clusters: diagnostic, impacts and mechanisms. The cluster on "diagnosis" aims at assessing how each principle is currently put into practice in a specific case. For principle 2 on scale for instance, the checklist asks at which scale the five flood risk management functions are primarily managed. The cluster on "impact" looks at the potential governance gaps and their impacts. For Principle 2, this translates into a question on the challenges towards vertical coordination. Finally, the cluster on "mechanisms" investigates coordination mechanisms, for example to know whether flood risk management plans are consistent with national policies and local conditions or which multi-level and riparian co-operation mechanisms are in place among users, stakeholders and levels of government for the management of

flood risks. The objective of the paper is to suggest a menu of options to ensure the enabling environment targeted by the OECD Principles is in place for the case of floods.

66.   The paper is the first phase of a broader analysis. Next steps will consist in collecting case studies and making a comparative analysis in order to draw hypothesis on what works best and where. Contributing with a case study will entail "ticking boxes" in the checklist, providing a short paragraph introducing the case and peer-reviewing the comparative analysis. A call for case studies will be extended to all WGI members in September. A more advanced OECD working paper will be prepared based on the comparative analysis. A scientific contribution may also be foreseen based on the working paper results. More broadly, OECD's ambition is to make a similar exercise to apply the principles to other sub-sectors such as droughts and groundwater.

Peer-review discussion

67.   WGI members were invited to react on the content of the paper, the checklist, and the methodology proposed. They were also invited to provide examples outside EU and guidance on how to select case studies, ensure their comparisons and replicability, and foster greater integration between water and spatial planning.

68.   Utrecht University congratulated the OECD for the paper and pointed out three comments. First, the role of citizens and land-users is downplayed (page 11). The German flood competence centre is developing a flood label system for buildings, which could be used for Principle 1 on roles and responsibilities in the paper. Second, land-owners are an important stakeholder which is missing (paragraph 55). Third, the word equity should be changed to justice when it is mentioned that different stakeholders have different perspectives on equity (page 40). The word equity refers to the ideas developed by John Rawls and disregards other conceptions of justice. Rawls' initial theory of justice revolves around the adaptation of two fundamental principles of justice which would guarantee a just and morally acceptable society. The first principle guarantees the right of each person to have the most extensive basic liberty compatible with the liberty of others. The second principle states that social and economic positions are to be to everyone's advantage and open to all.

69.   IMDEA highlighted that green infrastructures, such as natural water retention measures, are downplayed in the paper. Many EU projects aiming at implementing the WFD and the Flood Directive provide valuable examples of the multi-functionality of nature-based approaches. Other critical elements to be mentioned are upstream - downstream benefit sharing and incentives that need to be put in place to expand these ecosystem-based approaches.

70.   Transparency International advised to look beyond flood risks and focus on the lessons-learned in managing floods in conjunction with other natural risks, for example learning from the research carried out after the tsunami in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Pakistan. In particular, looking at Principle 9, reconstruction after floods are areas that are vulnerable to corruption. Transparency International's work on humanitarian aid corruption risks could be relevant to set the scene.

71.   Dundee University stressed that the section on "impacts" under the checklist of Principle 2 (scale) is worded in a negative manner. Dundee University suggested replacing it by asking informants to rate the degree of importance of these challenges rather than assuming ex ante that there are challenges. It was also recommended to use a different definition of floods, such as the one suggested by the EU Floods Directive. The one currently used in the paper considers a small rise in the water level as a flood. Finally, the document was considered too EU-centric.

72.   Deltares proposed to consider a self-assessment of each principle by asking informants whether the principle is relevant for them and whether they comply with it. Secondly, Deltares wondered why the notions of effectiveness, efficiency and trust and engagement did not appear in the assessment of the outcomes and results of flood risk governance.

73.   WIN requested more explanation on how the thorough and long checklist is expected to be used in different situations. Floods and droughts often occur at different places at different times or even occur at the same time on the same place. Not every flood or drought is a disaster. Managing floods is about managing situations. The paper does not pay enough attention to these distinctions. WIN also suggested a flexible approach using part of the checklist on some cases, but not necessarily systematically the entire checklist in all situations.

74.   GWP offered to include the paper in a module that they are currently developing with the World Bank, IWMI and the University of South Florida on urban flood management. The module is part of a package called Integrated Urban Water Management. GWP also reiterated the need to strengthen insights in the paper on green infrastructures, green cities and benefits that can be extracted from floods, by looking at the flood path, early warning systems and awareness of communities.

75.   WBCSD advised to find a better hook to attract businesses' interest in this kind of exercises. The business community should be very concerned with risks of floods as their assets are at stake. For instance, they can invest in green infrastructures. On Principle 5 on data and information, the paper fails to mention the climate change dimension that actually raises the risk of floods.

76.   The Water Youth Network welcomed the effort and stressed the importance of the intergenerational component and the need to take into account the trade-offs between policies decided now and the impacts they will have in the future. There is currently a lack of alternatives to avoid these inter-temporary trade-offs. The document should state the difference between water governance and water management more explicitly as well as their boundaries. WYPW thanked the OECD for inviting them to be part of the WGI and recalled the role of youth in engaging with communities. Youth often is the stakeholder category that has the more difficulties to cope with climate change and disasters. This should be added in Principle 10.

77.   Open University required more critical thinking to be placed on the recovery dimension as it does not imply only returning to the previous situation but to a better one. Incentive for filling the checklist also needs to be spelled out more explicitly for respondents to participate. Open University also highlighted that various stakeholders may have different perspectives on the same case. One suggestion to take this into account in the comparative analysis is to simply ask informants whether they think that other actors share a similar vision. The process of learning could also be more emphasised in the document. Finally, Open University suggested colouring the wheel of the principles in red, amber, or green in each of the principle's areas to get a picture of where each case study stands in terms of flood risk governance.

78.   ICPDR stressed that good practices at the international level could be better reflected in the paper. Many cooperation mechanisms are in place for transboundary flood management, in addition to the ones cited for the Danube and the Rhine. The EU Common Implementation Strategy provides a platform to agree on views for implementation through the subsidiarity principle. It concerns the river commissions for the Danube and the Rhine, and the eight river commissions within ICPDR countries.

79.   Utrecht University congratulated the OECD for the paper and underlined that on page 40, the focus was on exposed damage (i.e. damage caused by floods), but could also include pre-flood

damage, where measures to prevent floods from happening can also cause losses and damages to small groups of people.

80.   Peter Gammeltoft pointed out that the paper could be improved by addressing trade-offs and synergies between flood management and water management (Principle 1). Regarding land-use, property rights, and green infrastructures, the paper could help to provide alternatives to traditional flood management, and to make sure that more options are considered before decisions are taken. This could go under Principle 8 on innovation. On finance, two additional issues could be mentioned: the use of payment for ecosystem services to finance flood risk measures, and the need for policy continuity in terms of the actions and strategies put in place in between two floods. Finally, securing independent advice can be key for efficient and effective flood risk governance.

81.   NARBO mentioned the meeting of the OECD's High-level Experts and Leaders Panel on Water and Disasters (HELP) in September 2016, which provides a good opportunity to discuss potential collaborations on floods especially as many WGI members are part of it.

82.   The OECD thanked WGI members for their feedback on the draft paper. Comments by delegates will be addressed in the next version of the paper. These include notably:

- up-playing the importance of citizens, youth, land-users and land-owners in Principle 10; replacing the word equity by justice; rewording the section on impacts in Box 2; including pre-flood damage in addition to exposed damage on p.40; mentioning payment for ecosystem services and the need for policy continuity in terms of the actions and strategies put in place in between two floods in Principle 6.

- The authors will also consider incorporating suggested examples, e.g. on the flood label system developed by the German flood competence centre (Principle 1), lessons learned on fighting corruption from post-tsunami reconstruction in Indonesia, Malaysia, and Pakistan (principle 9).

- Further thoughts may be needed on definitions, in accordance with those provided by the EU Floods Directive. The definition of flood recovery adopted in the paper includes the idea of "building back better" and "improving" the situation. The emphasis on "better" recovery could be one of the messages of the paper, depending on the orientation which will stem out of the comparative analysis.

- Under Principle 11, further emphasis will be put on upstream-downstream benefit sharing, temporal trade-offs (e.g. between policies decided now and the impacts they will have in the future), inter-generational linkages as well as the possibility of broadening the scope from flood-drought trade-offs to flood-water trade-offs.

- The authors will also consider more emphasis on green infrastructure, green cities and benefits within Principle 8 on innovative governance, while keeping the focus on decision-making and policy frameworks rather than operational flood management. To that effect, a clarification of the difference between water *governance* and *management* will be specified.

- Regarding impacts' assessment, the paper looks at impacts per principle which, when adding up, will provide a view of the effectiveness, efficiency, and trust and engagement of the various flood risk governance arrangements considered. The authors welcomed the idea of colouring the wheel of the principles in red, amber, or green in each of the principle's areas to get a picture of where each case study stands in terms of flood risk governance.

- Informants will be asked whether the principle is relevant for them and whether they comply with it, and explanations will be provided on the expected informants and how the thorough and long checklist is expected to be used in different situations. Only part of the checklist could

eventually be used in some cases, although the inter-linkages between the different principles call for a more systemic approach when actually using the checklist. One of the incentives is for informants to know more about their own case. This paragraph, and the way the checklist will be promoted, will need to highlight what the interest and incentives for various stakeholders to fill in the checklist is. Businesses for example, may not be interested in looking at existing flood risk governance arrangements but rather at future ones. One option to attract the interest of businesses would be to emphasise how lessons learned from the comparative analysis could provide recommendations on potential future innovative flood risk governance arrangements.

- The authors welcomed the proposition of GWP to include the paper in their module on urban flood management, and potential synergies with the OECD's High-level Experts and Leaders Panel on Water and Disasters (HELP) will also be explored in cooperation with NARBO.

Assessing the Dutch Flood Risk and Delta Programmes

83. Chris Seijger, consultant at Deltares, and Stijn Brouwer, Senior Researcher at the Dutch Watercycle Research Institute (KWR), provided a quick overview of an ongoing project aiming to assess how the Dutch Flood Risk Protection Programme (since its operation in 2011) operates according to the Principles based on an assessment methodology focusing on learning from water governance practices. The HWBP Programme is tasked to reinforce 714 km of (primary) dikes and 264 sluices and has a budget of 4.03 billion € for the period 2011-2018. The assessment is carried out by a group of Dutch partners that are members of the WGI (Deltares, KWR, Erasmus University Rotterdam and Utrecht University).

84. The assessment includes four steps: problem definition; assessment against the OECD Principles and of results in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy; external validation; and learning through a systematic inventory of the lessons that can be drawn from the assessment. Important characteristics of the methodology include an operationalisation of the Principles close to the language of the programme, an online survey, a focus group with experts, desk studies, as well as an external validation. In the last step a learning table with scientists and experts will be organised.

85. The second step (online survey) was divided into three parts. The first part asked respondents to select whether they wanted to assess HWBP as a whole or a specific project. The second part asked the relevance of the OECD principles to the programme/project and the extent to which the programme/project meets this principle. The third part assessed the effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy of HWBP results. Results of the assessment indicate that respondents find all OECD Principles relevant for the programme, except Principle 12 on monitoring and evaluation, which may be explained by the fact that the programme is only at the start. Only four responses were collected but several respondents filled the survey as a group. The programme shows room for improvement in regards to the extent to which it meets the Principles, especially for the first cluster on effectiveness. The survey also goes into the specifics of each principle by formulating propositions to investigate why the programme does or does not meet this specific principle.

86. Four insights came out of the focus group discussion. In terms of policy coherence, integrating flood control projects with other interests and domains should be done at the local or regional level. A second insight was that capacity becomes a major challenge due to ageing of flood control experts and expected workload and complexity. The third insight concerns new regulatory frameworks on water safety norms which make flood control projects complex. Finally, innovative governance practices were seen by the group as an opportunity for experimentation but questions were raised regarding the contribution of these practices to cost reductions in flood control projects and the willingness of regional water authorities to adopt such practices. Focus group discussions among

regional water authorities helped participants to come to a shared perception on how the Programme functions.

87.   Interviews provided a perspective of 'involved outsiders' as to how the Programme functions in light of the Principles. Interviews highlighted debates regarding the allocation of roles and responsibilities between the Programme staff and regional water authorities who are responsible for the projects. An interesting observation is that integrity was found to be a "blind spot" not often discussed among stakeholders. Finally, equity issues and trade-offs are primarily discussed outside of the programme, at the national level for flood risk protection norms and at the local or regional level.

88.   Overall, lessons learned from this assessment are that the Principles need to be translated to the particular context of the Flood Risk Protection Programme. Principles are a useful framework to discuss in a structured manner the various governance aspects of a specific Programme. The early-stage of the programme made it difficult to link the Principles to programme outcomes. In terms of methodology, the project found that using multiple methods is very useful, but can be time-consuming. Leaving out methods is possible, depending on purpose. Group meetings is a relevant method but difficult to schedule with high-level experts.

Presentation of a Prize from the International River Foundation

89.   Miguel Angel Ródenas Cañada, President of the Segura River Basin Authority, presented the Segura River Project which has recently been awarded the International River Foundation's 2016 European River*prize*. The prize recognises the river's return to health following extensive restoration efforts over the past thirty years. This basin has the lowest rainfall index in continental European Union, but exceptional climate for crops production. Agriculture is the basis of the socioeconomic system in the region and it is estimated that every European citizen consumes around 10kg of fruits and vegetables produced in the basin district.

90.   In the 90s, the Segura river basin district was dirty, lifeless, and smelly, due to great stress on the available water resources and pollution of urban and industrial wastewater discharges. In 1998, the civil society organised protests in Madrid to demonstrate against the deplorable status of the river. After the 1995 National water management plan was passed, and pushed by the demonstrations, the national government signed an agreement with the basin district to revert the situation of the river. The core policies of the agreement encompassed *i)* infrastructure development; *ii)* controlling industrial wastewater discharges; and, *iii)* enforcing the "polluter pays" principle. A master plan was designed to develop in 10 years' time an urban water reclamation and reuse system, with the main objective to increase water supply to agriculture and recover the polluted Segura river. A total of 46 new and advanced wastewater treatment plants were constructed, and over 90% of the treated water in these plants now supplies reclaimed water to the agriculture industry which rapidly boomed after Spain became a member of the European Union. This once polluted and water-stressed river in Europe's driest basin has been transformed from an exposed sewer to a healthy, vibrant river, home to otter, migratory birds, and other flora and fauna, and the reuse of irrigation water has allowed increased agricultural, leisure and recreational activities. The Segura river management has then been praised as an example of an integrated approach with environmental, social and economic restoration activities. The established management framework includes a solid science foundation and shared governance, while the catchment management planning process was ahead of the European legislation requirement.

Sharing knowledge on water governance research, reforms, projects, publications

Building Blocks for Good Water Governance

91.   The 2nd Edition of the book "Building Blocks for Good Water Governance" is a product of the Dutch Water Governance Centre which ceased its activities earlier this year. The earlier version of the book started by a chapter explaining the three-layer model of water governance, followed by a list of five elementary building blocks for good water governance (chapters 2 to 6): a powerful administrative organisation of water management, a legally embedded system of water law, an adequate financing system, a systematic (planning) approach, and the participation of stakeholders. The second version of the book includes two additional chapters. Chapter 7 underlines the necessity of cooperation in water management and gives some valuable examples. Chapter 8 – as a case study - reviews the Awash River Basin in Ethiopia through the building blocks for good water governance. For each element, the Dutch situation is briefly described. Chapter 5 on financing pleads for the introduction of an international standard for water governance, whereby 1% of each country GDP minimum should be dedicated to water management (Netherlands' investments amount to 1.26%). The chapter also includes information about the Dutch Water Boards Bank. NWB Bank's current balance-sheet totals over 88 billion euros and each year around 5 billion euros in new loans are granted. The Principles on Water Governance are presented and compared to the three layer model of water governance introduced in the book.

Social sustainability in the urban water sector

92.   AEAS presented various mechanisms of social action implemented in the urban water sector in Spain to ensure the affordability of water and sanitation services for economically disadvantaged groups. The Spanish National Law establishes that water is of public ownership and that water supply is the highest priority amongst other uses. Spain has a universal access to drinking water and sanitation. Spain signed the UN Resolution 64/292 which recognizes the human right to drinking water and sanitation. In Spain in general, water tariffs comprise a fixed part and a variable part (which depends on consumption) and are progressive, following a block system of consumption with increasing prices. The cost of water represents, on average, 0.9% of the households' incomes. The aftermath of the economic crisis saw an increase in the aid provided to disadvantaged groups either through discounts applied in the tariff structures or solidarity funds, which are not associated with the tariff structure itself and are based essentially on income criteria. According to a survey carried out by AEAS and ECODES in 2014, on a sample of 15 million people, more than 90% lived in municipalities with some type of mechanisms of social action. Ten key messages stem out of this survey:

- Drinking water, as a Human Right, must have an affordable price;

- The broad coverage of mechanisms of social action shows the sensitivity of water service providers towards disadvantaged groups;

- The increased number of families with difficulties to pay for their water bill suggests the need of improving and standardising social assistance for water services;

- Mechanisms of social action should take into account income criteria and should be designed and applied based on socio-economic analysis which consider particularities of each municipality;

- Although social entities and services are responsible for determining who are the beneficiaries of these mechanisms, service providers should increase collaboration with them in the search of solutions for disadvantaged groups;

- Service providers should continue to improve transparency, communication efficiency and availability of information, with all involved parties in the urban water cycle, and very especially with consumers;

- Interrupting or cutting off the water supply is a tool that seeks to ensure that those users who can pay for the services, do pay for them;

- Collaboration between social entities and services, service providers and competent authorities should be increased in order to improve the implementation, flexibility and accessibility of mechanisms of social action, especially to avoid cut-offs to those users who cannot pay for their water bills;

- It is necessary to harmonise criteria in urban water sector in Spain and create an independent regulatory body; and

- A Best Practices Guide should be prepared for the design, management and implementation of mechanisms of social action in the urban water sector.

Applying Water Governance to Humanitarian Projects

93.   Action Against Hunger presented key highlights from a recently-launched handbook entitled "Water governance and sanitation applied to humanitarian and development projects". The manual targets managers in emergency and development contexts. The rationale behind the book is that Action Against Hunger carries out 40% of its WASH humanitarian projects in urban areas and 47% in situations of emergency, essentially conflicts and protracted crisis (e.g. Somalia, Lebanon, Ukraine). Water governance context is extremely complex in these contexts, especially in urban areas of fragile states. Disruptions can happen in the governance structure, which can be used as an opportunity to rebuild better. To do this, the book applied the OECD Principles to humanitarian settings. The overall analysis shows that in cases of crisis, the *effectiveness* and *trust and engagement* clusters are the most relevant, in addition to some principles from the cluster on *efficiency* such as innovative governance. In each of the case studies analysed, an institutional mapping was drawn, followed by a diagnosis of the governance gaps. In order to identify and bridge these gaps, capacity-building (e.g. in Guinea) or evidence-based advocacy (e.g. in the Philippines) was put in place in the cases covered by the book. The study shows that access to water of the poorest populations improves with intervention of NGOs.

Drinking Water and Sanitation in France: at which price?

94.   France recently released a report from the Environment General Inspectorate entitled "Which price for water and sanitation services?". The report aims at accompanying a revolution of the water sector's institutions and governance in France. Water and sanitation services in France are considered in the report of good quality and not too costly. The average price is 4€/m3, fully financed by the water price without subsidies from the State. France has more than 24,000 drinking water and sanitation service providers with around 800 calls for bidding per year. This competition on the water market provides reasonable price and productivity increase, except in small services. Statistics on prices are difficult to establish since each local authority has its own single price. Hence the conventional price is calculated for a reference consumption of 120 m3/subscriber/year. With the ongoing territorial reform, it is expected that most local authorities will merge in the coming five years, with the number of service providers going from 24 000 to 2 000 in the country. With this reform, new regulation and control become necessary and information on performance and costs should be easier to collect. In order to accompany these changes, the report makes several recommendations. First, the water information system (SISPEA) will be improved, with existing performance indicators being complemented by new structured data on costs and explanatory factors. Second, individual water consumption and bills will be compared to individual incomes. Households

spending more than 3% of their income for water bills will receive financial support. Fifty experiments regarding social tariffs will be carried out, including enquiries on real individual bills. Finally, a national Pact for water and sanitation services performance and costs will be negotiated between local authorities and private companies under the strategic supervision of the State.

Group discussion on the first set of presentations

95.   Peru shared its experience in regards to the key messages of the book "Building blocks for good water governance". Regarding point 6 of the book on the legal framework, the Peruvian water legal framework was issued in 2009. At the same time the National Water Authority started working as a single and multi-sectoral agency responsible for both water regulation and policy making. Water councils were created at the basin level as platforms where different actors meet to take decisions on water quantity, quality, flood and drought. About financing issues, in Peru water pays water. The National Water Authority, a deconcentrated agency of the Peruvian national government, does not receive any budget transfers from the central government.

96.   The Netherlands outlined similarities between the Peruvian and Dutch cases. In the Netherlands, the National Water Policy comes from the Ministry and Provinces, but is implemented at decentralised levels through the regional water authorities. The Regional Water Authorities are 95% self-supported. The only subsidies from the central government are for strengthening primary dikes but Regional Water Authorities pay half of the costs. On average a family in the Netherlands pays 300 EUR to the Regional Water Authority for wastewater treatment plants, water quantity, dikes and other water and sanitation services.

97.   Vlakwa mentioned that municipalities in Flanders, Belgium imposed drinking water companies to lead initiatives towards a more rational water use. But since this would lower the income of those companies, discussions are currently ongoing to know how this financial gap would be compensated, for instance by increasing water tariffs. Similar processes exist in the energy sector where energy companies are compelled by law to take initiatives towards a more rational water use and incorporated the costs into electricity prices. Vlakwa wondered whether similar experiences existed elsewhere. The Chair pointed out that in the Netherlands when the consumption went down 10%, then the price per litre (or cubic meter) went up 8%. So, when the two are combined the total is lower, but the financial calculation is complicated to explain to consumers. France explained that this topic was currently being discussed through a new law proposal. The proposal suggested raising a new tax on bottled water, but it was rejected. Another experiment is currently being carried out in the electricity sector, but there will be additional funds for people that cannot afford to pay the electricity.

98.   The OECD argued that many OECD countries face challenges to mobilise the funding that is actually needed to cover the investments required in the water sector, especially for renewing infrastructures, and especially in the tight fiscal context which makes it difficult to rely heavily on public spending as in the past. But another equally important issue is how investment needs can be minimised and how to document opportunity costs to ensure that decisions taken today are not generating future liabilities for the next generation. It was noted that in the Netherlands, the regional water authorities are a functional democracy with taxation power, which can be explained by the specificities of a country mostly located below sea level and subject to the risk of submersion. These authorities have had the capacity to collect sufficient revenues to cover their investments. But the question is whether the revenues collected are invested in the optimal choices in terms of infrastructure and who is documenting the opportunity costs in the absence of independent information at an arm's length from water authorities. This holds particularly relevant when it comes to striking a balance between the choice of going for large scale infrastructure rather and more low cost options that build on policy complementarities with other areas (land use, spatial planning, etc.). Independent

information does not necessarily mean independent regulation, as there is a menu of options to go beyond the current benchmarking exercises in the Netherlands (e.g. resorting to an observatory, NGOs, academia, etc.) The Netherlands emphasised that elected boards are the ones determining the tariffs and are not keen to raise them. The approval of provinces or ministries is not needed. Benchmarks are regularly carried out on a voluntary basis to reduce unnecessary increases in tariffs. The Netherlands do not see the need for an independent regulator, which can be financially cumbersome when its duties can be carried out through stakeholder democracy, benchmarking and transparency.

99. The OECD also wondered whether the establishment of independent regulators that is being discussed in Spain has gone hand in hand with a consolidation of the industry to reach a size in terms of utilities that allows the economic regulator to deliver its functions (which is difficult in a fragmented setting). AEAS stressed that in Spain the challenge was not so much to reduce the number of utilities but rather to harmonise the regulatory framework and have a common process to establish water tariffs. Spain has more than 8 100 municipalities and the vast majority has less than 20 000 inhabitants. Hence many consortia exist and it is difficult to establish a comparative assessment of water prices. The water management model is established by law (local governments are in charge of providing local services) but better coordination and harmonisation is needed overall to have more coherent urban water cycles.

100. Finally, the OECD asked France how the transition and governance "in flux" stemming from the ongoing territorial reforms is being managed in terms of stakeholder engagement (with utilities, and beyond) and which implications should be foreseen across the water cycle in terms of who does what in the different sub-sectors (including flood protection). France agreed that the transition period following the territorial reform would need to be managed and monitored. The transition should be relatively smooth in cities which will enlarge their territories because structured services already exist. More difficulties will probably arise in rural areas where small services will have to be merged.

Strategic Planning for Alpine River Ecosystems (SPARE) Project

101. IRSTEA introduced the [Strategic Planning for Alpine Riverine Ecosystems (SPARE) project](#). SPARE is a European Interreg project dealing with alpine river ecosystems and with a strong focus on river governance. It is inserted in the current Alpine Space Programme. The overall objectives of the project are to capitalize and improve strategic river management approaches across different spatial and governance levels of the Alps and to increase awareness of functions, services and the vulnerability of Alpine river ecosystems for successful protection activities. The project considers the multiple dimensions of Alpine river ecosystems including mountains, glaciers and sky resources. These multi-producer systems are key business dimensions in Austria, Switzerland and Italy (e.g. tourism). The governance in case of conflicting uses of water is addressed with through a balance between tourism, ecosystem preservation and local economic development. The main expected outputs of the project are a collection of river management challenges and best solutions; a set of governance tools ("Toolkit for multi-level participation"); guidance on innovative river protection and management processes across different sectors, spatial scales and administrative levels; an interactive platform for knowledge exchange ("Action and Policy Support Service" or APSS) and a pan-alpine overview of priority rivers with high protection need. The project is led by nine partners and includes the participation of 30 observers, including the WGI. Five pilot river cases will be considered: Drôme, Dora Baltea, Irin/Engadin, the Soča and Upper Austria/ Steyr. They run across France, Italy, Switzerland, Slovenia and Austria. IRSTEA leads the water governance component of the project which aims at fostering integration and implementation of innovative participatory methods and tools in all pilot cases. The [set of participatory methods](#) includes the [CoOPLAaGE toolkit](#) which was used

at the 6th meeting of the WGI , multi-level engagement mechanisms out-scaled to the larger public, a Self-Modelling process for Assessing Governance (SMAG), a pre-participation method (PRE-PAR) to engage stakeholders in designing their own participatory process, a simple wide public discussion toolkit (MyRiverKit) and an Action and Policy Support Service (APSS).

Global Water Studio

102.   The Netherlands presented the Global Water Studio. The initial project was entitled "Global Water Atlas". It was proposed to the High Level Panel on Water by Henk Ovink, Special Envoy of the Netherlands on International Water Affairs and Sherpa in the Panel. The Atlas aimed to provide an up-to-date and coherent picture of global challenges in the area of water through hundreds of maps, photographs, infographics and illustrations. But the Netherlands felt that an Atlas was not enough and that instead, a Studio would be more relevant to tackle complex water management challenges. The studio is designed to be a tool for developing and distributing the global narrative on water and to inspire key partners to take urgent action. The main expected outputs are the Water Atlas, Global Design Competitions and Project Ateliers. The project was inspired by the post Sandy "Rebuild by Design" initiative promoted by the Netherlands in New York. The studio would provide a research environment which would bring stakeholders at all levels together in order to come up with new designs to address water management challenges. The overall aim is to increase global water awareness to develop the new water narrative. The Global Water Studio is a cross-sectoral initiative but which takes water, and SDG6, as an entry point. The initiative recognizes the interdependence of water with other sectors and plans to build upon it to find innovative solutions. However all SDGs cannot be covered with the same level of intensity. The proposal is currently under review by the High Level Panel on Water and the Sherpas. If supported, the Studio should be running by November 2016.

Suez Materiality Survey

103.   Suez presented a materiality survey which was carried out among Suez internal and external stakeholders. The objective of the survey was to identify Suez priority issues both in terms of stakeholders' expectations and business impacts. The methodology was based upon the accountability international standard on materiality and relied mainly on an online survey, which received more than 1500 answers from 49 countries and 7 categories of stakeholders, and internal interviews. Stakeholders' expectations varied widely from one category to another and from a geographical area to another. Priority issues were ranked in a matrix comprising four criteria. The vertical axis assesses the importance of issues for stakeholders based on two criteria: press coverage and results of the online survey. The horizontal axis assesses the impact of issues on Suez business based on two criteria: the maturity of processes associated to the issue and the financial assessment of the impact of the issue over a 5 year period. Nine top priority issues came out of this exercise. The issue that was ranked highest is "optimized management of waste and water for clients" which is Suez core of business. The second issue was governance, including corporate governance and ethics. The first environmental issue to be listed is air pollution and climate, with a total of four issues related to climate. This may partly be explained by the COP21 conference which was held while the survey was taking place. One priority issue which surprisingly came out among the top priorities was "women in leadership position". The results of the materiality survey were used to build the 2016-2020 Sustainable Development Roadmap and to improve Suez reporting to stakeholders and shareholders. An integrated report was also drafted which aims to link the economic, environmental and social aspects of performance. The matrix does not include any non-materiality issue, which can be interpreted as a sign of Suez business' usefulness to society.

104.   SIWI updated members on the latest activities of the Water Governance Facility on integrity. The MENA Water Integrity Capacity Building Programme is currently being implemented by SIWI, IUCN and GWP in five countries (Lebanon, Palestine, Jordan, Tunisia and Morocco). Targeted stakeholders include public officials, operational staff, civil Society and women. So far, more than 500 persons have been trained. To date, 80 participants have been selected for the Action Plan mentoring. The programme includes high-level workshops to raise awareness on integrity risks and possible solutions. In Palestine, a tailor-made training was conducted for the staff of the Palestinian Water Authority. Four regional alumni workshops were also organised to exchange knowledge and experience. Even though the MENA region is undergoing a crisis, there is interest from donors to work there. Integrity is a sensitive issue, especially in this context, but the programme adopted a progressive approach including mainly awareness-raising and capacity-building activities to help stakeholders identify and map integrity-related risks. In some stakeholder groups, such as women's groups, integrity is openly discussed but with public officials it is more difficult. In Lebanon the America University of Beirut decided to carry out a public assessment of integrity risks, which is a major step forward.

105.   Another integrity activity is the Governance Advocacy and Leadership (GoAL) WaSH programme. In El Salvador, a social audit manual was prepared for "Promoting Good Governance in the Torola River Basin". The manual helps communities to relate and exert control over water institutions. In Tajikistan, water supply companies raise transparency and improve cooperation with their consumers. With the support of the programme, they have established Public Advisory Councils, together with the Consumers Union of Tajikistan. The aim of the Councils is to protect the rights and interests of consumers and encourage their participation in decision-making processes. Laos Water utilities have also taken action for improved integrity. In March 2015, four Laotian water utilities from different provinces participated in a water integrity training, conducted with UN-Habitat. The four parties are now engaging in an up-scaling process to improve integrity management across their utility operations. Other integrity activities include the implementation of an Integrity Action Plan developed for the department for delegated water systems of the Costa Rican Water and Sanitation Institute (AyA). In El Salvador, the use of an Integrity Pact in for the National Administration of Water and Sewer (ANDA) Water Utility was tried with success. The bidding process was completed and the Social Monitor published a report evaluating the integrity of the process. A social monitor is now evaluating execution of the works, which is expected to be finished in October 2016.

106.   The Accountability for Sustainability Programme also carried out accountability and regulation modules and mapping exercises in the frame of trainings for UNICEF staff. The programme also made a global analysis on accountability in WASH services based on GLAAS data. Finally, the Water Integrity Global Outlook 2016 was launched in Stockholm. Assessing the impacts of these programmes is difficult because the programmes involve a lot of individual trainings, even though they target more and more organisations and institutions (e.g. Palestinian Water Authority). In the future, developing organisation-wide management plans with indicators would help assess the impacts. At this stage, one can only assess if the individuals trained are actually undertaking their ambassadors' role in their own communities and institutions.

Building River Dialogue and Governance (BRIDGE)

107.   IUCN presented the Building River Dialogue and Governance (BRIDGE) project supported by the Swiss Development Cooperation Agency. The goal of the project is to enhance poverty alleviation, nature conservation and economic growth in target basins through sustainable management and governance of transboundary water resources. The project triggers transboundary changes in water

governance by involving multiple stakeholders at multiple levels (e.g. national governments, municipalities, provinces, civil society) in negotiations of agreements for cooperation on water management. As a union of members including NGOs and governments, IUCN has a privileged place to work on these issues. BRIDGE is now active in 14 river basins. The project started in 2011 in lower Mekong, Central America and the Andes and more recently extended to African regions. The project is inspired by the Water and Nature Initiative, the Volta Basin, the Transboundary Water Assessment Project with UNEP and the Nexus Dialogues. BRIDGE tries to be contextually responsive by designing responses with stakeholders in each river basin. The project builds on five pillars: demonstrations of cooperative actions, providing advice and technical support on water governance and management issues, building dialogue, capacity building and joint learning, and cultivating leadership by supporting water governance champions. The project is divided into four main governance themes: international water law, benefit sharing ("benefit opportunities assessment tool"), national water governance including basin level, and leadership development. The underlying rationale of the project is that Water Diplomacy Practice is an opportunity to create governance changes and move between "hard" governance to "soft" governance.

Group discussion on the 2ⁿᵈ set of presentations and additional insights

108.   Regarding the BRIDGE project, Turkey pointed out that the reality of negotiations of certain memoranda of understanding and agreements sometimes did not even deserve the term "transboundary diplomacy".

109.   GWP offered the Netherlands to put them in contact with Google for a potential partnership. Google is developing technologies on water-related information such as early warning systems and flood patterns identification. Netherlands accepted the offer.

110.   Morocco invited all WGI members to participate in the "Water Security for Climate Justice" conference in Rabat in July 2016 and offered to link with the conference Secretariat to issue customised invitations to interested members. Morocco also announced its willingness to host the 8ᵗʰ meeting of the WGI on 12-13 December in Rabat, one month after COP22. It would be the first WGI meeting to be held in Africa.

Artistic interlude by artist Ap Verheggen

111.   The Hague artist Ap Verheggen revealed his unique sculpture and world's smallest water production device at the end of the day. The sculpture uses solar energy to collect water from the air, thus operating as a fountain. With this project, Ap Verheggen intends to send out a positive message that climate change may also be used to our advantage. The more sun, the higher the temperatures, the more water will be produced. He has constructed this project by combining common, widely available technologies. With this creative concept and its huge potential he hopes to inspire others to embrace and further develop this technology in order to use it in (new) areas facing droughts.

Bottom-up consultations on Water Governance Indicators

Setting the Scene and Working Group Webinar outcomes

112.   The OECD reminded that the objective of identifying water governance indicators was to support the implementation of the OECD Principles. Having a systemic framework to measure water governance allows for greater accountability, transparency and bench-learning within the water policy cycle. But measuring water governance is a challenging task, notably in terms of comparability, continuity, complexity, context uncertainty, construction, causality and completeness. This is why a

scoping note was drafted that frames the work on water governance indicators through ten guiding questions: What is the scope? At which scale? What to measure? Whose views? Which process? Who are the beneficiaries? How will indicators be used? Who will monitor? How to ensure replicability? How to disclose results?

113.   The proposed approach includes three progressive steps: an assessment of framework conditions, measurement of progress and assessment of impacts. In order to prepare the work, the OECD started by making an [inventory](#) of existing water governance indicators and measurement frameworks. The OECD prepared the scoping note to provide a basis for discussion on the scope and approach, and organised webinar on 25th of April 2016 with interested members of the WGI. The webinar gathered 37 participants from 13 countries. Participants reached a consensus on the scope and approach proposed. It was agreed to divide indicators by stage of development of water governance (framework conditions, progress and impacts), to adopt a voluntary approach for collecting data, to link with SDG6 and other SDGs when relevant, to draw synergies with ongoing efforts, processes and WGI members and to disclose information in a user-driven fashion to foster accountability. Following the webinar, a [summary](#) of discussions was drafted, the inventory was analysed in detail in order to sort all existing indicators by principle. This could serve as a basis to see what already exists and choose indicators from the list rather than reinventing them. A preparatory document was drafted by the coordinators of the working group (OECD, ASTEE, INBO and Transparency International) which suggests a proposed methodology to identify indicators.

114.   Several issues were identified for brainstorming within the working group such as: how to include fact-based and perception-based indicators, how to incorporate indicators for all Principles (ideal) vs. indicators referring to specific Principles, how to deal with existing indicators and new ones, how many indicators should be developed and of which type.

Brainstorming in parallel working groups on the draft indicators

115.   Members gathered in five small breakout groups facilitated by the lead coordinators and members of the Steering Committee. The working session aimed to discuss the methodology proposed to identify indicators in the preparatory document distributed to participants. Each group worked on a specific cluster of the 12 principles, i.e. efficiency, effectiveness, trust and engagement and discussed:

- The "**knowledge**" needed for each principle within the assigned cluster,

- The proposed "**stages of development**" of water governance that should be measured for each principle (requirements of the formal context / progress / impacts),

- The proposed "**water management functions**" (IWRM and state of water bodies / Rural and urban drinking water supply / Sanitation services / Beneficial use and reclamation of river basins),

- The proposed "**scales**" (National / Basin / Local),

- The needed **balance** between gathering compelling information by stages of development of water governance, water management functions and scales and the number of indicators that is actually realistic for data to be collected and disclosed from interested cities, basins and countries, and

- Proposals for **next steps** (selection of existing indicators by principle, future meetings of the working group, allocation of roles and responsibilities, etc.).

Report Back to Plenary – key insights from discussions

116.   The first working group on effectiveness, moderated by SIWI with the support of the OECD, advised that the identification of indicators should link to **existing mechanisms** and that indicators should be **easily measurable** by all actors. The group highlighted the need to address potential confusion on the **meaning of "effectiveness''** and its link with impacts. Regarding the matrix, the group agreed that the suggested **scales were appropriate** but that there was a need to **redefine water management functions**. For instance, the IWRM function should reflect the integration of the nexus and acknowledge cross-sectoral dialogue. The group suggested for the second and third functions to be merged (as mentioned in the footnote of the preparatory document p2) but to also include sectoral water uses, such as sanitation. Finally, the group suggested that the fourth function should include ''basin integration'' as there is a need to recognise that basins are physically defined. Regarding the knowledge to be considered for each principle (i.e. content of the tables in the preparatory note), the group **focused on the "impacts'' column** and to a lesser extent on the ''progress'' column since it is difficult to link the impacts to a specific principle without also considering the progress. The group tried to identify **which kind of impacts** should be considered, whether it is impacts on local economies, on the quality of life or on other dimensions. The group suggested that there was a need to **measure investments made** in regards to the various principles. For example, when an investment is made, there should be indicators to assess to what extent other sectors have been integrated. On Principle 1, the group made several proposals for redefining the knowledge which will be sent to the Secretariat. On Principle 2, the group agreed that the indicators listed in the preparatory note were very clear and that it would be easy to translate that into impact indicators. GWP offered its support for that purpose. On Principle 3, the group also agreed on the clarity of the indicators suggested but added that an indicator was needed on mutual cross-sectoral benefits. On Principle 4, the group suggested that it was key to have capacity-building at all levels and all sectors.

117.   The second working group on effectiveness, moderated by INBO with the support of Suez, suggested to **use the water management functions defined in the SDGs**, which are: drinking water supply and sanitation (targets 6.1 and 6.2), scarcity and quality (targets 6.3 and 6.4) and resource management and ecosystems (targets 6.5 and 6.6). The group put on hold the question of what can be called a "disaster" (quantity, quality, pollution?) and where it could be included in terms of water management functions (either with resources and ecosystems or with scarcity). On the question of scales, the group underlined that the terms **"local'' and "regional'' could be used differently** in different places. For instance, ''regional'' may as well be used to talk about an international scale, like the MENA region for instance, then to talk about a subnational scale. The group agreed with the **need to distinguish between urban and rural areas** within the local scale. Two concrete options were suggested for trickling down the indicators by scale: first, to use three scales, namely cross national (including transboundary), national and sub-national, the latest including basins, sub-basins, cities and other local scales. The second option proposed was to use the global, national, regional and local scales. The group indicated its strong preference for the first option since in the second option the term "regional" was misleading as it could be understood as infra-national or inter-national. The group mentioned that it was too early to decide on the total number of indicators that would come from this exercise. Ultimate choices will need to be reasonable in terms of balancing comprehensiveness and feasibility. The group emphasised the need to be flexible and recommended to have **a set of *core* indicators** (10 to 20) backed by **a set of *supporting* indicators.** When entering into the detail of the matrix, the group advised to **use the term ''outputs'' rather than impacts**. The rationale of this statement is that impacts are much broader than outputs and are measured at the end of the process. Therefore, impacts are expected to be similar for all Principles, such as human well-being, good water, enough water or socio-economic development.

118.   The working group on efficiency was moderated by OECD with the support of ASTEE[2]. The working group was very heterogeneous in terms of the positions and countries of origins of participants (regulators, academics, donors, governments, civil society). The methodology suggested in the preparatory document was globally accepted by the group, withstanding several remarks and clarifications. The group agreed that the water management functions used in the preparatory document were **rather clear** but that **some could be merged** for some of the principles. For instance, it was suggested that "IWRM and water bodies' status'' and "rivers reclamation'' would require the same indicator for several principles. Similarly, "water supply'' and "sanitation services'' could be merged. It was also pointed out that the more the functions featured the greater the number of indicators on which data would need to be collected. Regarding the scales, the group also identified the need to **distinguish between rural and urban areas** when it comes to the local scales. It was pointed out that the use of the "national" and "basin" scales were coherent and meaningful. It was further suggested that the scales could also be reorganized and redefined to better reflect their relationship to the regulation of water resources versus the regulation of water services. One key message of the working group was the fact that the **principles are inherently interlinked** and so will the indicators as some indicators developed for one principle could be used for other principles. For instance, principle 5 on data and information is indirectly linked to all the other principles since monitoring them will necessarily bring a need for data. On the other hand, using indicators only once even if they relate to several principles entails that some indicators will not appear under a particular principle since they are assigned elsewhere. A second key message of the working group was that **impacts are more difficult to appraise** than context and progress. In those cases, it was suggested to resort to measuring the framework conditions and progress only. When taking the example of the principles on regulation or innovation for instance, the fact that formal laws are in place or innovations developed does not necessarily mean that they are implemented. Further on innovations, it was stated that qualitative rather than quantitative indicators could be more suitable. Examples could include the evidence of practices for benchmarking or sharing experiences that are conducive to innovations in the sector. The third key message is the fact that even though indicators are designed to be used by decision-makers, they could sometimes be **useful to other stakeholders** as well. For instance, governance of water prices is a matter of interest to all stakeholders, not only decision-makers. The fourth key message relates to the **limited relevance of quantitative indicators** for some of the principles. For these principles, qualitative indicators may be more pertinent. Finally, the group suggested some ways forward, including the need to **precise the definition of indicators as well as the results** (through a green light / red light / signal for improvement type of illustration) rather than identifying 12 indicators per principle. The group foresaw the possibility of creating an index with a ponderation or weighing of indicators. This would allow curbing the number of indicators to a workable set.

119.   The first working group on trust and engagement was moderated by WIN with the support of the OECD and included several new WGI members. Therefore, time was dedicated at the beginning of the session to clarify the process and purpose of the WGI and its working groups. The group initiated by a broad reflection on the reasons for monitoring and concluded on the need for usable, useful and flexible indicators. On the question of scales, the group highlighted the need to **revisit and contextualise the set of scales** at which indicators will be declined. It was also suggested to **add the global scale** while keeping in mind that principles primarily target national governments and that the focus of indicators should therefore primarily be on the **country scale**. The **cross-country scale** was also mentioned as relevant. The subnational scale should also be considered considering that the data collected should be useful at the local level. The group agreed that dividing indicators per water

---

[2] Special thanks are herein conveyed to Umrbek Allakulov (Water Integrity Network) for his contribution as rapporteur of the group session.

management functions was not necessarily needed for this cluster since trust and engagement dimensions cut across functions. Alternatively, functions could be associated with the types of organisations that will be using the monitoring framework. The group mentioned that featuring the **link with the SDGs** through a fifth column on the right of the matrix might be too limited and not very practical and that stronger connections could be made by integrating SDG indicators in the matrix itself. The group also identified this work on indicators as an **opportunity to complement the SDG process** which does not systematically assess actual impacts of water-related policies and actions. An example was given of SDG target 6b.1. On "Participation of local communities in water and sanitation management'' which is expected to be measured through an indicator on the "availability of procedures and policies at the local level to engage stakeholders''. The group agreed that the latter does not necessarily guarantee the engagement of all stakeholders nor their effectiveness in shaping policies; and that more meaningful indicators could be identified as part of the WGI process. It was also acknowledged that the primarily goal of indicators should be to support the implementation of the OECD Principles and that the link with SDGs was secondary; it should be explored to the extent it can create synergies with ongoing processes and minimise burdens in terms of reporting from governments. Before entering in the detail of each principle, the group carried out a broader reflection on the elements to be monitored to assess trust and engagement in water governance. Participants could not come to a consensus on this aspect. Some mentioned that a **multi-level, transparent genuine participatory process** could be a relevant indicator of trust and engagement. Others disagreed, arguing that a process had little meaning and that indicators needed to **focus on its impacts and performance** rather than the process itself. It was mentioned that principle 9d might be difficult to monitor since **corruption tends to be hidden**. The working group highlighted the usefulness of the [inventory](#) for providing a comprehensive source of information to select the indicators provided that the **rationale for indicators' selection** was made transparent. A proposition was made to have only one indicator for the whole cluster but it was rejected by other participants. Nevertheless, there was a consensus on the need to **limit the number of indicators** overall to be realistic in terms of data collection and processing

120.   The second working group on trust and engagement, moderated by Transparency International with the support of the OECD[3] could only cover principles 9 and 10 due to limited time. On water management functions, the group reiterated that IWRM and rivers reclamation should be merged. Some participants suggested confronting the terminology of context / progress / impacts to the **terminology employed in human rights discussions**. An open question was asked to other working groups to know whether the human rights terminology would be appropriate for other clusters too. A key message of the group was that **accountability is essential**, including the need to track expenditure, and notable for water services. However, the group warned that access to information on monetary flows could be an issue. The group suggested **to avoid being too prescriptive**, for instance by specifying the social accountability mechanisms to be used. It was stated that the Principles are about promoting good practices while the indicators are about assessing what has been done for promoting these good practices. The group highlighted the need to **be as dynamic as possible for measuring progress**, for example by facilitating the identification of overlaps and gaps. The group advised to **revise the preparatory document** to include comments and discuss the revised document during a **webinar**. The group concluded by emphasising the necessity to **keep in mind "clients'' or users** when setting up a monitoring process. Are there other users beyond governments? The indicators' framework should be context-driven and developed for users to assess accountability.

---

[3] Special thanks are herein conveyed to Gari Villa-Landa Sokolova (AEAS), for her contribution as rapporteur of the group session.

121.   For next steps two or three volunteers per principles were identified to work closely with co-ordinators and the OECD secretariat to fill in the matrix over the summer and pilot indicators' identification for specific principles. A webinar could then be held in autumn 2016 to move forward ahead of the 8th WGI meeting.

Group Discussion and additional insights on the report back

122.   The Chair mentioned that the ambition was to work towards the 2018 World Water Forum and that operational steps towards that goal needed to be identified, including the World Water Week in Stockholm in August and the COP22 in Marrakech in November. The current stage is more about setting the agenda than to decide upon definite indicators.

- Deltares suggested monitoring impacts per cluster rather than per principle.

- WIN highlighted that the principles have been developed with a holistic vision and are interlinked. Hence, indicators need to reflect these inter-linkages in order to assess the quality of implementation of the principles.

- Turkey mentioned that it would be easier to use the UN terminology as it has been agreed upon.

- WBCSD called for a more action-oriented approach that would consist in addressing remaining open questions while starting using the indicators in each country.

- GWP reminded that the objective of this exercise was to determine objective-driven indicators that are essential to ensure that the monitoring generates results.

- Suez invited participants from the other working group on effectiveness to join the small groups who had volunteered to fill in the matrix and feedback to all participants.

- Vlakwa stressed the importance of cost-effectiveness and to follow a pragmatic approach in the development of indicators.

Bottom-up consultations on Water Governance (Best) Practices

Setting the Scene and Working Group Webinar outcomes

123.   The OECD made a short introduction on the previous steps achieved by the working group. A scoping note was circulated among WGI members including ten proposals from the coordinators of the working group (OECD, SIWI, Suez and WIN) to frame the work. The ten proposals are:

- Adopting a broad approach to the definition of best practices with a set of minimum selection criteria;

- Including both bets practices and failures but using a positive language for failures (e.g. "lessons learned") and at the right level;

- Making a short review of existing databases on water governance (best) practices;

- Identifying a sample target group of decision makers to see what format and information would be useful to them;

- In terms of format, using a short questionnaire including links to relevant websites/programs and contact details for further information;

- Tagging the best practices with various features (scale, stakeholder, instrument etc.), rather than by principle only;

- Replicability could be ensured through a multi-stakeholder discussion of the best practices;

- A searchable web page would be preferable to a printed publication;

- Self-reporting of best practices is the most practical approach. It is up to the reader to judge validity and credibility; and

- Having at least a couple of exemplary best practices by August 2016 (World Water Week in Stockholm).

124.   A webinar was held on the 25 of April 201, with 29 participants from 13 countries. Participants agreed on a number of issues raised in the scoping note, notably: the need to capture examples from what works, but also pitfalls to avoid; practices should be disclosed and searchable by principle, water function and scale; the need to understand the needs of stakeholders and decision-makers searching for best practices; building upon existing best practices databases to design a fit-for-purpose template; adopting a voluntary approach for collecting data; using peer-reviewing and discussions for fact-checking; and ensuring that the practices relate to process, outcomes and instruments on water governance. Following the webinar, a summary was drafted, existing templates of (best) practices were collected and used to identify the mandatory elements which need to be included in the template and to draft a preliminary template for discussion at the 7th WGI meeting.

125.   Some issues identified for discussion within the working group include: the terminology and whether to use best practices, good practices, best-fit, solutions or another term; the trade-off between context-dependent practices and their potential for replicability; the link with the work on indicators and the process to collect practices, the format to be adopted and the way to showcase practices.

Brainstorming on the template and modalities for collecting best practices

126.   Members gathered in three small breakout groups facilitated by the lead coordinators and members of the Steering Committee (group 1 by SIWI and INBO, group 2 by OECD and OIEau, and group 3 by WIN and OECD) to discuss the process for collecting (best) practices and the template prepared by SIWI and the OECD.

127.   The guiding questions were proposed to guide discussions:

- Do you agree with the terminology "practices on water governance" (rather than best practices, good practices or solutions)?

- What do you think are the best formats to collect practices: a paper template, an online template, videos, interviews, a mix of those or else?

- Who will collect practices and update the database?

- Regarding the process to collect practices: do you think we should 1) prepare a template, pilot-test it with voluntary participants and then collect practices more widely or 2) collect practices, adapt the template and then collect practices more widely?

- Who in your network (including yourself) would be interested in volunteering to pilot-test the template?

- Shall we remove the "ticking" of the principles in the template and limit the template to a short initial list of 6 guiding/open questions?

- Do you agree to use in the template the water functions that will be used by the indicators' working group?

- Do you have any other concrete suggestions regarding the practices collection process or the template?

Report Back to Plenary– key insights from discussions

128.   Discussions did not outlie a clear consensus across the three groups on the concrete term to be used, but there were calls for the terminology to reflect that **practices change over time** and that practices are not a one picture moment, due to changing conditions of the surrounding framework. However, all groups agreed that valuable lessons can be drawn from the situation faced at that moment of time. As such, some examples came up reflecting these two ideas of change over time and lessons learned: "evolving practices", water governance solutions", "good governance practices", "lessons of practices", "practices on water governance" or "learning practices".

129.   The groups had different views on the best or preferable **approach to collect practices**. Two of the groups suggested starting by **preparing a template** before collecting the practices. It was mentioned that one practice could go through different stages: the evocation of the idea, the use of the template and inclusion in the database and finally peer-review and fact-checking. Unlike the two other groups, the third group suggested not to use the template but rather to start by **mapping existing knowledge, publications and practices** on each of the 12 principle, which could be used as a basis to build the water governance database. Several publications were listed to fuel this mapping: the 69 case studies collected for the OECD report "Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance"; publications of WGI members, including the four field studies published by Action Against Hunger; the UNDESA/UN-Water database of the decade on water and education; the UfM-labelled project carried out by the OECD and GWP-Med on water governance and financing in the Mediterranean countries; and the analysis of the implementation of the Water Framework Directive. The group also advised to incorporate knowledge from practitioners, which does not appear in the literature. For this, a concrete action could consist in carrying out interviews with IWA network members, or launching an open call for contributions within WGI members' networks.

130.   With regards to concrete edits to the current template, there was agreement to **keep the "ticking" of the principles** and to add additional water management functions. Among the suggestions were: "ecosystems", "flood", "drought", "soil erosion", "dam safety" or "sediment transport". There was a call to think on **comparability between case studies** when developing the template and for taking into consideration who is targeted. The objective is to respond to the needs not only of the people filling in the template, i.e. what will make the life easier for stakeholders with best practices to promote and how can they show better their best practice, but also to think about the stakeholders who want to learn from the practice, therefore to create a template that encompasses what they need to learn from the best practice in order to implement it for their specific situation.

131.   An **online public platform**, free of publicity and searchable by keywords, such as Survey Monkey or others, was thought to be the best format, which could be complemented with other formats (paper, online, video, interviews, etc.). For instance, it was suggested to use a different format to **display pitfalls**, such as closed doors sessions during conferences. Regarding fact-checking and **peer-reviewing of the practices**, several options were mentioned. One option would be to leave the receiver or reader the opportunity to gauge him/herself the relevance of the practice and contact the person or institution who contributed with the practice for more information if need be. Another option would be to accept the practice only after it has been approved by all institutions involved in its implementation. Alternatively, contributors could be asked to provide external references, such as press articles or research carried out on their practice. There was a disagreement regarding the link between the practices and the 12 principles. Some suggested that a practice would only be "integrated" and therefore relevant for the database if it referred to all of the 12 principles. Others argued that some

practices may only refer to one or two principles and still be relevant. To overcome this issue, a group agreed to be very inclusive at first and start by analysing existing practices before identifying criteria for their inclusion. Another group proposed to rank the best practices against specific criteria and peer-review each other's practices within the working group. Practices from other sectors were also welcomed when relevant for water, but in a second or more advanced collection phase.

132.   Regarding **next steps**, the groups proposed a four-step approach. First, to review the template according to suggestions received at the meeting. Second, to take stock of existing or already collected practice (e.g. as part of the stakeholder engagement project of the WGI) and provide a platform to discuss them. Third, to collect new practices using WGI members' networks and events. Finally, to organise a series of webinar or workshops whereby the working group could peer-review some practices. Some members offered to **pilot test** the template (AEAS), and others also agreed to help with the **methodology** to develop the template (UNESCO – IHE and Slovenia due to their extensive background on this research field). WGI members were invited to comment afterwards on the current template after they pilot-test it. This could create a "snowball effect" to attract interest from non-WGI members who could complete the form (on the same model than Wikipedia). According to the group, collection of best practices should not rely on one single institution but be a **collective action**. Various incentives were listed which could foster reporting back from non-WGI members: adding their logo in a publication, offering them a slot to present at a conference organised by OECD or WGI members. The group also outlined that being associated to an OECD process was already an incentive per se. Regular public relations campaigns should be organised to maintain the momentum and attract non-WGI members to contribute. One of the groups claimed that even though there was a need to maintain the coherence with the work on indicators for the next steps, it is not essential at this stage considering that indicators are not yet developed and that best practices are not meant to be evaluated.

133.   The OECD thanked delegates for sharing their experience and supporting the process on water governance indicators and (best) practices. The Secretariat will revise the scoping notes and send them along to WGI members with the Highlights of the meeting and a call for specific contribution to the working groups. An informal gathering will be organized during the Stockholm World Water Week (30 August) to move forward over the summer. Concrete proposals will be made by the Secretariat in September in terms of the next phases on indicators and best practices. A second webinar will be organised for each working group in October for thorough discussion in plenary at the 8th WGI meeting. Ultimately, this work will allow to provide more detailed guidance on the principles with concrete examples, which should feature in the OECD Publication "Water Governance at a Glance" to be released at the 8th World Water Forum in Brasilia (18-23 March 2018).

Closing remarks & Next Steps

134.   The Chair thanked delegates for a very fruitful two-day meeting of the WGI. He reported back on the **Steering Committee** meeting held in the morning. The withdrawal of UNESCO-IHP left a vacant seat, with the steering committee currently counting seven members (Suez, ASTEE, INBO, OIEAU, SIWI, WIN, and Transparency International). A call for application will be extended to the WGI members in October to fill in the vacant seat. Criteria will be laid down, such as the connectedness of the institution, evidence of its active commitment and participation in the WGI so far, and in-kind and financial resources to be made available. Delegates are invited to refer to the WGI Terms of Reference for details.

135.   The **mandate of the Chair** is for three years and will end in November. The current Chair, Peter Glas, notified his availability for a second mandate. The Steering Committee thanked the Chair for his remarkable work during the past three years, which he carried out with tact, diplomacy and

efficiency. The Steering Committee members also announced their full support to renewing the mandate of the Chair for a second phase of 3 years. The position will be nonetheless open to other applicants of the WGI in September. A communication will be issued by the Secretariat.

136.   Concerning **WGI communication**, the Steering Committee agreed that communication with WGI members through the website and the not-too-frequent emails was satisfactory for the time being and efficient for *internal* purposes. WGI members are invited to communicate ideas and express their interest on WGI *external* communication in order to make the best use of members' channels and networks.

137.   The increasing **size of WGI** and **financing** will be on the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting. A budget has been secured until December 2016 but additional options will need to be found for the two following years. In the 2015 satisfaction survey, 40% of WGI members mentioned that they would be ready to pay a membership fee, if requested to. However, only 2 members offered voluntary contributions this year. This question will need to be addressed to ensure financial self-sustainability of the WGI.

138.   The Chair thanked again the Ministry of infrastructure and Environment of the Netherlands for hosting the 7th meeting, the OECD Secretariat and the technicians and closed the meeting.

ACRONYMS

ACF	Action Contre La Faim
AECID	Spanish Agency of International Co-operation for Development
AIDA	International Association for Water Law
ANA	National Water Agency (Brazil)
ANDA	National Administration of Water and Sewer
APSS	Action and Policy Support Service
ASTEE	Association Scientifique et Technique pour l'eau et l'environnement
AyA	Costa Rican Water and Sanitation Institute
BRIDGE	Building River Dialogue and Governance
CSOs	Civil Society Organisations
ECODES	Foundation Ecology and Development
EDF	Électricité de France
EU	European Union
FP2E	Fédération Professionnelle des Entreprises de l'Eau
GEMI	Integrated Monitoring initiative GEMI
GLAAS	UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water
GoAL	Governance Advocacy and Leadership
GWOPA	Global Water Operators' Partnerships Alliance
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWP-Med	Global Water Partnership - Mediterranean
HELP	OECD's High-level Experts and Leaders Panel on Water and Disasters
HLP	High-Level Panel of Eminent Persons on the Post--2015 Development Agenda
HWBP	High-water Protection Programme
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICPDR	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River
IMDEA	Madrid Institute of Advanced Studies
INBO	International Network of Basin Organisations
IRs	Implementation Roadmaps

IRSTEA	Institut national de Recherche en Sciences et Technologies pour l'Environnement et l'Agriculture
IWA	International Water Association
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRA	International Water Resources Association
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
JMP	Joint Monitoring Programme
KWR	Dutch Watercycle Research Institute
LPAA	Lima-Paris Action Agenda
MCM	OECD Ministerial Council Meeting
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MENA	Middle East and North Africa
NARBO	Network of Asian River Basin Organizations
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisations
NWB Bank	Dutch Water Boards Bank
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OIEau	Office International de l'eau
PRE-PAR	Pre-Participation method
RDPC	Regional Development Policy Committee
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
SIRA	Strategic Innovation and Research Agenda
SISPEA	Services Publics d'eau et d'assainissement
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SMAG	Self-Modeling process for Assessing Governance
SPARE	Strategic Planning for Alpine River Ecosystems
SPIO	Senior Public Integrity Officials
SUEN	Turkish Water Institute
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNDESA	UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNECE	UN Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UN ECOSOC	UN Economic and Social Council
UNESCO-IHP	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation – International Hydrological Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNSGAB	UN Secretary General Advisory Board on Water
WASH	Water-Sanitation-Hygiene
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WGI	Water Governance Initiative
WIGO	Water Integrity Global Outlook
WIN	Water Integrity Network
WssTP	Water Supply and Sanitation Technology Platform
WYPW	World Youth Parliament for Water
WWC	World Water Council

CALENDAR OF 2016/17 EVENTS

28 August - 2 September 2016 Stockholm, Sweden	26th Stockholm World Water Week	SIWI
12-14 September 2016 New Delhi, India	19th International River Symposium - Great Rivers of the World: Management for Shared Benefits	International River Foundation
9-14 October 2016 Brisbane, Australia	IWA World Water Congress & Exhibition	IWA
17-20 October 2016 Quito, Ecuador	Habitat III	United Nations
19-22 October 2016 Daegu, Korea	Korea Water Forum	Republic of Korea
19-22 October 2016 Lourdes, France	14th International Conference "Europe-INBO 2016" on implementation of the European Water Directives	INBO
20 October 2016	"Water Affordability in Europe" Seminar	Aqua Publica Europea
7-18 November 2016 Marrakech, Morocco	COP 22	Morocco
28-30 November 2016 Budapest, Hungary	Budapest Water Summit	Hungary
12-13 December 2016 *Rabat, Morocco*	8th meeting of the OECD Water Governance Initiative	OECD
10-11 May 2017 Istanbul, Turkey	The Fourth Istanbul International Water Forum	SUEN
29 May-2 June 2017 Cancun, Mexico	XVIth IWRA World Water Congress	IWRA
30 October-3 November 2017 Amsterdam, Netherlands	Amsterdam International Water Week	Netherlands Water Partnership; IWA; WC International Water Conferences