



6th MEETING OF THE OECD WATER GOVERNANCE INITIATIVE

2-3 November 2015, OECD Headquarters, Paris

HIGHLIGHTS



The [OECD Water Governance Initiative](#) (WGI) is an international multi-stakeholder network of around 100 delegates from public, private and not-for-profit sectors gathering twice a year in a Policy Forum to share on-going reforms, projects, lessons and good practices in support of better governance in the water sector. It was launched on 27-28 March 2013 in Paris. It has held six meetings to date (7-8 November 2013, Paris; 28-29 April 2014, Madrid; 24-25 November 2014, Paris; 26 May 2015, Edinburgh and 2-3 November 2015, Paris).

The OECD WGI aims to:

1. **Advise governments** at all levels in taking the needed steps for effective water governance reforms through policy dialogue, stakeholder engagement and consultations;
2. Provide a technical platform to **share knowledge, experience and best practices** on water governance at local, basin, national and international levels;
3. Provide a **consultation mechanism** to raise the profile of governance issues in the **Global Water Agenda** (World Water Forum, Sustainable Development Goals);
4. Promote country and regional dialogues around the implementation of the **OECD Principles on Water Governance** at different levels;
5. Contribute to the preparation of **Water Governance Indicators** to support implementation of **OECD Principles on Water Governance** in interested countries ; and
6. Provide a continuity mechanism for the **7th World Water Forum Implementation Roadmap** on Effective Water Governance up to the **8th World Water Forum** (Brasilia, 2018).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|----|
| KEY HIGHLIGHTS | 3 |
| NEXT STEPS | 4 |
| SUMMARY RECORD..... | 5 |
| Update on WGI activities and outcomes | 5 |
| Update since the 5 th WGI Meeting | 5 |
| Process and milestones toward an OECD Recommendation on Water..... | 5 |
| Water Resources Governance in Brazil..... | 5 |
| OECD’s 2015 Ministerial Council Meeting | 6 |
| Further engagement of OECD countries | 7 |
| Launch of the 15 translations of the Principles on Water Governance..... | 7 |
| WGI's contribution to the Global Water Agenda | 8 |
| Sustainable Development Goals | 8 |
| Group discussion | 11 |
| World Water Forum..... | 12 |
| Group discussion | 14 |
| Peer-review: OECD Report on Water Governance in Cities | 14 |
| Group discussion: | 15 |
| Knowledge-sharing on recent/ongoing water governance research or publications | 17 |
| Water Integrity Global Outlook..... | 17 |
| A book "Une victoire face aux multinationales: ma bataille pour l’eau de Paris"..... | 17 |
| The 2016 Dutch Delta Programme | 17 |
| Towards a special issue on water governance of “Water International” | 18 |
| CADWAGO project’s findings on systemic water governance | 18 |
| A book on “Frontiers of Land and Water Governance in Urban Regions” | 19 |
| A Reference Guide for Programming Accountability in WASH | 19 |
| A Governance Assessment guide for drought adaptation..... | 19 |
| Additional experience-sharing..... | 20 |
| Outcomes on water governance of recent major events | 21 |
| 25 th Stockholm World Water Week..... | 21 |
| 2 nd International Forum of Water Regulators | 21 |
| 2015 OSCE Economic & Environmental Forum on Water Governance..... | 22 |
| “5+5 Water Action Plan in the Western Mediterranean” workshop..... | 22 |
| 1 st International conference on Redrafting Water Governance..... | 22 |
| EURO-INBO 2015 | 22 |
| Towards an International (UN) Year for Water and Women | 23 |
| Other events and updates | 23 |
| WGI Future: Strategy and programme of work 2016-2018 | 24 |
| Key highlights from the Strategic Paper..... | 24 |
| Brainstorming in working groups on the strategic programme and deliverables | 27 |
| Outcomes of the break-out discussions | 27 |
| Water governance in practice: participatory modelling and simulation..... | 30 |
| ACRONYMS | 32 |
| CALENDAR OF 2016 WATER AND GOVERNANCE-RELATED EVENTS..... | 33 |

KEY HIGHLIGHTS

1. The 6th WGI meeting was held at OECD Headquarters, Paris, and gathered more than 100 members and 15 observers (click [here](#) to see the list of participants). In all, 21 countries were represented as well major stakeholder groups and organisations within and outside the water sector.

2. The 6th meeting of the WGI had the following objectives (click [here](#) to see the agenda of the meeting):

- Follow-up on the adoption of **OECD Principles on Water Governance** on 3-4 June 2015
- Contribute to the **Global Agenda**, in particular SDGs and World Water Forum
- Peer-review analytical work on **Water Governance in Cities**
- **Share knowledge** on latest water governance research and developments
- Put water governance in practice through **participatory modelling and simulation** exercises

3. Delegates **WELCOMED** the key achievements of the WGI since the 5th meeting:

- The backing of the [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#) by the 34 Ministers of OECD Countries during the 3-4 June OECD Ministerial Council Meeting, and their translation into 15 languages thanks to the contribution of many WGI members. A set of new languages will be available by mid-2016;
- The online launch of the [Inventory](#) of water governance-related indicators and measurement frameworks, building on inputs from several WGI members, as a stepping stone on the road to developing a set of water governance indicators. The Inventory will be updated on a regular basis, with new information and suggestions from WGI members;
- The draft **Strategic Paper** prepared by the Secretariat and the Steering Committee that builds on the results of the [Satisfaction Survey](#) to shape the way forward for 2016-18. It suggests to focus the work of WGI on the overarching objective of contributing to the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance, with two sets of core activities:
 - o Collecting and scaling up **good practices** that can help foster peer-to-peer dialogue within and across cities, basins and countries facing the similar types of challenges; and
 - o Contribute to the development of **water governance indicators** that can be used as a self-assessment tool for greater bench-learning among interested cities, basins and countries.
- The **innovative format** of the brainstorming discussion in breakout groups structured around action-oriented discussions, policy labs and simulations. It meant to respond to the call from WGI members for smaller and livelier discussions. Similarly, the participatory and simulation workshop facilitated by IRSTEA was an enriching experience to dig deeper into the role of stakeholders in water management and policies at different scales.

4. Delegates **DISCUSSED** the proposals to focus on implementation and action during the next phase of the WGI, stressing in particular that:

- The future activities of WGI should make the most of **members' comparative advantages** and expertise to create win-win synergies with their own programme of work;
- The work on best practices and indicators should be supported by a **pro-active communication and outreach strategy** as a collective responsibility of all WGI members. It should include

tailored consultations with various stakeholder groups and in different regions to raise awareness on the Principles on Water Governance and map the role each can play in implementing them;

- The programme of work should continue to link to the **global water agenda**, in particular the Sustainable Development Goal process through inputs to the monitoring process with the water governance indicators; and the World Water Forum to maintain continuity of governance discussions between the 7th and 8th forum (Brasilia, 2018);
- The planned activities will require **in-kind and financial resources**; setting-up a WGI-wide fundraising strategy is needed to broaden the range of champion countries and institutions.

5. Delegates **SHARED** experiences, views and knowledge on:

- Recent **research and publications** on water governance, including the forthcoming [Water Integrity Global Outlook](#) that calls for addressing corruption to ensure the sustainability of the water sector; the book "[Une victoire face aux multinationales: ma bataille pour l'eau de Paris](#)" on the lessons learnt from shifting water and sanitation services back to public management in Paris; the [2016 Dutch Delta Programme](#) that changes the Dutch paradigm from reactive to proactive flood management strategies; a proposed special issue of "[Water International](#)" on governance to be jointly carried out by IWRA and the WGI on the OECD Principles on Water Governance; the Open University's [CADWAGO project](#) on social learning in water governance; the Utrecht University's book on the "[Frontier of land and water governance](#)" that calls for tailored solutions to address the challenge of spatial planning and water management; SIWI's [Reference Guide](#) to strengthen accountability in WASH projects; the DROP project's [Governance Assessment Guide](#) that provides an evaluation of restrictive governance conditions to effective water management; Aqua Publica Europea's publication "[Water and Climate: European Public Water Operators' commitment to water resources protection](#)" on best practices for water resources protection; and GWP-Med's report on [Water Governance in Palestine: Sector Reform to include Private Sector Participation](#).
- Recent and up-coming **events on water**: the [25th World Water Week](#) (22-28 August 2015); the [2nd International Water Regulators Forum](#) (7-8 September, London); the [23rd Economic and Environmental Forum](#) (14-16 September, Prague); the "[5+5 Water Strategy Action Plan](#)" workshop (10 September, Madrid); the 1st international conference on [Redrafting Water Governance](#) (8-9 October, Lisbon); [EURO-INBO's meeting](#) (23-24 October, Thessalonica); and the proposed 2017 International Year on Water and Women.

NEXT STEPS

- ✓ **January 2016** : Finalisation of the Strategic paper after consultation with OECD Members countries and comments by the Regional Development Policy Committee;
- ✓ **February 2016**: Renewal of membership to WGI, with agreed-upon and tailored contributions to the activities; and call for applications to the Steering Committee;
- ✓ **March-July 2016**: Working group activities on indicators and best practices, including milestone meetings or workshops, dates tbc;
- ✓ **23-24 June 2016**: 7th WGI Meeting, The Hague, Netherlands.

SUMMARY RECORD

Update on WGI activities and outcomes

Update since the 5th WGI Meeting

6. The Chair welcomed delegates and provided updates since the 5th WGI meeting (26 May 2015):
 - The [OECD Principles on Water Governance](#) were backed by the 34 Ministers of OECD countries during the 2015 OECD Ministerial Council Meeting of 3-4 June 2015.
 - The [Inventory](#) of water governance indicators and measurement frameworks was up-dated, building on WGI members' comments, and is available online.
 - A draft Strategic Paper on the past achievements and ways forward for the WGI in 2016-2018 was circulated to all members in October for comments. It also builds on a one-day brainstorming retreat of the Steering Committee, hosted by SUEZ on 7 September in Paris.
 - The Scoping Note on water governance indicators was updated to include written comments received before and after the 5th WGI meeting.
 - An informal gathering of 25 WGI members was held during the Stockholm World Water Week on 23 August.

Process and milestones toward an OECD Recommendation on Water

7. The Chair updated delegates on progress related to the OECD Council Recommendation on Water under preparation. This horizontal undertaking seeks to update OECD's guidance on water, including the Principles on water governance, and to abrogate four of the six existing water-related Recommendations. A first round of consultations took place in October-November with member states across a range of OECD committees. A revised draft will be issued in January 2016 for a second round of comments by committees. WGI members will be invited to comment on the text around March-April 2016.

Water Resources Governance in Brazil

8. Joaquim Oliveira-Martins launched the OECD report "[Water Resources Governance in Brazil](#)", which had been peer-reviewed during the [4th WGI Meeting](#) on 24-25 November 2014. It also benefited from the expertise and opinion of a team of experts and international peer-reviewers: Peter Gammeltoft (European Commission), Francisco Nunes Correia (Portugal), Marie Brisley (South Africa), Emmanuel Branche (EDF), Sharon Bailey (Canada), and Robert Speed (Australia). The report assesses the performance of Brazil's water governance and suggests policy recommendations for strengthening the co-ordination across levels of government and for setting up water allocation regimes that can better cope with future risks. The report also focuses on the National Water Management Pact as a tool to enhance integration between federal and state water resources systems. It argues that remarkable progress in water management has been made since the 1990s, but extra steps need to be taken to reap intended economic, social and environmental benefits. Challenges remain, particularly in terms of horizontal and vertical co-ordination, river basin governance, planning, pricing and multiple uses of water. The OECD recommended in particular raising the profile of water in the broader economic and political agenda of the country, especially given the national security issues around energy, so that water becomes a real factor for sustainable growth.

9. The report is the result of an 18-month policy dialogue with the Brazilian National Water Agency (ANA). More than 100 stakeholders took part in the extensive consultations carried out throughout

the project. The report includes case studies on three states, Rondônia in the Amazon region, Paraíba in the semi-arid Northeast, and Rio de Janeiro in the Southeast, showing the diversity of situations in the country. It also includes cases on the São Francisco and São Marcos basins illustrating how water is allocated in practice, including potential barriers to reform and opportunities for more robust regimes. The report was launched on 2 September 2015 in Brasilia, in the presence of the Deputy Minister for Environment, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, national secretaries from the ministries of energy, planning, national integration, cities, and agriculture, as well as stakeholders from public, private and non-profit sectors. The National Water Agency set up a multi-stakeholder taskforce, in close co-operation with water-related ministries, to follow-up with implementation of the policy recommendations. In addition, Brazil signed a new agreement with OECD to carry-out a second policy dialogue to support the implementation of these recommendations, zooming in particularly on how to set and govern economic instruments for water resources management.

10. Joao Lotufo, Director General of Brazil's National Water Agency shared some remarks to explain that the OECD policy recommendations will be used to review the legal framework in Brazil. Difficulties in terms of integration between actors and levels of government are prominent, given the double jurisdiction over water at state and federal levels, which calls for new arrangements to be set up at problem-shed. Currently, Brazil is facing its worst drought in 90 years, directly affecting the metropolitan area of Sao Paulo, while the South of the country suffers from floods. This crisis has highlighted weaknesses in the Brazilian system, particularly regarding emergency-driven decisions. ANA has consolidated its institutional role to bring continuity, integration and mobilisation by building consensus and fostering implementation. Brazil called upon the OECD to carry out this policy dialogue because of its technical expertise and its ability to bring international experience. The OECD also brings an external and neutral opinion allowing to discuss conflicting issues in a non-politicised manner, and to get greater consideration from all parties involved. The iterative and consensus-building nature of the policy dialogue has shaken the business model of Brazil. The conclusions from the report will be a reference to reinforce the water resources management framework in years to come. The new policy dialogue will focus on water charges, already used in some basins in the country, and institutional water governance, particularly related to resources allocation in sanitation and hydraulics infrastructure to increase water security. Findings from this new study will be used as inputs for discussion at the 8th World Water Forum (Brasilia, 2018).

OECD's 2015 Ministerial Council Meeting

11. Noé van Hulst, Ambassador of the Netherlands to the OECD, presented the outcomes of the OECD 2015 Ministerial Council Meeting (MCM), which was chaired by the Netherlands, under the theme "[Unlocking Investment for Sustainable Growth and Jobs](#)". It marked the first time in MCM history that water was on the agenda for discussion, as part of a session "[Investing for a Low-Carbon Economy – Saving Resources, Greening Investment](#)", chaired by Melanie Schultz, Dutch Minister for Infrastructure and the Environment. Indeed, water is one of the main challenges through which climate change unfolds, as climate change is expected to increase the frequency and impact of water-related disasters worldwide. If no concerted action is taken, it will come at a great cost to society at last, with the cost of inaction estimated globally to rise to around USD 500 billion annually. Preventing such risks to reduce future costs is at the heart of the Netherlands' adaptive water policy. In the [MCM statement](#), Ministers agreed that "[...] *managing water in a sustainable, integrated and inclusive way is necessary for sustainable development and to strengthen climate adaptation efforts [...]*" and "*welcomed the OECD Principles on Water Governance*". This statement recognises the WGI contribution, without which the discussion on water could not have taken place at the MCM. The statement also gave a clear mandate to further work on important water issues. As a follow-up, the Netherlands will actively participate in the development of the Council Recommendation on Water to make it ambitious to tackle future water challenges, and urged the OECD to be ambitious in this regard and to go beyond the consolidation of existing materials.

Further engagement of OECD countries

12. José Ignacio Wert, Ambassador of Spain to the OECD, reiterated Spain's full-fledge support to the WGI and in particular its contribution to strengthen water governance in Latin America and the Caribbean. Spain has supported the WGI since its creation in March 2013, both financially and through the involvement of the Spanish representatives in the network. Spain believes in the added value of fostering discussions between policymakers and practitioners and is highly satisfied with up-to-date achievements, particularly regarding the bottom-up, extensive and inclusive work to develop the OECD Principles on Water Governance. In addition, Spain is committed to support the full and effective implementation of the [human right to drinking water and sanitation](#) recognised by the UN in 2010. The current political momentum with the SDGs, including a dedicated Goal on water and several water-related goals, is a unique opportunity to progress in managing the risk of shortages, insecurity of supply, drought and floods as well as the lack of quality. Good governance will play an instrumental role in ensuring water security for the broader economic and development agenda, but also in adapting to climate change. From a political perspective, Spain is supportive of cross-border co-operation as a means to resolve conflicts due to shared water use, even more so since it became a member of the UN [Security Council](#). Furthermore, the OECD Principles on Water Governance are useful to help Spain do better with less, and are applicable to other countries with similar challenges. These Principles will be helpful to meet the challenge of scarcity, floods and droughts, pollution and environmental degradation through more resilient institutions and governance frameworks as they acknowledge the importance of hydrologic water basin planning, participation of users, legal stability, physical infrastructure and information as well as technological development and innovation. Spain is determined to provide a bridge between WGI and Latin America, through the activities of its co-operation and development agency (AECID) in particular while contributing to the regional consultations on the Principles, and in-depth dialogue and consultation on the development of water governance indicators.

13. Rebekah Riley, Deputy Permanent Representative of New Zealand, shared that New Zealand's current programme of water reform highlights how important effective governance is at national and local level in ensuring the sustainable management of freshwater resources. This is why the country continues to support the work of WGI in providing policy guidance and fostering experience-sharing, in order to help governments build water policies on a foundation of solid knowledge about what has proven to be effective and successful around the world. Freshwater is managed at the regional level in New Zealand, with responsibilities devolved to regional councils, the boundaries of which are based on water catchments. The central government plans to make the country more productive and sustainable by putting in place and supporting a system that requires regional councils and local communities to set water quality and quantity limits reflecting the communities' values and priorities. Indeed, collaboration has been a key theme of New Zealand's water reform. The Land and Water Forum, an independent stakeholder-led collaborative group, was asked in 2009 to advise the government on better ways forward for freshwater management. It created the foundation for regional councils to identify what communities want for their water bodies and to make decisions about the trade-offs necessary to meet these objectives. As a result, many councils set up collaborative stakeholder groups, often at catchment level, to offer a mechanism for communities to provide inputs on freshwater decision-making processes. In addition, several mechanisms arose for indigenous groups to be involved in water management, from advisory to decision-making roles. The central government also fosters exchanges among regional councils to share their experience and expertise on particularly challenging areas, as well as lessons learnt from success and failure.

Launch of the 15 translations of the Principles on Water Governance

14. Rolf Alter, Director for Public Governance and Territorial Development, congratulated members of the WGI for their achievements over the past two years and a half. The WGI delivered all expected outcomes and met the expectations. It has also converted itself into a crucial platform for mutual learning

and experience-sharing as well as for best practices identification and upscaling. The WGI is now starting a new chapter and has an ambitious and promising agenda for 2016-18: the preparation of both a database on water governance and a set of water governance indicators will provide invaluable pieces of advice for interested members and non-members. Rolf Alter highlighted the exemplary bottom-up and multi-stakeholder contribution of the WGI to the preparation of the Principles, which were adopted and backed by OECD Ministers in June 2015. It is a strong testimony of the role that stakeholders play alongside policymakers to shape better policies for better lives. The Principles are now available in 15 languages, which is a record in terms of OECD publications translations. It is a great asset to ensure their broad dissemination globally, make them accessible to different communities and get new stakeholders on board. This is part of the WGI's effort to be as inclusive as possible for the Principles to gain further traction. They are already being used in several countries and by diverse stakeholders. These experiences can serve as a reference of what the must-have and must-do are to get water governance right. The WGI is now set to support implementation and action, and the development of a Best Practice Database on Water Governance and water governance indicators will help to have impact. In this endeavour, the close partnership of the WGI with OECD member states will be critical to build consensus and acceptance. Greater co-operation with the delegates of the RDPC will also be highly beneficial for such interactions and will imply two-ways experience-sharing while developing the database and the indicators on water governance. The work of the WGI is also expected to be a valuable contribution to the OECD's broader agenda on inclusive growth, which should not be limited to greater income and equality, but also devote particular attention to access to public services such as drinking water and sanitation.

WGI's contribution to the Global Water Agenda

Sustainable Development Goals

15. The Chair introduced the discussion recalling that a new [Development Agenda](#) was adopted at the UN Sustainable Development Summit on 25-27 September in New York City. It sets out 17 goals related to key issues of prosperity, dignity, people, justice, partnerships and the planet. Water is acknowledged in the new Agenda in a full-fledge goal n°6, as well as horizontally in relation to poverty (goal n°1), well-being and health (goal n°3), gender equality (goal n°5), resilience in cities (goal n°11), sustainable consumption (goal n°12), and ecosystem protection (goal n°15). Governance issues are also reflected in terms of accountability and inclusiveness (goal n°16) and partnerships (goal n°17). He expressed that the WGI stands ready to contribute to these efforts and to foster experience sharing that can help scale up good practices from local, basin and national levels.

Outcomes of the UN Sustainable Development Summit 2015

16. István Mikola, Minister of State for Security Policy and International Collaboration of Hungary presented the outcomes of the [UN Sustainable Development Summit](#). Hungary co-chaired the [Open Working Group](#) on the SDGs. Heads of states and governments came together in New York City and made a very important decision that not only defines the cornerstones of the next 15 years' global development policy but also seeks to secure the future of generations to come. Undoubtedly, water is at the core of sustainable development and is critical for socio-economic development, healthy ecosystems and human survival. The state ministers mentioned that Hungary has played an essential role in having a dedicated goal on water, in particular with the [Statement¹](#) of the [2013 Budapest Water Summit](#). The targets of Goal n°6 reflect almost perfectly the ones suggested in the Budapest Statement, namely improving sanitation and hygiene services, reducing pollution and increasing the re-use of untreated wastewater, integrated

¹ Written comments received from Turkey on the draft version of these highlights pointed out that the Budapest Water Statement was not approved by consensus.

water resources management and the protection of our environment. The Minister then conveyed three main messages:

- Most of the impacts of climate change are expressed through the water cycle: increased floods and droughts, challenges to food and energy production, groundwater resources, difficulties in maintaining ecosystem sustainability, infrastructure development and water dependant manufacturing, etc. Climate variability feeds uncertainty that will also contribute to increased risk. In order to double food production in 25 years, irrigated agriculture needs to increase. Given that 80% of water use is agricultural, it will be a major challenge to meet irrigation needs that are required for food security. As humanity needs to increase the resilience of its systems, more storage capacity will very likely be needed for hydropower. Thus, the role of water in climate change adaptation strategies and mitigation needs to be specifically and urgently addressed.
- Besides climate change, the nexus between water, food and energy also needs to be emphasised and related-challenges need to be addressed. It requires consistently integrating and co-ordinating the interaction and interdependencies among these areas. A new way of thinking is called for. Water, energy and food systems should be planned in an integrated way: legal frameworks, institutional arrangements, support instruments and improved allocation of funds among sectors need to be closely scrutinised worldwide. Science and multidisciplinary research need to help better understand how water, energy, food and climate impact each other, which requires investment in education. Evolving scientific knowledge must inform decision-makers in an interactive process of adaptive management.
- Global regular monitoring and reporting are critical elements of the implementation process. Yet, there is no responsible international institution set up for the overview of the implementation process of the water SDG. Hungary supports the creation of an Intergovernmental Panel on Water and Sanitation to fill this void, involving all UN Member States along with relevant stakeholders. This mechanism could be the responsibility of the UN, either directly under the General Assembly or under the ECOSOC (Economic and Social Committee) that would report regularly on the state of progress supported by UN-Water as Secretariat. The critical nature of water conditions any future sustainable development agenda and requires a robust intergovernmental process to monitor, review and assess progress. An appropriate mechanism should be put in place to that effect as soon as possible.

Toward an SDG Monitoring and Indicator Framework

17. Fiona Gore, representing the [Joint Monitoring Programme on Water and Sanitation](#) and the [UN-Water GLAAS initiative](#), shared some perspectives on these two initiatives. The Joint Monitoring Programme was set-up to monitor the [MDGs](#), and calls for continuity while moving on to the SDGs. For all its limitations, the water and sanitation monitoring matrix of the MDGs has proven useful. The indicators for monitoring the MDGs had some key gaps, and a detailed consultation worldwide with WASH stakeholders and experts identified new critical areas. There was a clear recognition that the water and sanitation indicators missed out on important aspects of service levels, such as water quality and wastewater management. As a result of this consultation, the Joint Monitoring Programme is proposing to use the existing water and sanitation ladders of the MDGs monitoring framework, and add a higher level of services that brings in aspects of management. The Joint Monitoring Programme is also proposing to go further to include institutional WASH such as in schools, work places and healthcare facilities. Another critical element is hygiene, which was lacking in the MDG framework, and remains underestimated in the current proposed indicator framework.

18. The GLAAS initiative collects data on the inputs to the sector (e.g. financing, human resources) and the enabling environment (monitoring analysis, governance). Ninety-four countries participated in the latest GLAAS assessment, along with 23 external agents that looked at donors' priorities, and countries' needs and gaps. The GLAAS objective is to support country-led processes, looking at institutions and key stakeholders that are involved in delivering WASH services, and to identify the drivers and bottlenecks of progress. The indicator framework for the SDGs is under development, and two indicators have been suggested and selected per target. The OECD is contributing to developing indicators for the means of implementation (i.e. targets 6a and 6b) regarding ODA flows on water and sanitation. The GLAAS initiative has also recently launched the "[TrackFin](#)" project that looks at financing related to sanitation, hygiene and drinking water, and which was piloted in Brazil, Morocco and Ghana. The first phase of scaling up is under way in several African countries. The GLAAS initiative strives to harvest national data, to avoid duplications, and to limit the reporting burden on countries related to the SDGs. A number of GLAAS products were published online, namely a global report on "[UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water](#)", [regional reports](#), [highlights](#) for donors to focus on targets and priorities; and [country highlights](#) summarising GLAAS primary data collection on four key areas (i.e. human resources, financing, governance, monitoring). Furthermore, the World Health Organisation is committed to supporting countries in capacity building at country level, and strengthening the underlying sources of data that serve for monitoring at national, regional and global levels.

Progress towards OECD Water Governance Indicators

19. Aziza Akhmouch, Head of the Water Governance Programme of the OECD, updated delegates on the progress achieved since the 5th meeting regarding the scoping note on water governance indicators. A revised version was produced to reflect the comments received from WGI members, while adjusting the framework and the timeline to keep it realistic and allow sufficient time for consensus-building. The scoping note proposes to work with WGI and OECD bodies that have experience in measuring governance, in order to support the implementation of the Principles. There is a wide range of options to use the Principles: as a tool for dialogue, as a check-list of what should be done; to provide a common frame of reference for stakeholders to assess their own system. She noted that while progress was made in measuring the *outcomes* of water policies (i.e. water quality, quantity, etc.), challenges remained to measure the performance of *governance* because issues of process are complex. The development of water governance indicators should be undertaken with a view to improve the overall water policy cycle, as governance is foremost a means to an end. In order to formulate water policies and strategies based on these Principles, indicators are needed to measure the effectiveness of current systems and identify the adjustments needed. A preliminary step consisted in taking stock of what exists with an [Inventory](#) of 62 indicators and measurement frameworks, also building on the contribution of WGI members. This undertaking showed that there is no systemic evaluation framework that provides the comprehensive approach of all 12 Principles. The Scoping note raises 12 questions as a basis to kick-off the work in 2016. A working group of the WGI will be dedicated to indicators, and work according to a three-steps approach: i) in the short term, the WGI and OECD bodies will develop indicators on whether framework conditions are in place or not vis-a-vis the 12 Principles (e.g. traffic light system); ii) in the mid-term, the indicators should measure progress in water governance, which implies having a baseline and the ability to see whether institutions have been strengthened to better contribute to the intended goals; iii) in the long term, the indicators should foster impact assessment regarding the extent to which water governance structures deliver the expected outcomes of water policies. The Regional Development Policy Committee has carried out similar work in other governance-related areas, such as on the impact of [metropolitan bodies on productivity](#). The process for developing the indicators includes the preparation of a working paper to be discussed within WGI and OECD Committees. Ultimately, it should lead to a first snapshot of how Principles have been implemented at various levels in selected voluntary countries, to be presented at the 8th World Water Forum (2018, Brasilia).

Which Global governance mechanism(s) for water-related SDGs?

20. Gérard Payen, member of [UNSGAB](#), informed delegates that UNSGAB will be terminated at the end of 2015. The adoption of a standalone SDG on water signals a new era: water is increasingly visible in political agendas; and the SDG sets a new and ambitious global water policy with an integrated vision, that is expected to trigger action on the ground. However, there are some governance obstacles. At national level, water policies should be reviewed to adapt the SDGs' targets, and tools are necessary to regularly monitor progress. The work of WGI on water governance indicators will thus be instrumental in supporting the achievement of these targets. At global level, international institutions should ensure that governments remain committed to implementing the new water policy they agreed upon. However, current global institutions either consider only some water challenges, or only some regions of the world. There is a need for a new global water architecture at the political level, which raises some questions: how will progress towards the targets be reviewed by governments in the future? Will there be any global dialogue with all stakeholders? How will the ambition and the integrated vision be maintained in the future? Furthermore, political and water challenges are likely to evolve in the coming 15 years, and new decisions will be needed. How will governments make these decisions when they do not meet regularly to discuss the challenges? Such discussions also raise questions regarding UN-Water and its ability to support the implementation of the water Goal. Is a new intergovernmental political arena needed to review the progress on water-related targets? Should UN member states meet regularly? What can be done to more closely link UN-Water agencies with UN member states? Should a UN scientific and practice body be created to support the implementation of the water-related SDGs? These questions were at the core of UNSGAB's last meeting, which [final recommendations](#) were presented to the UN Secretary General and governments at the end of November 2015, to tackle these challenges.

Group discussion

21. The WBCSD underlined that the business community has been a stakeholder in the process of developing the new Development Agenda. However, the UN Summit seemed centred on UN member states and agencies, while not addressing the agricultural and industrial actors, who are already contributing to the targets' achievement. To drive change effectively, the UN should find innovative mechanisms to bring stakeholders in the decision-making process.

22. The OECD is committed to engage all stakeholders in the implementation of the Principles: umbrella organisations of stakeholders will be consulted in 2016 to identify how they can contribute to putting the Principles into action. Similar consultations will take place regarding water governance indicators to provide pilot-testing and reality checks. This is in line with the WGI message that governance is not only about governments.

23. Sorbonne University emphasised the importance of having indicators to foster good practices. Forthcoming water governance indicators should look at other indicator frameworks developed by OECD related to areas of public procurement and the impact of institutions. In addition, such indicators should not neglect sanitation services, which cannot be isolated from the improvement of water services.

24. The Butterfly Effect was satisfied that NGOs actively participated in the UN process to develop the SDGs, and called for solutions to keep such multi-stakeholder engagement ongoing.

25. UNECE underlined that UN agencies are making a co-ordinated effort to map and inform countries on inter-linkages across SDG targets, and a [UN-Water metadata document](#) on the water-related Goal and targets is available. In addition, a number of frameworks can contribute to implementing the SDGs. In particular, the [UNECE Convention on transboundary watercourses](#) and the [Protocol on Water](#)

[and Health](#) have several tools that could be useful (e.g. score cards on equitable access to health and water supply and sanitation).

26. SIWI pointed out that monitoring the progress of the SDGs will be a greater challenge than implementing the SDGs. Developing robust monitoring systems require long-term investments.

27. Action Against Hunger recommended to hold more discussions on the monitoring process, and suggested that events such as the World Water Forum could be an arena to do so.

28. Fiona Gore concluded with some insights from recent discussions on the SDG indicator framework. Indicators for targets 6.1 and 6.2 (safely manage water and sanitation) are agreed upon, except for hygiene. Indicators for targets 6.3 (wastewater management and water quality), 6.6 (wetlands) and 6a (ODA flows) were also approved. At the time of the 6th WGI meeting, the experts pointed out that further discussions were needed on indicators for targets 6.4 (water-use efficiency), 6.5 (IWRM) and 6b (local participation).²

29. Gérard Payen agreed that multi-stakeholder dialogues on the SDGs should be fostered at global levels. The water community should follow the example of the food security community who set up a political committee during the last food crisis, which was formally informed by a scientific panel and a permanent multi-stakeholder representation. Regarding the monitoring framework, it is expected that statisticians will finalise the proposed list of indicators by the end of November 2015, to be formally endorsed in March 2016.

World Water Forum

Results of the 7th World water Forum's Survey

30. Danielle Gaillard Picher from the World Water Council presented the results from the evaluation survey carried out on the [7th World Water Forum](#). It was considered opportune to revisit the previous evaluation, carried out in 2009 following the [5th World Water Forum](#), which was conducted to assess and provide recommendations on the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder engagement and collective learning mechanisms offered by the Forum. A new evaluation would, therefore, provide an interesting comparative analysis of the evolution of the Forum's processes over time and also provide the opportunity to seek new views on follow-up mechanisms to support ongoing collective action in between editions of the World Water Forum.

31. Over 5,000 registered Forum participants were invited to take part in the survey in August 2015. The survey covered three parts: the participant, the experience at the 7th Forum and the World Water Forum in general. The response rate was 10.8%. Survey results show that, on the one hand, the Forum's main strength is the multi-stakeholder knowledge exchange that enables the creation of better understanding, participatory learning and collective action; and on the other hand, that the Forum's weakness centres on the need for more concrete actions and commitments and for more innovative thinking. Satisfaction ratings are overwhelmingly positive for the Forum in general, the dialogue and learning experience, and the quality of the sessions, but less so for the level of audience participation/interaction.

- On the participants: they were mostly male, as in 2009. A majority of the participants is from NGOs or national governments, similarly to the 2009 results. Youth respondents have doubled

² Written comments received from Turkey on the draft version of these highlights pointed out that Turkey disagrees with the statement that further discussions were needed, especially on target 6.4.

since 2009. The respondents' geographical affiliation is mainly from Asia, easily explained by the Forum taking place in Korea.

- On the 7th World Water Forum: nearly half of the respondents contributed to the 7th Forum's preparatory process, doubling since 2009, with a majority (38%) engaging in the year prior to the Forum, most often as session contributors. Nearly half of the respondents (47%) attended the World Water Forum for the entire week. However, feedback highlights that the Forum should not be in one single venue to avoid dispersion. The thematic sessions gathered most participants and earned the highest level of satisfaction in 2015. Feedback points to strengthening the other processes.
- On the World Water Fora: respondents agreed that all critical water issues are covered during the Fora but perceived the 7th Forum had less inherent value and did not fully meet its purpose as compared to the 5th Forum, especially on generating political commitment. The 7th Forum is perceived as more open and participatory than the 5th Forum, although it did not sufficiently reflect a variety of perspectives (e.g. from NGOs, women, non-water sectors, the media, politicians, regional representation, youth).
- Over 91% of respondents felt that there is a need for greater continuity between World Water Fora. The WGI can be considered as an exemplary and successful continuity mechanism. A majority of respondents (59%) also suggest creating stronger linkages between the World Water Fora and other international events and processes. 61% of respondents find the 7th Forum's Implementation Roadmaps very or somewhat useful and 49% thought they will help catalyse collective action.

32. In addition to the survey, interviews with 15 signatories of the [Daegu-Gyeongbuk Implementation Commitment](#) (DGIC) and desk research were carried out to determine how the World Water Forum compares to other international water events, and how the Implementation Roadmaps relate to the broader post-2015 development agenda. The study revealed that the proposed mechanisms have value and should be pursued, supported, and improved, and demonstrated potential for linking to the Sustainable Development Goals agenda.

33. During the World Water Week in Stockholm, a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was signed between the Korea Water Forum, on behalf of the Korean Government, and the World Water Council in regard to Implementation Roadmaps. The MoU sets out proposals on how best to support Implementation Roadmaps, as the key vehicle to monitor, account and report on publicly committed actions between the 7th and 8th editions of the World Water Forum. It recognises the role of DGIC signatories as key voluntary leaders in the follow up process. It sets up the basis for creating a World Water Partnership, a loose network of past and future World Water Forum host countries whose experience could support the Roadmaps process and influence other associated international processes. It establishes responsibility for the WWC to monitor and report on outcomes of the Roadmaps on a semestrial basis and for Korea to host an annual review meeting to aid in that process.

On the road to the 8th World Water Forum

34. Paulo Salles represented the Organising Committee of the 8th World Water Forum and presented the road to Brasilia's 8th World Water Forum in 2018. The theme "Sharing Water" echoes the critical issues of sharing water bodies, co-operation, planning, monitoring, and solidarity. It is also in line with the fundamentals of Brazil's water policy: decentralisation, participation and multiple uses of water. The first kick-off meeting will take place in April 2016 (tbc). Preliminary discussions foresee the creation of a virtual platform to support dialogue and exchanges. The emphasis will also be on making the Forum a process, rather than just an event. The Forum will focus on the topic of sustainability as part of the

different processes (thematic, political, regional, citizen) and conclude with the adoption of a Brasilia Declaration on water sustainability. Brazil will also focus on strengthening the political process of the Forum in the early stages, to discuss critical political aspects of water. The regional process will be emphasised as well, to encourage an inter-regional approach. The Forum agenda will have fewer themes than the 7th Forum, but more in-depth discussions and a strong component on the SDGs. Brazil is also committed to make the Citizen Forum an integral part of the Forum, rather than an alternative event. The "Road to Brasilia", an initiative of the Brazilian business group of the World Water Council, will seek in particular to mobilise civil society through non-technical dialogues that will also end in a Declaration.

Group discussion

35. CNRS reminded delegates that the 7th Forum also organised for the first time a double competition on good water projects, whether related to innovation, governance or regional approaches, which could be reproduced and improved for the 8th Forum.

36. The Water Youth Network welcomed the commitment of Brazil to raise the profile of the Citizen Forum. Youth organisations are starting to mobilise, including in Brazil, to participate in the "Road to Brasilia" initiative.

37. The Butterfly Effect praised the 7th Forum's approach to involve stakeholders during the preparatory work, such as part of the thematic process. It was pointed out that having the Citizen Forum held in the same venue as the other processes would facilitate exchanges across different actors.

38. K-water reiterated that to support continuity between two Fora, the World Water Council and former host countries created the World Water Partnership with the objective to resolve global water problems by effectively implementing and disseminating the outcomes of each World Water Forum. In addition, the Asian Water Council will be launched in 2016 to seek concrete actions for the water sector in Asia. Therefore, the WGI could build co-operative relationships with both the World Water Partnership and the Asian Water Council to implement and disseminate the Principles on Water Governance.

39. Peter Gammeltoft advised that the next Forum should also look closely at the link between water and climate change, to discuss key issues such as water efficiency and the water-energy-food nexus.

Peer-review: OECD Report on Water Governance in Cities

40. The OECD Secretariat presented the main findings of the draft OECD report "Water Governance in Cities", which builds on the results of a survey carried out across 48 cities from OECD and non-OECD countries. The report proposes an analytical framework that combines: i) an assessment of key factors affecting urban water governance, making a distinction between factors within and outside the water sector; ii) a mapping of who does what at which level in water policy-making and implementation, regulation, information/monitoring/evaluation and financing across different water functions, from drinking water supply to water security; iii) an appraisal of the main multi-level governance gaps to urban water management; and iv) a set of policy responses based on the "3Ps" (policies, people, places) co-ordination framework. The report argues that the successful recipe for better governance in cities lies upon the co-ordination across *policies*, to favour inter-sectoral complementarities, while efficiently allocating resources and building capacities; *people*, to raise awareness on current and future water risks, manage conflicts on water allocation and set convergent objectives across policy areas; and *places*, to overcome territorial mismatches and favouring co-operation between cities and their surroundings.

Group discussion:

41. The Netherlands welcomed the report's approach to look at cities jointly with their hinterlands. It was suggested to include the process of city-to-city learning in the report, as an example of mechanism whereby cities can learn from each other's best practices. Networks such as the [C40](#) and [100 Resilient Cities](#) provide good example of such platforms. It was also recommended to add the geographical location of cities in the report as a factor affecting water governance (e.g. delta cities may face different challenges and solutions than mountainous urban areas). The Sustainable Development Goal n°11 could also be added as a reference.

42. Peter Gammeltoft congratulated the Secretariat for highlighting both the complexity and the diversity of urban environments. The report stresses the importance of horizontal co-ordination, policy coherence, financing, and urban-rural co-operation. Three issues are often common to all urban areas: policy integration, financing and water pricing. City mayors play a pivotal role in these areas. Several networks of cities (e.g. [Sustainable Cities Network](#), [ICLEI](#), [H2O](#), [City Blueprint](#)) encourage experience-sharing among cities and can help raise awareness on the benefits of good urban water governance.

43. The Dutch Association of Water Authorities welcomed the draft report for its added value to inform daily practice of dialogue with cities, and for providing incentives to raise the profile of water at national and European levels. Indeed, the EU is preparing an urban agenda in which water is nearly absent. The OECD report could help raise the profile of water in urban policies. Spatial planning in cities calls for innovation and could be linked to the Principle on Water Governance n°8.

44. Scotland underlined that better linking urban and rural areas can yield important benefits. However, it calls for complex modelling system that would bring information from rural hinterlands into urban solutions. It was also recommended to link the report's policy options to the Principles to combine the two guiding frameworks.

45. WWF international pointed out that cities are centres of finance and of innovation to improve water governance.

46. Deltares argued that many cities ask for more resources to manage water because they consider they are better placed than national authorities to deal with water governance. Therefore, the report could further investigate the national-local link related to urban water governance.

47. The UN Water Decade Programme on Communication and Advocacy wondered how the report's conclusions could also be used in non-OECD countries and to support the SDGs' implementation. On vertical integration, many initiatives are carried out by communities in non-OECD countries.

48. The Open University underlined that cities are changing and have new demands for water governance. A project on [Water Sensitive Cities](#) in Australia questions the notion of cities itself from "Drained cities" to "Water-supply cities" and "Water-sensitive cities".

49. AgroParisTech stressed that to properly address water governance in vulnerable cities, territorial continuity is needed with urban and peri-urban areas. A relevant scale could be the hinterland where water use-based issues can be addressed.

50. Transparency International's experience echoes the OECD's conclusions that obstacles to stakeholder engagement relate to lack of funding, lack of time, and consultation fatigue. Successful examples of cities regarding stakeholder engagement could be highlighted in the report. The list of key words often associated with water management in cities shows governance in a low position, which could be explained by a failure to properly advocate water governance among various stakeholders.

51. The Water Youth Network pointed out that ageing infrastructure is an inter-temporal problem, which will be faced by future generations, even if solved in the coming years. It is thus important to increase awareness of future decision-makers' responsibilities, and to investigate the extent to which managerial and governance capacities are transferred from managers and decision makers to youth.

52. SIWI is preparing a paper on water governance in arid and semi-arid African cities. It highlights that people have to go further away to get water, partly because of groundwater over-exploitation, and need to invest in water management and to transport water in different ways. The report could illustrate more lessons learnt from the experience of OECD countries that could be relevant for arid/semi-arid countries, linking to economic growth and social development. The report's conclusions could mention that cities should become more autonomous to raise and invest their own revenues. Transparency, integrity and participation would then be critical to monitor such revenues.

53. Utrecht University advised to make a distinction between land use and spatial planning, because the former relates to property rights and land owners perspectives, while the latter relates to strategic plans.

54. Murcia Water Agency congratulated the OECD Water Governance team for the report. He emphasised that tariff regulation is a major governance problem at the local/regional level, with each municipality setting up its own tariffs. This leads to inequalities and unfair prices. An idea could be to develop governance recommendations to ensure that the criteria to set up the water tariff would lead to a clearer, more comparable and more rational system. It was emphasised that this would not limit the municipal capacity in water regulation but would instead improve transparency and public participation.

55. The OECD Secretariat shared some final remarks. The report should be considered as a benchmarking exercise across metropolitan, urban and rural areas. City networks like [ICLEI](#) and [H2O](#) have been looped in the project to provide insights. Best practices on innovative governance at city level will be further investigated. National-local co-ordination and transfer of responsibilities to cities should not prevent policy alignment with the national level. Also, national governments have a role to play in empowering sub-national actors when needed. The draft report adopts a territorial approach based on the functional urban areas applied to the water sector. Good practice of city-to-city learning can be found in the green growth field where the OECD is testing a "[knowledge sharing platform](#)" with developing countries. A co-operation programme is currently being pilot-tested with cities in Thailand, the Philippines, and Vietnam. The issue of decentralisation should not be confused with autonomy, but related to partnership. The more competences are devolved to lower levels of government, the more arrangements are needed to co-ordinate and align policies. The list of key terms associated to water management shows "infrastructure" at the top, which can be explained by cities' concern about ageing infrastructures in a context of economic crisis and fiscal consolidation. This is overshadowing more structural, institutional reforms that are needed to cope with water-related challenges. Finally, the report deliberately focuses mainly on cities from OECD countries to show that developed economies also face serious water issues. Its conclusions are relevant for developing countries as well. More concretely, the launch of the report will be followed by the setting-up of an online database where city profiles will be publicly available.

56. The Chair concluded that cities are becoming increasingly autonomous, which should ideally be coupled with greater partnerships and check and balances across levels of government and stakeholders. However, cities with growing water demand, ageing infrastructure and decreasing water availability are under great pressure. Looking ahead, solutions will have to be innovative to tackle such challenges, looking for instance at circular economy.

Knowledge-sharing on recent/ongoing water governance research or publications

Water Integrity Global Outlook

57. WIN provided an update on the forthcoming [Water Integrity Global Outlook](#)³, a joint undertaking of WIN, SIWI, GWP, IWMI and TI. The publication provides some projections on integrity, in particular in the post-2015 era, and makes strong links with the work of WGI. In particular, the OECD Secretary General was asked to write the preface. The Outlook builds on sound literature review and policy recommendations were discussed with various actors, such as WaterAid and the World Bank. It will aim to spur dialogue at country and local levels, and with the private sector on integrity issues. Two key messages from the Outlook can be highlighted: i) evaluating integrity provides an indication of the "health" of the water sector; ii) the sustainability of the water sector requires addressing corruption, which should be tackled collectively with the broad range of stakeholders. Overall, more research is needed on the financial and economic costs of corruption in the water sector, as well as performance of integrity measures, and institutions like SIWI, IWMI and OECD are well-placed to conduct further investigation, such as through case studies and surveys. The Outlook is expected to be launched early 2016, and will be presented at international conferences and the next WGI meeting.

A book "Une victoire face aux multinationales: ma bataille pour l'eau de Paris"

58. Anne Le Strat, former President of Eau de Paris, presented key highlights from a recently-launched book "[Une victoire face aux multinationales: ma bataille pour l'eau de Paris](#)". The book addresses the process of "remunicipalising" the water and sanitation service provision in Paris. From 1985 to 2001, service provision in Paris was delegated to private operators. The decision was made to shift service provision to a public management model with the creation of a public operator, Eau de Paris. Paris followed objectives of economic, social, environmental and democratic sustainability. The public operator was officially created in 2008. A contract was signed between the operator and the city of Paris, which retains organisational powers, to set out clear objectives of performance and serve as an evaluation tool. The public provider operates according to a long-term investment policy, an innovative social policy targeting the poor, and an environmental protection policy (with targeted actions at catchment level). Eau de Paris has also fostered close relations with customers and civil society through a municipal Water Citizen Observatory that fosters dialogue on key water issues. She argued that Paris has become an example of a city where water is more than a technical issue, but has been integrating citizens' expectations. While Paris' experience might look specific, a similar process could take place in other cities, building on key aspects such as sound service evaluation, data sharing and transparency, oversight by the municipal authority, financial balance and investments, innovation, etc. Strong political will is also critical. Since the shift, the private sector has kept a role in water service provision in the form of infrastructure development and technological innovations.

The 2016 Dutch Delta Programme

59. The Netherlands presented the recently-adopted [2016 Dutch Delta Programme](#) organised around three pillars: water security, freshwater availability and spatial adaptation. On the latter, the Delta Programme aims to better integrate water and spatial planning strategies, and to encourage policy makers to design policies that protect vital infrastructure in case of flooding (e.g. hospitals, gas pipelines, etc.). Using a risk-based approach, the Netherlands has designed new standards for flood protection, which consist of a probability of 1 in 100 000 for every inhabitant in the country. When economic activity is concentrated, the probability is even lower. Dutch authorities are also dedicated to securing more freshwater availability, given that 20% of the economic activity depends on it. It will for instance consist in

³ For an overview of the report, see: <http://exploredoc.com/doc/4133180/water-integrity-global-outlook>

more transparency in order for investors to take informed decisions. The new Delta Programme will focus on implementing proposed measures for each of the three pillars, and will be supported by a dedicated budget. Indeed, a Delta Fund of around EUR 1.2 billion per year until 2028 supports the activities of the Delta Programme, independently from political changes. It is made of national and local taxes. The Delta Act, which underlies the Delta Programme, requires yearly updates, with clear timetables and expenditure planning. It also nominates a Delta Commissioner who co-ordinates the various stakeholders involved. The Delta Programme marks a change in Dutch paradigm, from a reactive to a proactive strategy regarding flood management.

Towards a special issue on water governance of "Water International"

60. The IWRA proposes to publish a special issue of its journal "[Water International](#)" on water governance, in co-operation with the WGI. There is growing literature on water governance and it would be timely to dedicate a special issue, while making the most of the knowledge-base of the WGI. It would provide an opportunity to mobilise the WGI's scientific members, and to give the WGI an internationally peer-reviewed voice. "Water International" is the official peer-review journal of IWRA, published by Taylor & Francis, and is considered as the leading scientific publication on water resources management and policy. Seven editions are published every year, in addition to special issues co-ordinated with major international organisations such as UNESCO-IHP. A joint special issue with the WGI would consist of a compendium of 10 to 14 articles that would be submitted to rigorous and independent scientific process. IWRA and the Secretariat would work together to prepare an outline that would be validated by an editorial committee. The Chief Editor of "Water International" sets out publishing requirements for the issue to be international, interdisciplinary and covering a relevant water topic. The target audience mirrors the composition of the WGI, i.e. policy-makers, public authorities, and researchers. An Editorial Committee, composed of 4-5 scholars from WGI, could examine and select the papers before the peer-review process. The special issue could be tentatively published during the second half of 2016. Typically, issues are complemented after the launch by policy briefs targeting different audiences, as well as by debates and discussions on the topic. Moving forward, WGI members are invited to share manifestation of interest to publish in the special issue. A working group could also be created to support the process, jointly between IWRA and WGI secretariat.

CADWAGO project's findings on systemic water governance

61. The UK Open University presented the findings of the [CADWAGO project](#) on systemic water governance (Climate Adaptation and Water Governance). The project was funded by Volkswagen Stiftung and Riksbankens, as part of the Global Change Initiative. The project aims to shed light on the link between changes in practices and changes in understanding, which are critical for water governance. It identifies factors that influence these changes over time: stake holding; institutions and policies, and epistemologies. The project digs deeper into the latter factor to investigate how people think about water, with what purpose, and in what framework. It suggests a systemic enquiry for water governance in England and Wales, building on the second phase of the EU Water Framework Directive to reconsider how catchments are connected to river basins. In 2011, the Open University was asked by Defra to help develop a systemic collective inquiry on how to reconnect catchments into the Water Framework Directive, jointly with a core group of stakeholders from major water bodies and government departments. The discussion highlighted that drinking water supply is not a major issue in England as compared to the good ecological status of water bodies. The project also fostered co-ordination between stakeholders at national and local levels. As a consequence, some national agencies have started to invest in skills and practices to rethink their water governance practices. The project concluded with two main messages on systemic approaches to complexity in water governance: i) policy-makers need to act to increase diversity in complex situations and should worked based on various choices rather than an unique approach; ii) only through collaboration can policy-makers get through complex situations.

A book on “Frontiers of Land and Water Governance in Urban Regions”

62. The Utrecht University presented its recent book on the "[Frontier of land and water governance](#)". The intensification and expansion of land and water use in urban areas call for rethinking the relation between spatial planning and water management. The two areas used to be separated but a new governance era is emerging that brings them closer. The book purposely refers to the term "frontier" rather than "boundary", and proposes an analytical framework to look at the different governance challenges related to the frontier between spatial planning and water management. Three types of socially-constructed physical frontiers are identified: i) vertical, related to groundwater management issues; ii) horizontal, related to urban river fronts and dynamics; and iii) fluid, related to flood risks and property right conflicts. Case studies in the book revealed that governance challenges and social confrontations are different from one type of frontier to another, and require different answers. Rethinking water governance along these frontiers can help design tailored solutions, particularly when spatial planning and water management overlap.

A Reference Guide for Programming Accountability in WASH

63. SIWI introduced a [Reference Guide on programming accountability](#) in WASH. It was developed as part of a dialogue with UNDP and UNICEF to strengthen the sustainability of their investments in the WASH sector. Recent reports, such as prepared by the auditors of the European Commission, showed that accountability and good governance at large are key to secure long-term sustainability in investments. Two publications on "[Accountability in WASH: Explaining the Concept](#)" and collecting practical experience on how to improve accountability were thus prepared, including with country cases in Burkina Faso, Guinea-Bissau, Madagascar, and Algeria, to support policy analysis on how to strengthen accountability across the water and sanitation service value chain. Accountability is about relationships and is a way to formalise or regulate how different types of stakeholders (policy-makers, regulators, service providers and consumers) relate to each other. The publications also address the informal water supply sector, which falls out of the regulated system. SIWI's Reference Guide provides nine different examples on how to improve accountability in various contexts. It breaks down accountability into aspects of responsibility, answerability, and enforceability. The Reference Guide also includes action sheets for community-based monitoring, participatory budgeting, citizens' report cards, etc. These include lessons learnt and provide practical guidance on how to work on accountability.

A Governance Assessment guide for drought adaptation

64. The water authority of Vechtstromen introduced the [Governance Assessment Guide](#) for drought adaptation prepared under the [DROP project](#), which was financed by the European Regional Development Funding. The Dutch water authority of Vechtstromen was the lead partner, along with other practitioners and scientists. The project covered six regions in North West Europe dealing with drought adaptation. The Governance Assessment Tool builds on the research from the DROP project and is not specific to drought contexts but can be applied to various water governance practices. It has been applied by five knowledge partners from the countries involved in the DROP project, as well as in several countries including Canada, Iran, Vietnam, Turkey, Romania, and Mexico. The Tool echoes the Principles on Water Governance by referring to efficiency, trust and engagement. It takes the form of a matrix with assessment questions around five dimensions of governance: i) levels and skills; ii) actors and networks; iii) perceptions of the problems and goals ambitions; iv) strategies and instruments; and v) responsibilities and resources for implementation. The assessment of these dimensions is based on criteria of extent, coherence, flexibility and intensity. The Assessment Tool does not intend to be normative, but to assess whether current governance conditions are supportive or restrictive to effective water management. It aims to provide insights for practitioners and create effective action perspectives on the ground, and it can be applied at

various levels (national, regional, local). It is expected to lead to a publication on the governance of drought resilience in 2016.

Additional experience-sharing

65. ASTEE shared with delegates an update on current institutional reforms in France that have an impact in the water sector. New laws enforced in 2015 will progressively strengthen the role of local authorities. Metropolitan areas and smaller local authorities will be given greater responsibilities. The reform will set a minimal size for organising authorities for public services. In the water sector, it is expected that this reform will bring the total number of organising authorities from 24 000 to less than 2000 by 2020. Inter-municipal bodies will also have greater prerogatives related to territorial development, integrated management of rivers, and flood protection, in coherence with the level of water service management. The governance frameworks of these public bodies should be strengthened to deal with these new responsibilities. Recent changes were also brought to France's basin governance framework: multi-stakeholder representation within basin committees was reformed to give a greater voice to associations and NGOs, and to local authorities. The reform is also expected to foster greater benchmark between public authorities regarding water services. The Ministers of Ecology and the Interior have jointly commissioned a study on the price of water by a dedicated working group that includes an OECD expert.

66. Aqua Publica Europea has recently released a publication "[Water and Climate: European Public Water Operators' commitment to water resources protection](#)" with best practices from its members on the protection of water resources. It presents a variety of experiences, ranging from reducing agricultural pollution, to detecting water linkages.

67. FP2E (the Federation of French water companies) made the point that the debate between private or public management of water services should give way to a discussion on the public governance of public services, in terms of securing the needed capacities to reach intended objectives. Private sector participation in water management has taken various forms, from the delegation of public services, to companies with mixed economies. Future discussions should address the issue of investment needs for managing infrastructure, a field where the private sector has greatly invested in France, up to EUR 900 million per year, and on technological innovations.

68. CNRS shared the conclusion of a recent research across several European countries on the evolution of urban water governance. It showed that there are three possible policy options to address current challenges: i) upscaling water management to shift responsibilities to upper levels, such as at the regional scale like in Portugal and Great Britain, or river basin scale like in Germany and the Netherlands; ii) downscaling water management in the form of neighbourhood management with high level of stakeholder engagement, which can take place simultaneously to up-scaling; and iii) technological sophistication of water management through new technologies, such as Singapore or Barcelona with desalination or wastewater reuse.

69. The National University of Public Service of Hungary announced that it will create an International Water Governance Centre, to carry research on two key topics: i) the effectiveness of transboundary water management in Europe, and ii) a comparison of Federal water governance regimes (e.g. in the United States, Australia, Brazil, etc.).

70. GWP-Med shared a new report on "[Water Governance in Palestine: Sector Reform to include Private Sector Participation](#)", prepared jointly by GWP-Med and the Palestinian Water Authority to support water reform in the country, within the framework of the Union for the Mediterranean labelled project "Governance & Financing for the Mediterranean Water Sector". It is the result of a multi-stakeholder policy dialogue to build trust and ownership among more than 100 key stakeholders. The

report proposes policy recommendations and a plan with proposed actions for enhancing water governance and improving financial sustainability of the sector. GWP -represented by GWP-Med- referred to the [SDG Preparedness Facility](#) that is currently under preparation by GWP together with its regions. Given that GWP fully supports the implementation of the OECD Principles on Water Governance within the framework of the SDGs, there is room for further co-operation with the WGI in this area.

71. UNECE mentioned an upcoming report, "[Policy Guidance Note on the Benefits of Transboundary Water Cooperation: Identification, Assessment and Communication](#)", covering several transboundary river basins to assess inter-sectoral linkages, trade-offs, and benefits. The report also covers governance issues related to the regulatory framework, and interactions between actors and policies. It was launched on 17-19 November in Budapest.

72. The University of Dundee hosts a UNESCO Centre for Water which looks at the importance of scale in water governance, and how policy-makers in Scotland have been very keen on focusing on catchments in river basin planning. The Centre focuses on analysing legal frameworks for the provision of water and sanitation services and water resources management. The upcoming work of WGI on indicators will be highly valuable for this research.

Outcomes on water governance of recent major events

25th Stockholm World Water Week

73. SIWI shared the outcomes of the [25th World Water Week](#) held in Stockholm on 22-28 August and which gathered over 3500 participants from 120 countries. Many workshops linked governance discussions to issues of financing and infrastructure development. A specific workshop focused on rethinking governance: the objective was to look at how past failures could be turned into positive outcomes when properly analysed. It also addressed the issue of equity through innovative governance such as targeting indigenous people, and the topic of the water-energy-food nexus. The implication of water as a human right on governance was also discussed during the launch of the manual "[Human rights based approach to integrated water resources management](#)". The Week also celebrated the 10th anniversary of the collaboration between SIWI and the [UNDP Water Governance Facility](#) with a jubilee publication that compiles experiences on infrastructure-technology-governance.

2nd International Forum of Water Regulators

74. IWA presented the [2nd International Water Regulators Forum](#) held in London on 7-8 September and jointly organised with the UK Environment Agency. The Forum fostered experience-sharing, skill transfers and the creation of new partnerships, in particular between regulators and other key stakeholders. The [1st Forum](#) (Lisbon, 2014) concluded with the [Lisbon Charter](#) that sets international guiding principles on water public policies and regulations, an outline to the rights, duties and responsibilities of stakeholders; and a basis for sound institutional development. It also built on key messages from the OECD report "[Stakeholder Engagement for Inclusive Water Governance](#)", and was endorsed by the IWA board of directors. The 2nd Forum focused on the implementation of the Lisbon Charter, as well as the OECD Principles on Water Governance. Participants worked in thematic groups to prepare working papers around five main topics: i) integration across regulatory boundaries; ii) beyond compliance monitoring and reporting; iii) enabling innovation for better service delivery; iv) stakeholder participation for better regulation (with OECD); and v) regulatory tools for sustainable financing. The Forum's key message emphasises that the diversity of countries and regulatory frameworks calls for various policy solutions. Nevertheless, regulators can share lessons learnt and good practices to better understand the common challenges they are facing. The 3rd Forum will be held during the next [IWA World Water Congress](#) in Brisbane, jointly with the Water Directorate of the Northern Territory Department of Land Resources

Management. It will serve as a basis for an IWA Global Outlook on the strengths and gaps in water and sanitation service regulation. It will address the enabling regulatory environment for more resilient systems, the role of regulators in long-term planning and the regulation for basins and cities of the future.

2015 OSCE Economic & Environmental Forum on Water Governance

75. The OSCE held the concluding session of its [23rd Economic and Environmental Forum](#) on 14-16 September in Prague. This Forum takes place yearly, tackles a key topic of concern for security and is organised around three sessions in different locations. The first session discussed the basic concepts and introduced the early messages of the principles of water governance and the links between water challenges and social and political stability. The second session discussed water governance in the context of disaster risk reduction, such as the benefits of transboundary co-operation in the context of floods, as well as stakeholder participation. The last session took stock of the policy recommendations raised in the other sessions to discuss what can OSCE's role be in this area. The 3rd meeting was also the opportunity to present the final set Principles on Water Governance as well as to review participating States' implementation of their commitments in the field of water governance and management. Following the Forum, a call has now been launched for the adoption of a ministerial council decision on water governance with a draft under negotiation.

"5+5 Water Action Plan in the Western Mediterranean" workshop

76. Spain presented the outcomes of a recent workshop regarding the Action Plan of the [5+5 Water Strategy](#) in the Western Mediterranean that took place on 10 September in Madrid. The objective was to establish criteria to support the effective implementation of the Action Plan. The workshop addressed the synergies between water and environment and defined the different types of projects that can be developed under the Strategy: sustainable projects, regional projects, national projects that can also be up-scaled at regional level, and demonstrative projects. Examples of projects are a Mediterranean water knowledge platform, a study on hydrological consequences of climate change in the western Mediterranean, or a comparative analysis of water reuse in the region. Overall, more than 20 projects have been suggested. The draft Action Plan is expected to be endorsed at Ministerial level during the second half of 2016.

1st International conference on Redrafting Water Governance

77. APDA shared key messages from the 1st international conference on [Redrafting Water Governance](#) held on 8-9 October 2015 in Lisbon, Portugal. The event aimed to i) discuss governance alternatives to deal with the complexity and human dimension of the water sector; ii) suggest a paradigm shift towards integrated water management at all appropriate levels; iii) promote innovative thinking to leverage human capital in imaginative ways; and iv) incorporate new structures and platforms to foster learning in the water sector between academics and practitioners. The conference was an opportunity to discuss, among other issues, the institutional, administrative and legal instruments in water governance; innovative governance solutions at several levels, and the OECD Principles on Water Governance. It concluded with a call for water governance to be more widely discussed in academic research, and in university programmes. Some papers prepared for the conference have been published in a special issue of the "[Utilities Policy](#)" peer-reviewed journal, including a dedicated article on the OECD Principles on Water Governance.

EURO-INBO 2015

78. The [latest meeting](#) of the [EURO-INBO](#) took place on 23-24 October in Thessalonica, Greece, in the presence of the Environment Minister of the new Greek government. The meeting had four main themes: i) the measures of adaptation to the effects of climate change; ii) water governance in

transboundary basins; iii) financing of water policy and economic analysis; and iv) local processes for the application of EU Directives related to water. A special workshop also discussed diffuse pollution management. In all, 193 participants from 32 countries attended the meeting and adopted, at its closing, a [Declaration of Thessalonica](#) that will be presented to the strategic co-ordination group of the European Commission. The next meetings will be held in Lourdes, France (2016) and Dublin, Ireland (2017). The meeting was also the occasion to address the peer-review mechanism of the WFD whereby basin management plans in one country are audited by a basin organisation from another country. Such procedures currently involve 14 river basins. The EURO-INBO group also discussed the setting-up of a joint platform between INBO, UNECE and UNESCO to test adaptation measures to climate change in basins, particularly transboundary ones; the OECD Principles on Water Governance and the SDGs. INBO is also involved in the preparation of COP21 and has prepared a [Paris Pact](#) for the adaptation to climate change in basins, which has gathered more than 90 signatures from major stakeholders. WGI members were invited to sign the Pact, which set out to: i) reinforce capacity development and knowledge; ii) adapt basin management planning to climate change; iii) reinforce governance; and iv) ensure adequate financing.

Towards an International (UN) Year for Water and Women

79. The Butterfly Effect informed delegates that 2017 could be named International Year on Water and Women. It would mark the 25th anniversary of the [Dublin Principles](#), which states that “women play a central part in the provision, management and safeguarding of water”. The pivotal role of women as providers and users of water has seldom been reflected in institutional arrangements for the development and management of water resources. Accepting and implementing this principle requires policies to address women’s specific needs and to empower women to participate at all levels in water resources programmes, including decision-making and implementation. This proposed International Year would also be timely regarding the implementation of the SDGs n°5 and 6 (on equity and water), and would provide an opportunity for mainstreaming gender strategies in the work of major international institutions such as AMCOW, ADB, GWP and OECD, as well as at operational level. It would also provide a follow-up to recent events related to gender and water, such as conferences in [Duschanbe](#) (2013), [East London](#) (2014) and [Zaragoza](#) (2015), and as an input to the 8th World Water Forum. It would bring visible attention to involve women in the implementation of the SDGs on water management and governance, and spur the creation of a global fund for water and women. Moving forward, WGI members are invited to support the process by promoting the International Year in their ministries and their UN country missions, and by assisting in implementing the Principle on Water Governance n°10 on stakeholder engagement.

Other events and updates

80. PF2E welcomed initiatives taken by international organisations like OECD and IWA to discuss water governance. Most recently, a specific session on governance and regulation was organised as part of the FP2E General Assembly and shed light on how regulatory functions are organised in France.

81. The Water Youth Network recalled that a session on youth engagement was held during the World Water Week, with senior stakeholders eager to involve youth organisations.

82. Transparency International pointed out that the nexus between governance, infrastructure and financing is critical considering the level of corruption in the contracting business. The European Union is promoting a project on the application of integrity pacts developed by Transparency International to help reduce corruption in construction. The 2015 Work Plan of the B20 Anticorruption Task Force includes a focus on best practice in procurement in large/significant infrastructure projects.

83. Peter Gammeltoft underlined that water governance needs civil society's support to be successful. Thus, water managers should learn to take customers' views into account in order to build robust water policies.

84. The UN Decade Programme on Advocacy and Communication mentioned its last conference held in January 2015 in Zaragoza on the topic of water and sustainable development. The event focused on the "what", the "how" and the "who" needed to implement the SDGs as part of a social learning process to understand how each stakeholder foresees its role. A report "[Water and Sustainable Development: From vision to action - Means and tools for Implementation and the role of different actors](#)" was prepared following the conference on the means of implementation that was presented at the UN General Assembly.

85. Israel hosted the WATEC conference on 13-15 October in Tel Aviv, which focuses on water technologies. The Hebrew version of the OECD Principles on Water Governance was presented and should pave the way for further co-operation on water with the WGI.

86. Green Cross International pointed out 2 recent governance developments regarding the entry into force of the UN Water Courses Convention and the global opening of the UNECE Water Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes.

87. The Chair informed delegates about recent developments in the Netherlands regarding governance and financing in the water sector. The Netherlands [Water Bank](#) has issued in 2014 a green water bond of EUR 1 billion, which sold in a few hours, showing that international financiers are highly interested in this type of bonds.

88. GWP-Med held a workshop during the World Water Week in Stockholm on "Improving water governance for achieving financial sustainability in the Mediterranean" organised within the joint GWP-Med/OECD project "Governance & Financing for the Mediterranean Water Sector" and financially supported by Sida. The OECD Principles on Water Governance were presented, whereas lively discussions covered issues of governance, transparency, inclusiveness, stakeholder engagement and sustainable financing.⁴

89. The [2016 ASTEE Congress](#) will take place in June and a session will be organised jointly with OECD to discuss how the Principles on Water Governance and the SDGs can be applied in France.

90. Hungary invited delegates to attend the [7th session of the meeting of the parties to the UNECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes](#) held in Budapest on 17-19 November 2015. Three hundred participants and 80 countries have already confirmed participation at ministerial level. The meeting will be opened by the President of Hungary, and will be held, for the first time, under the global opening of the Convention.

WGI Future: Strategy and programme of work 2016-2018

Key highlights from the Strategic Paper

91. The OECD Secretariat reminded delegates that the first period of the WGI was from March 2013 to the 7th World Water Forum. A satisfaction survey was carried out across the 110+ WGI members and gathered a 70% response rate, which signaled a strong sense of ownership and commitment. Preliminary results were presented at the 5th WGI meeting, and were published in a [synthesis paper](#). A SWOT analysis

⁴ More information is available at: www.gwpmed.org/governanceandfinancing

was carried out during a one-day brainstorming retreat of the Steering Committee to develop a draft Strategic Paper. Four key messages ought to be conveyed regarding past achievements and ways forward:

- The WGI can be proud: 100% of survey respondents are satisfied with the WGI and all of them want to continue the activities. The WGI has proven successful in putting stakeholder engagement into practice, alongside policy-makers to design and implement water policies. There is a broad acknowledgement that the WGI has become a unique forum for discussions on water governance. Before the launch of the WGI, an [Inventory](#) of existing initiatives and platforms dealing with water governance was prepared and showed the need for such a network, and was supported by a broad pledge at the 6th World Water Forum.
- The WGI has delivered: The WGI's five objectives set in 2013 were completed through several national dialogues; peer-review of analytical work; contribution to the Principles on Water Governance thanks to thematic discussions in working groups and written feedback; contribution to the global water agenda (e.g. Budapest Water Summit, IWA World Water Congress, UN-Water Conference in Zaragoza, 7th World Water Forum) which have anchored the WGI globally.
- The WGI can still do better: The SWOT analysis flagged specific areas for improvement, related to membership gaps (e.g. local governments, property developers, missing OECD Members, non-OECD countries, etc.); the performance of selected working groups and the format of meeting among others.
- The WGI should move forward: Several OECD Members and other stakeholders call upon the WGI to move to implementation and action on the Principles, which may imply a new structure and four main activities: i) collecting and scaling-up good practices on the Principles, from basin to national levels, towards a Best Practice Database on water governance ii) developing water governance indicators through extensive discussions; iii) disseminating and communicating the Principles and iv) linking to the global agenda, especially the SDGs, and the World Water Forum. This new programme of work will also require implementation means (champion institutions, in-kind contribution, and fundraising) as well as the renewal of all memberships to the WGI.

Group discussion

92. IRSTEA shared interest to further work on the Principles to transform them into practical actions and potential strategies to support policy-makers on implementation in a multi-level context. Joint research on operational projects or strategies on operationalising the Principles could thus be developed, and would need funders, either within or outside the WGI (e.g. European Commission).

93. Peter Gammeltoft thanked the Secretariat for its dedication in making the WGI a success, along with the Chair and Steering Committee. Collecting good practices and developing indicators are effective ways forward and should be supported by a sound communication strategy. City mayors can help as water governance is an important issue at the local level. The water sector lacks strong lobbies, and engaging mayors, promoters, and urban managers can help tackle water challenges (i.e. policy coherence, the water-energy nexus, resource efficiency).

94. Turkey has followed the activities of the WGI closely. While acknowledging that the results from the satisfaction survey are encouraging, Turkey mentioned that they do not reflect the views of *all* the OECD members. While expressing concerns on the “Draft Strategic Paper on the achievements and ways forward for OECD-WGI (2016-2018)” and its annexes, Turkey offered to convey written comments from the related Ministries and institutions to the Secretariat, including on the suggested Observatory on water governance, which may be a difficult and complex process to put into practice. A call to be reasonable and

realistic was made and it was reminded that water governance was ranked lowest in the overall list of priorities for the Regional Development Policy Committee (RDPC). Turkey indicated a preference to keep the WGI as an *informal* platform where views and ideas of various participants are exchanged. Furthermore, it was mentioned that although there are 24 (out of 34) member countries in the WGI, the issue of how to engage further OECD membership should be addressed. Turkey would like to see the WGI to focus on best practices and national experiences and mainly to provide a platform to exchange views and ideas where interested countries and other stakeholders can draw lessons for their own national water issues.

95. Deltares shared the on-going effort in the Netherlands to disseminate the Principles. Several Dutch institutes are developing an assessment methodology for the Principles, which is being pilot-tested on the Dutch national flood programme. The methodology is structured around four steps: i) analysing the context and the scope of the process (who will contribute, which governance practices should be assessed, etc.); ii) assessing the Principles according to a particular case, looking at the outcomes and the effectiveness of governance practices, and the enabling/constraining conditions to implementing the Principles; iii) validating the assessment by external and independent experts; iv) drawing lessons from the results on what can be improved in the governance practice).

96. The Dutch Association of Water Authorities is developing an international co-operation programme that will include the Principles as a cornerstone for joint international work up to 2019. Future international co-operation, which will focus on nine non-OECD countries, will provide opportunities to communicate and share the Principles.

97. Ian Barker congratulated the WGI on helping to make governance an international "currency" when discussing water issues. Future work on water governance indicators should be done cautiously because measuring water governance can reveal poor performance and create tensions. Therefore, when indicators show lesser performance, they should be coupled with best practice as tools to remedy existing problems and improve performance.

98. Spain is committed to continue contributing to the next phase of the WGI and suggested that it better engages with agricultural actors, who represent important water users and create large pressure on water bodies. They should be active actors in building good water governance.

99. The WBCSD informed delegates that the Principles were discussed during the 2015 General Assembly and it was agreed that they would be integrated into their programme of work. The WGI budget deficit for the next biennium should be a concern for all members and call for a common fundraising strategy.

100. Sorbonne University suggested that beyond policy-makers, the dissemination efforts should also target high and medium-level managers, such as through training sessions in OECD and non-OECD countries.

101. The Netherlands was satisfied to see that the survey results were taken into account in the new programme of work. Moving forward, the WGI should make sure to link the development of indicators to the SDG framework and the draft OECD Council Recommendation on Water under development, to create synergies. The Dutch Ministry of Infrastructure and the Environment has also been involved in Deltares initiative that had proven valuable as a self-assessment exercise to access best practice and discuss sensitivities in water governance.

102. UNECE flagged some parallels between the OECD Principles and existing instruments, such as the [Principles for Effective Joint Bodies for Transboundary Co-operation](#) (regarding OECD Principle n°2),

and [Scorecards](#) on the Protocol on Water and Health (regarding OECD Principle n°6). When the water governance indicators are further advanced, they could be useful to assess transboundary co-operation, in line with the SDG targets on IWRM that refers to transboundary co-operation.⁵

103. Mexico has been a long supporter of the WGI as an exemplary platform of co-operation. The National Water Commission (CONAGUA) is working to implement the OECD Principles, at national and sub-national levels. In addition, thanks to its involvement in the WGI, Mexico was the first country to tap into the EUR 5 million Netherlands' fund on disaster risk remediation, which allows experience sharing between the two countries. This is a valuable example of how the WGI, in addition to being a technical platform, can foster networking to the benefit of member countries of the OECD.

104. AgroParisTech has started disseminating the OECD Principles among the academic community and is interested in translating the Principles into practical projects.

105. The Portuguese Water Partnership congratulated the WGI for its achievements, despite being a peculiar platform within the OECD structure. The network has helped enrich global thinking and improve policies closely with stakeholders. Such an experience could be reiterated in other policy areas. The development of water governance indicators should carefully consider that some social aspects of governance are difficult to assess quantitatively, as being highly local and contextual. Indicators should therefore be flexible, as some issues and values cannot easily be quantified.

106. Korea explained that the Ministry of Environment is interested in implementing the OECD Principles and indicators to the national water management system. In particular, Korea is developing a second national management plan for 2025 that should include good practices on watershed management and ecological services focusing on good water governance. Several indicators will be developed by Korea to monitor progress and could potentially build on the OECD water governance indicators.

Brainstorming in working groups on the strategic programme and deliverables

107. Members gathered in five small breakout groups facilitated by the Steering Committee to discuss the proposed programme of work and ways forward, including contribution to the overall priorities, communication and outreach efforts. Through nine participatory exercises, prepared by the OECD Secretariat and SUEZ, the working sessions aimed to: i) collect feedback and reactions of members on the overall programme of work; ii) identify members' interest in and concrete contributions to the proposed working groups on best practices and indicators; and iii) map members' suggestions for improving communication and outreach on the WGI activities.

Outcomes of the break-out discussions

108. Group n°1, moderated by the OECD and INBO, raised the need to address the trade-offs between the inter-governmental process of OECD and the practitioner-based approach of WGI, and to clarify that the WGI is an *informal* group without any decision-making power. The importance of making the most of members' knowledge was identified as a key opportunity for the future. When discussing the most important contributions of WGI to their work, participants ranked first experience-sharing and second the inputs to the global water agenda. When discussing their contribution to the WGI, they pointed to sharing practical experience and case studies, and disseminating the outputs. Regarding the up-coming milestones, participants recommended to be selective and strategic, to develop a real-time mapping of relevant events,

⁵ Written comments received from Turkey on the draft version of these Highlights pointed out that Turkey cannot subscribe to this statement and considers it is up to the countries to establish SDG indicators on transboundary watercourses.

and to invite the leaders of key events to WGI meetings. The two proposed working groups (best practices and indicators) are both of interest to the participants, whom recommended clarifying the practical aspects of members' contributions in order to find the best possible approach for each working group's priorities. The water governance indicators and the "Water Governance at a Glance" publication were ranked as the most anticipated outcomes of the next programme of work, while the contribution to the 7th World Water Forum's Implementation Roadmap was ranked last. To bridge membership gaps, participants suggested to rely mostly on umbrella organisations and networks, and to focus efforts especially on reaching out to sub-national actors. Moving forward, the communication strategy of WGI should improve how information flows between members.

109. Group n°2, moderated by ASTEE and WIN, highlighted the unique nature and strength of the WGI as a platform that brings together various stakeholders to discuss common issues. It also pointed out the weakness that some sectors are not represented in the network, as well as the risk of confusion if a distinction is not made between water *resources* and water *services* governance. The participants ranked experience sharing and bench-learning as the most important contributions of WGI to their work, and explained that sharing policy/practical experience and academic expertise was their main inputs to WGI activities. It was pointed out that the milestone calendar of WGI should include events at local level and outside the water box. Participants were interested in both working groups, explaining that it would be hard to contribute to one without contributing to the other. Concerning the suggested outputs, the participants showed lower interest for the 7th World Water Forum implementation roadmap. Participants recommended broadening the WGI's membership in-between plenary meetings, through regular joint projects and events. WGI members who can help in this endeavour should be clearly identified and help tailor the communication approach to each category of actors and their interests. In addition, communication co-ordinators could be named to help deliver WGI messages.

110. Group n°3 was moderated by the Chair of the WGI and Transparency International and highlighted the timely opportunity for the WGI to closely link its work to the SDG framework. Participants pointed out on the one hand to experience-sharing and the contribution to the global water agenda as the critical value added of WGI for their work, and on the other hand to result dissemination and policy experience-sharing as the most important inputs they provided to WGI's activities. Milestone events in the coming three years should include thematic events such as the international anti-corruption conferences. To contribute to the proposed working groups, participants are mostly willing to share good practices and success stories, as well as to disseminate WGI outputs within their own networks. They are mostly interested in the Best Practice Database and the set of indicators on water governance. The group pointed to critical sectors missing within the WGI, including financiers, energy producers and contractors. Business and water stewardships should also be more involved, such as through the [CEO Water Mandate](#). The WGI's communication strategy should include a strong media component and could tap into the UN-Water communication approach.

111. Group n°4 was moderated by SUEZ and the OECD. The participants identified two critical opportunities to be seized: the use of digital tools (e.g. webinars, web platforms) to bridge membership gaps, and the link with climate change discussions (e.g. COP21). They also pointed to the risk of being overly ambitious with the level of technicality when developing the water governance indicators. As in the other groups, participants pointed to experience-sharing and the contribution to the global water agenda as the primary value added of the WGI to their work. Conversely, sharing policy and practical experience was their most important contribution to WGI activities. The group suggested that major events such as Habitat III and the High-level Platform on the SDGs be added to the list of milestones, as well as events involving public administrations to raise awareness about the WGI. Both suggested working groups are of interest to the group, with a specific attention to the indicator framework and the development of the Best Practice Database on water governance. The membership gaps within the WGI could be addressed through OECD events at national and regional levels, and umbrella organisations that bring different industries together.

Understanding actors' specific interests and challenges could help tailor WGI's messages to match their priorities. WGI members should commit to communicate on the WGI using their websites, newsletters, workshops, etc. The WGI's communication strategy should be structured around basic materials that could be tailored to different audiences. A mentorship process could also be created whereby WGI members could mentor other institutions to improve their water governance practices. Finally, members should more actively support the Secretariat in representing the WGI during events.

112. Group n°5, moderated by SIWI and the OECD, applauded some of the strengths of WGI, such as its gender balance and its ability to address different topics within the water sector. The group also mentioned the opportunity of growing urbanisation as a lever to engage local authorities and mayors into water governance discussions and to broaden the stakeholder base. Participants also noted that most WGI documents are only available in English, which restrict their dissemination in some regions. They also stressed that some discussions have become political, which is a signal that the WGI is addressing important issues. Participants ranked experience sharing and bench-learning as the most important contributions of WGI to their work. Conversely, sharing practical experience and disseminating the WGI results were their most important contributions to the network. In addition, some participants helped provide a humanitarian perspective to the work of WGI. The list of key milestones for the WGI's next programme of work could include closed-door meetings (e.g. EU Water directors meeting) to advocate the uptake of the Principles. The WGI could also target regional meetings and academic workshops. It could be the responsibility of the Steering Committee to flag priority events. The group discussion showed that participants are slightly more interested in the working group on best practices, than on the indicators. They suggested contributing with their respective on-going activities, initiatives and projects. The Best Practice Database on Water Governance raised strong interest but needs the appropriate resources to be deployed. The membership gaps could be bridged by engaging more closely with training centres on water, UN agencies, regional economic commissions, and development banks. This could also help put the Principles into practice, offer concrete technical support and create incentives (e.g. funding opportunities). Informative workshops at different levels and in different regions (e.g. CODIA meetings in Latin America) could also help raise awareness on the WGI. Finally, the WGI could develop easy-to-use tools to communicate its messages (presentation video, membership logos, etc.)

Group discussion in plenary

113. The Butterfly Effect suggested that the WGI's budget also reflect in-kind contribution and support to activities to be more in line with the realities of how much the network costs. It would be interesting to explore digital avenues for bringing in CSOs and less-represented actors that cannot afford the expenses to attend WGI meetings.

114. Deltares underlined that the dissemination of the Principles should be a collective responsibility of all members. It was suggested to explore the possibility of having local antennas of the WGI where stakeholders within a country could meet to increase the influence of the network.

115. The WBCSD advised to reorganise activities alongside the amount of resources they require. It would also help identify possible limitations and be realistic. Regarding the membership gaps, these cannot be bridged only by bringing more people around the table. The emphasis should be to reach out to umbrella organisations for the meetings to be manageable.

116. The Australian National University encouraged WGI members to liaise with government officials at OECD to help raise the profile of and implement the Principles. This would be in line with the Chair's call to WGI members to liaise with their capitals regarding the draft OECD Council Recommendation on Water.

117. Peter Gammeltoft made the point that the WGI should remain focused on being an experts' network. The WGI should also invest in disseminating this expertise.

118. SIWI called for setting clear priorities to move forward and stay realistic. The WGI should be careful to develop few but strategic partnerships that could bring value. The WGI also needs a fundraising strategy to support its future and scale-up its work, which should encourage each member to raise funds under the WGI umbrella.

119. The Chair announced that UNESCO-IHP is stepping down from the Steering Committee for the next biennium, while remaining a WGI member and prominent co-founder of the network. The Secretariat will send a call for contribution to members, based on the Terms of Reference when approved.

Water governance in practice: participatory modelling and simulation

120. The objectives of the workshop organised by a team of experts from IRSTEA were to: i) engage WGI delegates in a series of practical exercises on water governance to dig deeper into the role of stakeholders in water management and policies at different scales; ii) explore new water governance regimes through modelling and simulation; and iii) discover a range of techniques based on the "[Wat-A-Game](#)" toolkit and the "[CoOPLAaGE](#)" set "Coupling innovative tools for sharing change in socio-environmental systems". The latter is an innovative participation strategy and toolbox developed by IRSTEA and designed to support all stakeholders' groups, from citizens to policy-makers, in discussing and engaging in change strategies in socio-environmental systems.

121. The workshop was structured around the different steps of a common project cycle, with the objective to explore how participation could be strengthened at each stage: i) identification of a social/environmental issue (i.e. situation assessment and modelling, stakeholder analysis, data collection); ii) solution development (i.e. operational planning, decision-making process, strategy, solution testing); iii) solution implementation (i.e. engineering implementation, monitoring); and iv) expansion (i.e. final evaluation, scaling-up, dissemination). The IRSTEA approach considers participatory modelling as the backbone of participatory water governance. It is the process by which all actors design together the relevant models (i.e. actionable representations) of their situation, options, responses, plans, which they can use to explore, formalise and engage in adaptation. To put this principle into practice, WGI members gathered in small groups on 3 activities:

- *Wat-A-Game*: This toolbox was used to discuss water management and governance processes that associate policy-makers, practitioners and the public. Delegates worked on the basis of an abstract case study for which they were assigned the role of a key stakeholder (ranging from director of a river basin organisations to mayor of a city). Delegates had to react to real operations and different scenarios (whether under normal climate or during a drought) to explore and discuss roles, responsibilities and trade-offs across water uses. Delegates were able to discuss the economic, social and environmental impact of each of their actions, as well as to explore new social rules and policies through dialogue between various stakeholder groups.
- *Cooplan*: Delegates used this tool to discuss and build integrated, coherent and feasible water management strategies. They brainstormed on the implementation of water-efficiency project proposals to estimate the required resources, expected impacts, etc. All project proposals were then included in a collective matrix to discuss the overall coherence, feasibility, and efficiency.
- *PrePar*: Delegates were asked to plan a participatory process around a water project in order to discuss how this process should be organised, with/by/for whom, with which method, in order to get a water management plan designed, agreed upon, and implemented.

122. Delegates reported back in plenary to share feedback, perspectives and the needs identified during the activities. This exercise was an experimental one for WGI as a whole, and for many of its members. IRSTEA's methodologies proved realistic, eye-opening and an enriching learning experience. Some delegates regretted the lack of time to dig deeper into the large variety of methods and tools presented, especially for the "PrePar" tool which raised some questions about the possibility and necessity to organise early engagement processes in a rigorous planning framework. Other questions were raised regarding the practical application of these methods, especially in terms of schedule and various audiences (e.g. language issues, etc.). Delegates highlighted the following specific points:

- The integral perspective as well as the tools presented were creative and innovative;
- The "CoOPLAage" approach could include new aspects such as corruption and accountability issues;
- Simulated situations were representative of real-life experiences in terms of frustrations from opposing approaches in the decision-making process, large amounts of complex information, little time, language and linguistic barriers, etc.; and
- The workshop was highly instructive in inviting delegates to explore the point of view of other stakeholders.

123. The workshop concluded with an invitation to repeat the experience with simplified tools and more flexibility in the planning at future WGI meetings. IRSTEA's participatory simulation provides interesting lessons on the practical implications of water governance and the needed tools and methodologies to manage complexities at catchment level.

ACRONYMS

| | |
|-------------------|---|
| AECID | Spanish Agency of International Co-operation for Development |
| ANA | National Water Agency (Brazil) |
| ASTEE | Association Scientifique et Technique pour l'eau et l'environnement |
| CNRS | Centre Nationale pour la Recherche Scientifique |
| CSOs | Civil Society Organisations |
| EDF | Electricité de France |
| EU | European Union |
| FP2E | Fédération Professionnelle des Entreprises de l'Eau |
| GLAAS | UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water |
| GWP | Global Water Partnership |
| GWP-Med | Global Water Partnership - Mediterranean |
| ICLEI | International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives |
| INBO | International Network of Basin Organisations |
| 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 |
| LAC | Latin America and the Caribbean |
| MCM | OECD Ministerial Council Meeting |
| MDGs | Millennium Development Goals |
| MENA | Middle East and North Africa |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organisations |
| ODA | Official Development Assistance |
| OECD | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development |
| RDPC | Regional Development Policy Committee |
| SDG | Sustainable Development Goal |
| SIWI | Stockholm International Water Institute |
| SWOT | Strength-Weakness-Opportunity-Risk (analysis) |
| UN | United Nations |
| UNDP | UN Development Programme |
| UNECE | UN Economic Commission for Europe |
| UNESCO-IHP | United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation – International Hydrological Programme |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| UNSGAB | UN Secretary General Advisory Board on Water |
| WASH | Water-Sanitation-Hygiene |
| WBCSD | World Business Council for Sustainable Development |
| WGI | Water Governance Initiative |
| WIN | Water Integrity Network |
| WWF | World Wildlife Fund |

CALENDAR OF 2016 WATER AND GOVERNANCE-RELATED EVENTS

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <i>22 March 2016</i> | World Water Day | UN-Water |
| <i>21st March 2016</i> Tucson, United States | Arizona's Water Resources Research Centre annual conference | Water Resources Research Centre |
| <i>27-29 April 2016</i> Bilbao, Spain | 8th European Conference on Sustainable Cities & Towns | ICLEI |
| <i>10-13 May 2016</i> Rotterdam, The Netherlands | Adaption Futures 2016 | Global Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation (PROVIA), EU, the Government of the Netherlands |
| <i>31 May-03 June 2016</i> Issy-les-Moulineaux, France | 95^{ème} congrès de l'ASTEE "Territoires en transition : mettre l'intelligence numérique au cœur des services publics" | ASTEE |
| <i>1-3 June 2016</i> Mérida, Mexico | 10th World General Assembly of the International Network of Basin Organisations | INBO |
| <i>23-24 June 2016</i> The Hague, Netherlands | 7th OECD-WGI Meeting | OECD |
| <i>10-14 July 2016</i> Singapore | Singapore International Water Week | Ministry of the Environment and Water Resources of Singapore |
| <i>28 August - 2 September 2016</i> Stockholm, Sweden | 26th Stockholm World Water Week | SIWI |
| <i>9-14 October 2016</i> Brisbane, Australia | IWA World Water Congress & Exhibition | IWA |
| <i>12-15 October 2016</i> Bogotá, Colombia | World Summit of Local and Regional Leaders | UCLG |
| <i>1-4 December 2016</i> Panama City, Panama | 17th International Anticorruption Conference | TI |