Session III: Working Group on Indicators

13th Meeting of the Water Governance Initiative, January 10, 2020
Key questions
Principle 1.
Clearly allocate and distinguish *roles and responsibilities* for water policymaking, policy implementation, operational management and regulation, and foster co-ordination across these responsible authorities.

To what extent does a dedicated *water law*:

a) Increase access to water and sanitation services for the both the general population and under-represented groups? (Goals 6.1, 6.2)

b) Reduce risks of water contamination? (Goal 6.3)

c) Minimise negative effects on the environment? (Goal 6.a)
Principle 2. Manage water at the appropriate scale(s) within integrated basin governance systems to reflect local conditions, and foster co-ordination between the different scales.

To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies:

a) Improve the vulnerability of ecosystems to climatic events? (Goals 6.6, 15.1, 15.8)

b) Reduce biodiversity loss? (Goal 6.6)

c) Improve quality of coastal and inland waters? (Goal 6.6)

To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation:

a) Contribute to better water resources quality? (Goals 6.3, 6.5)

b) Contribute to sound hydrological cycle management?

c) Improve data and information gathering as well as water monitoring and evaluation?
Principle 3.
Encourage policy coherence through effective *cross-sectoral co-ordination*, especially between policies for water and the environment, health, energy, agriculture, industry, spatial planning and land use.

To what extent does the effective implementation of *cross-sectoral policies and strategies*:

a) Reduce conflicts among users as a consequence of more effective integrated strategies and legislations across key water-related areas? (Goal 6.5)

b) Reduce economic costs due to more effective integrated strategies and legislations across key water-related areas? (Goal 6.5)

c) Reduce/ avoid changes in ecological and chemical status of surface water bodies? (Goals 6.3, 12.4)

d) Reduce the number of people affected by flooding? (Goal 11.5)

e) Increase water use efficiency? (Goal 6.4)

To what extent does the existence of an *inter-ministerial body or institutions* for horizontal co-ordination:

a) Improve the use of financial resources? (Goals 17.5, 6.5)

b) Reduce transaction costs? (Goals 17.5, 6.5)
Principle 4.
Adapt the level of capacity of responsible authorities to the complexity of water challenges to be met, and to the set of competencies required to carry out their duties

To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies:
 a) Increase satisfaction and trust in water-related institutions?
 b) Reduce costs due to complaints, invalid procedures, repeated hiring procedures?

To what extent do mechanisms to address capacity gaps:
 a) Improve the quality of services?
 b) Increase the availability of finances and other resources? (Goal 4.a)
Principle 5.
Produce, update, and share timely, consistent, comparable and policy-relevant water and water-related *data and information*, and use it to guide, assess and improve water policy

To what extent do updated, timely shared, consistent and comparable water information systems:

a) Minimise the risks of floods and droughts? (Goal 11.5)

b) Minimise the risks of human casualties? (Goal 11.5)

c) Reduce costs related to mismanagement in data production and sharing?
Principle 6.
Ensure that governance arrangements help mobilise water finance and allocate financial resources in an efficient, transparent and timely manner

To what extent do governance arrangements for water-related investments:

a) Increase economic productivity and growth? (Goal 17.3)

b) Improve access to financial flows?

c) Improve affordability?

d) Increase the amount of water and sanitation related ODA that is part of a government co-ordinated spending plan? (Goal 17.4)
Principle 7. Ensure that sound water management regulatory frameworks are effectively implemented and enforced in pursuit of the public interest

To what extent does implementation of a sound water management regulatory framework:

a) Improve user satisfaction level related to water and sanitation services? (Goals 6.1, 6.2)

b) Increase the frequency of availability to safe water networks? (Goal 6.1)
Principle 8.
Promote the adoption and implementation of innovative water governance practices across responsible authorities, levels of government and relevant stakeholders

To what extent do institutions that encourage bottom-up initiatives, dialogue and social learning, as well as experimentation in water:

a) Foster innovation in water management practices and processes levels?

b) Bridge the divide between science, policy and practice?
Principle 9.
Mainstream *integrity and transparency* practices across water policies, water institutions and water governance frameworks for greater accountability and trust in decision-making

To what extent do *integrity and transparency frameworks* (water or related):

a) Allow better resource spending?

b) Reduce the number of (estimated/actual) illegal or unregulated cases of water abstraction and effluent discharge? (Goals 3.9, 6.3, 12.4)
Principle 10.
Promote stakeholder engagement for informed and outcome-oriented contributions to water policy design and implementation

To what extent do legal frameworks meant to engage stakeholders:

a) Improve water and sanitation management? (Goals 6.1, 6.2, 6.5)
Principle 11.
Encourage water governance frameworks that help manage *trade-offs* across water users, rural and urban areas, and generations

To what extent do the existence of *formal provisions* or legal frameworks fostering equity:

a) Improve access to water and sanitation? (Goals 6.1, 6.2)

b) Reduce conflicts among water users?

c) Lead to equitable access to improved water between rural and urban areas? (Goals 6.1, 6.5)
To what extent do policy frameworks that promote regular monitoring and evaluation of water policy and governance:

a) increase the degree of integrated water resources management implementation? (Goal 6.5)

b) Improve water use efficiency (%) over time? (Goal 6.4)

c) Decrease the number of people suffering from water-related risks? (Goal 6.4)

d) Decrease the proportion of untreated wastewater? (Goals 3.9, 6.3, 12.4)

e) Increase recycling and safe reuse of water? (Goal 6.3)
Interactive, co-production session

1. **Feedback** on the proposed questions for each of the 12 Principles

   - Very useful, I agree
   - Could be interesting, but needs some work
   - Not relevant, to be discarded

2. **Suggestions** / ideas / comments through the post-its
Results
Session provided valuable feedback for the indicators

- More than **1500** reactions to the indicators
- Total number of indicators: **42**, of which **24** were agreed on by a majority of the votes
- **Average response rate** per indicator: **36**
- Range of one to seven indicators per Principle
- Most voted green:
  - **Principle 2**: To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation improve data and information gathering as well as water monitoring and evaluation (91%)
  - **Principle 3**: To what extent does the existence of an inter-ministerial body or institutions for horizontal co-ordination improve the use of financial resources (90%)
  - **Principle 2**: To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation contribute to sound hydrological cycle management (84%)
  - **Principle 3**: To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce conflicts among users (81%)
  - **Principle 4**: To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies increase satisfaction and trust in water-related institutions (78%)
Principle 1: Roles and Responsibilities

Results of the Feedback

To what extent does a dedicated water law:

Increase access to water and sanitation services for both the general population and under-represented groups? (38 responses)
- 45% Agree
- 50% Agree, but to be reworded
- 5% Not relevant, to be rephrased

Reduce risks of water contamination? (39 responses)
- 36% Agree
- 51% Agree, but to be reworded
- 13% Not relevant, to be rephrased

Minimise negative effects on the environment? (42 responses)
- 21% Agree
- 30% Agree, but to be reworded
- 7% Not relevant, to be rephrased

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding

Comments
- “Yes to all if there is law enforcement, not hindered legislation, for example, other political priorities, vested or other individual interests”
- “Questions on water law omit water resource dimension of government”
- “Turning this around to a negative questions... to what extent does not having a water law affect these aspects?”
- Note to add to “To what extent does a dedicated water law”... or an environment law that considers water resources
- All depends on the quality of the interactions between institutions/ if the visions of the institutions are aligned?
Principle 1: Roles and Responsibilities

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent does a dedicated water law:

- **Increase water and sanitation**
  - Agree with the indicator
  - Agree, but to be reworded
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased

- **Reduce contamination**
  - Agree with the indicator
  - Agree, but to be reworded
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased

- **Minimise environmental effects**
  - Agree with the indicator
  - Agree, but to be reworded
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased
### Principle 2: Appropriate Scales

#### Results of the Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree, but to be reworded (%)</th>
<th>Not relevant, to be rephrased (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation improve data and information gathering as well as water monitoring and evaluation (35 responses)</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation contribute to sound hydrological cycle management (37 responses)</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies improve the vulnerability of ecosystems to climatic events (35 responses)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation contribute to better water resources quality (34 responses)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies reduce biodiversity loss (35 responses)</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies improve quality of coastal and inland waters (47 responses)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments

- Not just the existence of RBO’s is effective, must ensure that they actually work.

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding.
Principle 2: Appropriate Scales

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies:

- Improve vulnerability of ecosystems: Agree with the indicator
- Reduce biodiversity loss: Agree, but to be reworded
- Improve quality of coastal/inland waters: Agree with the indicator
- Better water quality: Agree with the indicator
- Sound hydro management: Agree with the indicator
- Improve data/information and monitoring/evaluation: Agree with the indicator

To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation:

- 0% Agree with the indicator
- 0% Agree, but to be reworded
- 0% Not relevant, to be rephrased

---

Principle 2: Appropriate Scales

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies:

- Improve vulnerability of ecosystems: Agree with the indicator
- Reduce biodiversity loss: Agree, but to be reworded
- Improve quality of coastal/inland waters: Agree with the indicator
- Better water quality: Agree with the indicator
- Sound hydro management: Agree with the indicator
- Improve data/information and monitoring/evaluation: Agree with the indicator

To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation:

- 0% Agree with the indicator
- 0% Agree, but to be reworded
- 0% Not relevant, to be rephrased

---

Principle 2: Appropriate Scales

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies:

- Improve vulnerability of ecosystems: Agree with the indicator
- Reduce biodiversity loss: Agree, but to be reworded
- Improve quality of coastal/inland waters: Agree with the indicator
- Better water quality: Agree with the indicator
- Sound hydro management: Agree with the indicator
- Improve data/information and monitoring/evaluation: Agree with the indicator

To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation:

- 0% Agree with the indicator
- 0% Agree, but to be reworded
- 0% Not relevant, to be rephrased

---

Principle 2: Appropriate Scales

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies:

- Improve vulnerability of ecosystems: Agree with the indicator
- Reduce biodiversity loss: Agree, but to be reworded
- Improve quality of coastal/inland waters: Agree with the indicator
- Better water quality: Agree with the indicator
- Sound hydro management: Agree with the indicator
- Improve data/information and monitoring/evaluation: Agree with the indicator

To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation:

- 0% Agree with the indicator
- 0% Agree, but to be reworded
- 0% Not relevant, to be rephrased
**Principle 3: Cross-sectoral co-ordination**

### Results of the Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the existence of an inter-ministerial body or institutions for horizontal co-ordination improve the use of financial resources (30 responses)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce conflicts among users (33 responses)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce economic costs due to more effective integrated strategies and legislation across key water-related areas (30 responses)</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies increase water use efficiency (32 responses)</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce the number of people affected by flooding and other water risks (32 responses)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does the existence of an inter-ministerial body or institutions for horizontal co-ordination reduce transaction costs (24 responses)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce/avoid changes in ecological and chemical status of surface water bodies (29 responses)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

- “Do not only explore opportunities regarding hydropower but also thermal energy from water resources (how lands have less hydropower and more thermal energy).”

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding.
Principle 3: Cross-sectoral co-ordination

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies:

- Reduce conflict
- Reduce economic costs
- Avoid ecological and chemical status changes
- Reduce people affected by floods
- Increase water efficiency
- Improve use of finances
- Reduce costs

To what extent does the existence of an inter-ministerial body or institutions for horizontal co-ordination:
## Principle 4: Capacity

### Results of the Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies increase satisfaction and trust in water-related institutions (37 responses)</td>
<td>78% 16% 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do mechanisms to address capacity gaps improve the quality of services (40 responses)</td>
<td>65% 33% 2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do mechanisms to address capacity gaps increase the availability of finances and other resources (39 responses)</td>
<td>10% 51% 39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies reduce costs due to complaints, invalid procedures, repeated hiring procedures (37 responses)</td>
<td>8% 59% 33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding

### Comments

- Should re-examine” the wording of “reduce costs...” and increase the availability of finances...

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
Principle 4: Capacity

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies:

- Increase satisfaction/trust
- Reduce costs due to complaints, etc.
- Improve quality of services
- Increase availability of finances

To what extent do mechanisms to address capacity gaps:

- Principle 4: Capacity

Agree with the indicator
Agree, but to be reworded
Not relevant, to be rephrased
## Principle 5: Data and information

### Results of the Feedback

To what extent do updated, timely shared, consistent and comparable water information systems:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree, but to be reworded (%)</th>
<th>Not relevant, to be rephrased (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the risks of human casualties</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise the risks of floods and droughts</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce costs related to mismanagement in data production and sharing</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding

### Comments

- Should focus on how water information systems are used; this is what will define their impact
Principle 5: Data and information

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do updated, timely shared, consistent and comparable water information systems:

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
## Principle 6: Financial Resources

### Results of the Feedback

To what extent do governance arrangements for water-related investments:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Reagreement</th>
<th>Not Relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to financial flows (34 responses)</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase economic productivity and growth (34 responses)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve affordability (32 responses)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the amount of water and sanitation related ODA that is part of government co-ordinated spending plan (31 responses)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

- Might want to seek better definition or variation of “improve affordability”

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding
Principle 6: Financial Resources

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do governance arrangements for water-related investments:

- Increase economic growth
- Improve access to financial flows
- Improve affordability
- Increase ODA

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
### Principle 7: Regulatory Frameworks

#### Results of the Feedback

To what extent does implementation of a sound water management:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve user satisfaction level related to water and sanitation services</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the frequency of availability to safe water networks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Comments

- Unclear what increasing the frequency of availability is conveying
- This could be a question of service regulation rather than water management

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding.
Principle 7: Regulatory Frameworks

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent does implementation of a sound water management:

1. Improve user satisfaction
2. Increase frequency of availability to water networks

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
## Principle 8: Innovated Water Governance Practices

### Results of the Feedback

To what extent do institutions that encourage bottom-up initiatives, dialogue and social learning, as well as experimentation in water:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Agree, but to be reworded</th>
<th>Not relevant, to be rephrased</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge the divide between science, policy and practice (44 responses)</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster innovation in water management practices and processes levels (45 responses)</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding.

### Comments

- The impact of the innovation needs to be understood/examined; its existence does not signify that it is inherently good
- Need to consider how bridging the divide between science, policy and practice can be measured
Principle 8: Innovated Water Governance Practices

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do institutions that encourage bottom-up initiatives, dialogue and social learning, as well as experimentation in water:

- Foster innovation
- Bridge divide between science, policy, practice

0 10 20 30 40 50 60 70 80 90 100

Agree with the indicator
Agree, but to be reworded
Not relevant, to be rephrased
Principle 9: Integrity and Transparency Frameworks

Results of the Feedback
To what extent do integrity and transparency frameworks (water or related):

Allow better resource spending (44 responses)
- Agree with the indicator: 43%
- Agree, but to be reworded: 43%
- Not relevant, to be rephrased: 14%

Reduce the number of estimated/actual illegal or unregulated cases of water abstraction and effluent discharge (47 responses)
- Agree with the indicator: 38%
- Agree, but to be reworded: 55%
- Not relevant, to be rephrased: 6%

Comments
- “The problem is not so much the existence of these frameworks but their effective enforcement/application”
- The term “Better” needs to be clarified – What is meant by this and does it include distributional issues (equity, etc.) as well as efficiency?
- The number of unregulated cases might depend on how serious public participation is taken by the government
- The indicator could not measure the individual illegal abstractions but could be relevant for cases of corruption
- To what extent do integrity and transparency frameworks (water and related) reduce corruption risks in public procurement at national, regional and municipal levels

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding
Principle 9: Integrity and Transparency Frameworks

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do integrity and transparency frameworks (water or related):

- Allow better resource spending
- Reduced illegal/unregulated water abstraction/effluent discharge

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
## Principle 10: Stakeholder Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results of the Feedback</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve water and sanitation management (44 responses)</td>
<td>Water as a natural resource needs to be considered too</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>Agree with the indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>Agree, but to be reworded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30%</td>
<td>Not relevant, to be rephrased</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding
Principle 10: Stakeholder Engagement

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do legal frameworks meant to engage stakeholders:

- Improve water and sanitation management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Percentage Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree with the indicator</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree, but to be reworded</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant, to be rephrased</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Principle 11: Trade-offs

**Results of the Feedback**

To what extent to the existence of formal provisions or legal frameworks fostering equity:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Partially Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to water and sanitation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce conflicts among water users</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to equitable access to improved water between rural and urban areas</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- To measure equitable access/equity, it would first need a clear definition, which might be difficult to do.

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding.
Principle 11: Trade-offs

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent to the existence of formal provisions or legal frameworks fostering equity:

- Improve access to water and sanitation
  - Agree with the indicator: 60%
  - Agree, but to be reworded: 30%
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased: 10%

- Reduce conflicts among users
  - Agree with the indicator: 50%
  - Agree, but to be reworded: 40%
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased: 10%

- Lead to equitable access between rural/urban areas
  - Agree with the indicator: 50%
  - Agree, but to be reworded: 40%
  - Not relevant, to be rephrased: 10%
### Results of the Feedback

To what extent do policy frameworks that promote regular monitoring and evaluation of water policy and governance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase the degree of integrated water resources management implementation</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease the proportion of untreated wastewater</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve water use efficiency over time</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase recycling and safe reuse of water</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the number of people suffering from water-related risks?</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Total values above or below 100% possible due to rounding

### Comments

- The linking of policy frameworks as means to increase or decrease these indicators is not clear.
- Does the framework stimulate integrated dialogue?
Principle 12: Monitoring and Evaluation

Percentage share of each feedback per indicator

To what extent do policy frameworks that promote regular monitoring and evaluation of water policy and governance:

- Increase water resources management implementation
- Improve water use efficiency
- Decrease people suffering from water risks
- Decrease proportion of untreated wastewater
- Increase recycling/safe water reuse

- Agree with the indicator
- Agree, but to be reworded
- Not relevant, to be rephrased
Note: The order of the indicators for each principle is according to the order in which they appeared on the posters, not organized by any percentage points.
• **Principle 2:** To what extent does the creation of a river basin organisation
  – improve data and information gathering as well as water monitoring and evaluation (91%)
  – contribute to sound hydrological cycle management (84%)
• **Principle 3:** To what extent does the existence of an inter-ministerial body or institutions for horizontal co-ordination
  – improve the use of financial resources (90%)
  – To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce conflicts among users (81%)
• **Principle 4:** To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies increase satisfaction and trust in water-related institutions (78%)
Indicators with highest yellow response percentages (Top 5)

- **Principle 6:** To what extent do governance arrangements for water-related investments improve affordability (72%)
- **Principle 3:** To what extent does implementation of cross-sectoral policies and strategies reduce/avoid changes in ecological and chemical status of surface water bodies (65%)
- **Principle 2:** To what extent do IWRM policies and strategies reduce biodiversity loss (63%)
  – improve quality of coastal and inland waters (60%)
- **Principle 4:** To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies reduce costs due to complaints, invalid procedures, repeated hiring procedures (59%)
Indicators with highest red response percentages (Top 5)

- **Principle 6**: To what extent do governance arrangements for water-related investments
  - increase the amount of water and sanitation related ODA that is part of government co-ordinated spending plan (42%)
  - increase economic productivity and growth (24%)

- **Principle 4**: To what extent do mechanism to address capacity gaps increase the availability of finances and other resources (39%)
  - To what extent do merit-based recruitment policies reduce costs due to complaints, invalid procedures, repeated hiring procedures (33%)

- **Principle 10**: To what extent do legal frameworks meant to engage stakeholders improve water and sanitation management (30%)