

WORLD WATER WEEK

in Stockholm,
August 12–18, 2007

Presentation

Presentation from the 2007 World Water Week in Stockholm. © The Author(s), all rights reserved



Outcomes from the seminar: trend-related monitoring and evaluation on IWRM

**IWRM is a solution on the search for its own problem.
Unnamed WSS expert**

Stockholm Water Week
2007

Objectives and key questions

Objectives:

- Increased knowledge of on-going efforts to monitor IWRM
- Challenges (financial, organisational, capacity wise, political etc) involved in current IWRM monitoring activities clarified
- Inputs for defining IWRM (planning, implementation and impact) indicators clarified
- Ideas for the establishment of a formal monitoring and reporting mechanism in support of advancing IWRM at country level collected

- What are the 'monitoring' lessons learned from on-going IWRM implementation?
- Does the CSD 16 IWRM questionnaire capture all the important aspects?
- How can we monitor IWRM (process and impact) better?
- Which are the relevant indicators for good water management under the principles of IWRM?
- How could cooperation between ministries, sector institutions and statistical offices be improved and what support is needed?
- Does the international community need additional information to coordinate support efforts?

Joakim Harlin / UNDP

- Many uncoordinated IWRM surveys
- need for developing indicators
- CSD 16 questionnaire (for the CSD 16) being done right now

Manuel Dengo / UNDESA

- Global initiative for rationalizing water information (GIRWI)
- Monitoring of policy action of CSD 13

Niels Henrik Ibsen/IWRM task force

- UNEP sent out a questionnaire
- IWRM covers a lot of issues not to say it's confusingly complex
- results show inconsistencies and is probably related to lack of a concept for what we need to monitor
- variable approach in doing the survey (individuals, group meetings)

Paul Taylor/ CAP-NET

- measuring impacts and not processes

Vadim Sokolov

- GWP analysed more the qualitative aspects than the CSD survey, that collected probabaly biased

Progress and non progress: what is the progress made today in trend-related M&E of IWRM

- Several surveys on implementing IWRM on the way but no results yet.
 - CSD 16
 - CSD 13 policy action
 - Some surveys been done.
 - GWP 108 countries report
 - UNEP 60 countries covered
 - There is a lot of overlap between the different surveys.
 - The current surveys all are only concentrating on aspects of a process but not on impacts with practical measurable indicators.
 - Results appear partially inconsistent.
-

Obstacles (and challenges) :

what are the obstacles of achieving progress in the future
in M&E on IWRM

- no consistent system of assessing and monitoring water management according to IWRM principles existing
 - Such soft data are difficult to monitor and to assess, a consistent impact based monitoring system (like for WSS) is difficult to develop.
 - There is a variety of IWRM understanding (positive: flexibility to address national priorities; negative aspect: what is it than at all?)
 - Since this is process that exist only since 1992, we don't have a baseline (on impact indicators).
 - answers are always personal (from household to Ministries); transparency of data is a challenge for all these levels
 - Impacts of IWRM take long time to materialise
 - IWRM goes beyond the water sector itself and makes it a challenge
-

Prospects and proposals for the future: what are the prospects for future M&E on IWRM

- Define proxies by subdividing IWRM into manageable compartments/ Identifying proxy indicators for that.
 - Increased focus what we are trying to achieve: sustainable development and management of water resources.
 - We need to monitor consistent and meaningful process indicators (monitoring capacities or flows of money).
 - Country specific and global indicators needed.
-