



Case studies for the GWP ToolBox: Guidelines for case preparation

A case study is an examination of real events and practical experience with the implementation of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and provides an analytical and critical account. Case studies are an essential part of the GWP IWRM ToolBox, the interactive database of the Global Water Partnership for exchanging and sharing knowledge about putting IWRM into practice. This note provides guidelines for authors and organisations in the preparation of case studies for inclusion in the GWP's IWRM ToolBox.

1. What is a GWP case?

An essential part of the IWRM ToolBox

The GWP ToolBox brings together global knowledge and experience of IWRM, making this experience available to water professionals and policy makers. The IWRM ToolBox contains a range of policy tools (see below) that can be used together or in combinations towards the goals of IWRM.

CASE STUDIES offer a critical examination of real events, and provide information about how different policy tools can be used for IWRM. They help people to learn from experience in the implementation of more sustainable water strategies and policies. They form a central element of the Toolbox and provide a valuable dissemination mechanism for improving understanding of IWRM. Case studies are put into the ToolBox, are available through the Internet and can be downloaded as PDF files by users.

What is an IWRM approach?

The IWRM approach involves:

- an integrated approach to water, looking across sectors at society's total needs for water;
- the sustainable management of water and water-related resources;
- recognition that water is a valuable resource and the value should be reflected in how it is used; and
- a participatory approach to water resources management, involving stakeholders to ensure equity as well as efficiency in water use.

GWP particularly seeks cases which relate the sectors to each other or illustrate how IWRM policy approaches (using the tools) improve water resource management in an individual sector.

Are there clear criteria for GWP Case Studies?

Cases support the development of IWRM as a better approach to ensuring sustainable water resource management. A case may describe for example a wholly integrated approach to water – for example in the successful outcomes in a river basin or catchment area; or they may cover reform in practices in a specific sector which adopt an IWRM approach, using the IWRM tools and achieving a better outcome. As well as success stories, case studies can also describe and discuss situations where things went wrong or where outcomes were very different from those expected.

Generally, cases that are analysed for inclusion in the Toolbox should:

- Illustrate the application of tools shown in the ToolBox
- Have overall relevance to IWRM – with lessons about how an IWRM approach (as described above) supports water management in each sector
- Reflect both pros and cons in the analysis of the case

- Reflect issues of main concern to the water community
- Have a broad relevance and therefore potential for wide dissemination.

Case studies should always be both objective and verifiable. They must of course be informative, add value, increase understanding, and be practical.

What does a GWP case study look like?

Cases should describe the following:

- problem faced,
- actions taken, and
- examination of the outcomes and lessons learned.

Each case contains a one page abstract (summary) and 8 to 10 pages of the full case study. Each case is linked, through the ToolBox, to other relevant tools, providing a network of knowledge.

All cases are supported by references to sources of further information, details about the authors and institutions involved and link with other cases and tools in the ToolBox. Further, almost all case studies will build on other documentation. References and links are made to this background documentation in the case study abstract and ToolBox.

Who can propose a case for the GWP ToolBox?

Any GWP partner or person with a special interest in IWRM may propose a case study. GWP, however, has a strong belief in quality assurance, and proposals for cases will be screened for relevance and quality by GWP's ToolBox team and review panel.

In order that the case is genuinely a balanced account, it is important to involve the institutions involved in the events/decisions discussed if possible. GWP takes very seriously the idea that the cases are objective and verifiable. Where there are two or more strongly defined opinions about the case in question, then this should be made clear by the authors.

2. Structure of the GWP ToolBox

Users of the ToolBox will find information organised into four main parts: policy guidance; operational tools; case studies, which support the use of tools; and references, organisations and websites. The framework for the Tools in the ToolBox is based on three fundamental elements of IWRM:

- The enabling environment or rules of the game created by legislation, policy and financing structures.
- Institutional roles of resource managers, service providers, irrigation agencies, utilities, river basin authorities, regulators and other water sector stakeholders. Capacity building supports the functions required for these roles.
- Management instruments - water resources assessment, demand management, public information and education, conflict resolution, regulatory devices, economic measures and information and communications.

Within these elements, the ToolBox offers a compendium of 62 tools for putting IWRM into practice. The aim is to illustrate how tools can be used in a given combination and context, through the case studies and the full selection of tools is listed below.

<p>A – Enabling Environment A1 – Policies A1.01 Preparation of a National Water Resources Policy A1.02 Policies with Relation to Water Resources A1.03 Climate Change Adaptation Policies</p>	<p>B – Institutional Arrangements B1 – Regulation and Compliance B1.01 Regulatory Bodies and Enforcement Agencies B1.02 Local Authorities B1.03 Monitoring & Evaluation Bodies B1.04 Impact Assessment</p>	<p>C – Management Instruments C1 – Understanding Water Endowments C1.01 Demand and Supply C1.02 Data Collection C1.03 Monitoring and Evaluation Systems C2 – Assessment Instruments C2.01 Risk Assessment C2.02 Vulnerability Assessment</p>
---	---	--

<p>A2 – Legal Frameworks A2.01 Elements of Water Law A2.02 Implementation and Enforcement A2.03 The Role of Customary Law in IWRM A2.04 Integrating Legal Frameworks for IWRM</p> <p>A3 – Investment and Financing Structures A3.01 Investment Frameworks A3.02 Strategic Financial Planning A3.03 Generating Basic Revenues for Water A3.04 Repayable Sources of Finance for Water</p>	<p>Committees</p> <p>B2 – Water Supply and Sanitation Services B2.01 Public Sector Water Utilities B2.02 Private Sector Water Service Providers B2.03 Community-Based Water Supply and Management Organisations</p> <p>B3 – Coordination and Facilitation B3.01 Transboundary Organisations B3.02 National Apex Bodies B3.03 Civil Society Organisations B3.04 Basin Organisations</p> <p>B4 – Capacity Building B4.01 Information Gathering and Sharing Networks B4.02 Training Water Professionals B4.03 Building Partnerships B4.04 Water Integrity and Anti-Corruption</p>	<p>C2.03 Social Assessment C2.04 Ecosystem Assessment C2.05 Environmental Impact Assessment C2.06 Economic Assessment</p> <p>C3 – Modelling and decision-making C3.01 Geographic Information System C3.02 Stakeholder Analysis C3.03 Shared Vision Planning C3.04 Decision Support Systems</p> <p>C4 – Planning for IWRM C4.01 National IWRM Plans C4.02 Basin Management Plans C4.03 Ground water Management Plans C4.04 Coastal Zone Management Plans C4.05 Integrated Urban Water Management Plans C4.06 Integrated Disaster Risk Management Plans C4.07 National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)</p> <p>C5 – Communication C5.01 Communication Channels C5.02 Consensus Building C5.03 Conflict Management</p> <p>C6 – Efficiency in Water Management C6.01 Demand Efficiency C6.02 Supply Efficiency C6.03 Recycle and Reuse</p> <p>C7 – Economic Instruments C7.01 Pricing for Water and Water Services C7.02 Water Markets C7.03 Tradable Pollution Permits C7.04 Pollution Charges C7.05 Subsidies C7.06 Payments for Environmental Services</p> <p>C8 – Promoting Social Change C8.01 Youth Education C8.02 Raising Public Awareness C8.03 Water Footprint C8.04 Virtual Water</p>
---	--	---

3. Format and structure of abstracts (one page proposal)

<p>Case title: up to 12 words Eg: Costa Rica – Introducing water resource charges</p>
<p>Subtitle Enter a brief summary or "sub-title" of this item with a maximum length of 20 words. Eg Describes introduction of surcharge on energy bills for water resource protection, linking water resource protection with deforestation. Case involved changes in legislation and policies.</p>
<p>Description of the problem Actions taken Lessons learned Key outcomes</p> <p>Text under these headings should show: the main issues addressed, the approach taken, the lessons learned, and, most important, how the case illustrates an integrated approach to water resource management (Max. 350 words)</p>
<p>Main Tools Used: Show the most important ones by referring to the tools listed above (max 4 tools)</p>
<p>Keywords: 4-5 key words</p>
<p>Contact: Contact name, organisation, address, zip code, city, country, and email address</p>
<p>Additional information: web sites, other related reports links</p>

4. Format and structure for full case study reports

MAIN TEXT

The following is a suggestion of the structure you should use in your main text. What is important is that the issues mentioned below are fully addressed in your text.

1 Problems

Policy tools are used to address problems which have arisen and these problems should be clearly stated (eg depletion of ground water resources, increasing frequency of flooding, eutrophication of lake or estuary, failing water services in an urban area), It is important to describe the problem rather than manifestation of the problem itself.

2 Decisions and Actions Taken

This section should describe and explain the actions taken to address the problem. Issues which could be discussed here would include:

- Decisions taken at the start of the action. What were the objectives, who took the leadership role in the definition of objectives, who was involved in defining the objectives? What was the succession of decisions during project implementation?
- Actions taken, instruments used, stakeholders (Public, private and associations) and their role.
- Alternatives considered, how were the actions selected, information and methods used

3 Outcomes

This section should describe what happened as a result of the actions taken – and examine what were the underlying reasons. Some of the possible questions could be:

- What were the problems encountered during the implementation phase? How were they overcome? What problems still exist?
- What were the key implementation issues?
- Were the project objectives achieved? What were the results obtained: quantitative and qualitative results (such as; improvement of water ecosystems, water quality and peoples health; financial sustainability of the water infrastructure and delivery systems; or social improvements?)
- What was the impact of the action: for example, on policies at national level? On capacity building (regulations created, institutions created, agreements with private partners, etc.)?
- Who were the winners and losers as a consequence of the action/programme?
- Sustainability – will the changes described continue to be effective? Financial, institutional, technical strengths and weaknesses
- Resources used in the actions (How were resources obtained, level of cost recovery, level of dependency on external resources of the investment phase and the Operation phase of the initiative.

4 Lessons learned and replicability

This section considers how this experience can be used elsewhere.

What are the most important lessons from this case that might be useful for other countries and for water policy in the implementation of the IWRM approach?

Does this case have relevance in other places? Does it have wider relevance?

Importance of the case for IWRM

5 Contacts, references, organisations and people

Author:

Contact name, organisation, address, zip code, city, country, telephone and email address

References and websites

Max 10 items of max 250 characters

Published sources of information about the case study and relevant web sites

Organisations and people

Max 10 items of max 250 characters.

People or organisations involved in the case and willing to give more information (Name, Organisation, Address, Telephone, Fax, e-mail)

5. House style and layout

In order that the cases are easily added to the ToolBox and have a consistent style, GWP asks that the authors preparing cases follow these guidelines:

- Submit your file in Microsoft Word
- Use rooted Standard English, reflecting the international system, and using European spellings (British English). The GWP will be responsible for final editing into GWP house style.
- A case should not exceed 10 pages or about 4000 words. Number your pages in one sequence throughout the typescript.
- If graphics, tables or photos are included as part of your case, submit them as a separate file in one of the following formats: XLS, TIFF, GIF and BMP.
- Include no more than 4 photos, no more than 4 graphs and/or other graphics. In total, there should not be more than 6 graphic units.
- Graphic units need to be kept simple in order that users can download speedily, and files transferred electronically are not too bulky.

Final formatting will be done by GWP.

6. Review procedures for cases

Review of cases

Full cases are reviewed by the review panel. The review team may request the author for amendments and when satisfied of the quality the review panel will recommend the inclusion of the case in the ToolBox.

Editing

The quality assured case is edited through the ToolBox Core Team following GWP's house style.

Timing, progress and transparency

The targets for timing are:

From submission of one page proposal to assigning registration number and posting – approximately one week

Review and posting of full case depends on the amount of work needed, but the review team will aim to respond within two weeks of receipt of case.

7. Submission of cases

Case studies come from users of the ToolBox, and we welcome case study proposals from all those and others involved in implementing IWRM. The format for the one page case proposal can be downloaded in Word and submitted directly to the GWP. Case proposals can be submitted in writing to the ToolBox core team, the GWP regions, or be submitted electronically to the ToolBox web site.

The address of the ToolBox core team is the GWP Secretariat:

Global Water Partnership Secretariat

Linnégatan 87D, SE-104 51 Stockholm, Sweden

Tel: +46 8 1213 86 00

Fax: +46 8 1213 86 04

E-mail: toolbox@gwp.org

The GWP website: <http://www.gwp.org>

The GWP ToolBox website: www.gwptoolbox.org