GWP Strategy : Delivery to 2013
Focus Areas for Action

'Before growing externally, it is important to get stronger internally'.

Victor Hugo, *Post-scriptum de ma vie* (1901)

Table of Contents

Annex 1 – MTR Findings with GWPO Comments

GWP Strategy : Delivery to 2013
Focus Areas for Action

Preamble

Implementation of the GWP Strategy 2009-2013 passed its midpoint in June 2011. The Strategy provides a broad umbrella for the implementation of a five-year work program by 13 very diverse GWP Regions and by GWPO. The depth of Strategy implementation has been constrained by financial challenges, while the Network has continued to grow. The current rate of growth is over 10% per year, with many new Partners and Strategic Allies becoming involved in the different aspects of the Strategy implementation. The GWP Financial Partners supported and the GWP Steering Committee approved a process for a Mid-Term Review of the current Strategy in May 2011. The purpose of the Review was to consider progress with Strategy implementation at mid-term, to identify areas that need additional focus and to begin to look at the future, given the opportunities for new funding for GWP.

The Mid-Term Review was designed as a forward-looking, independent, constructive assessment of progress in implementing the Strategy, with a view to helping GWP maintain momentum through to the end of 2013, and guiding the on-going process of change management within the organization. The Review was guided by a joint Financial Partners/GWP Steering Group[1], which reviewed the inception and draft reports and provided detailed factual and substantive comments on the draft report in October 2011. The objectives were:

    (a) to document and analyse progress in implementing the Strategy at national, regional and global levels;

    (b) to identify whether changes are needed to both the organisational structures and the work programming of GWP, or either of these, in order to improve progress in implementing the Strategy; and

    (c) to identify and review options for scaling up delivery of the Strategy and make recommendations for the way forward. The intention was to get full participation of different parts of the Network and Partnership through interviews and review of relevant documentation.

The Review was partially successful, in that progress in just 6 of the 13 GWP Regions was documented. Views were gathered from many different partners and stakeholders within the organization, as well as from GWP´s Strategic Allies and Financial Partners. The challenge the

---

[1] The Steering Group comprised 4 members : the GWP Chair, a representative of the Financial Partners, the GWP Executive Secretary, and a specialist in Evaluations/Reviews of this nature (who is also a GWP Technical Committee Member).

Review faced was that for various reasons, many of the recommendations did not have any analytical underpinning, making it difficult to draw conclusions for action. Furthermore, because the Review was based on conversations with a broad and diverse group of stakeholders, there were often contradictory messages/recommendations. Finally, several of the recommendations are contingent on substantial additional funding being available to GWP.

The final MTR report was discussed by the GWP Financial Partners Group and subsequently in detail by the GWP Steering Committee in its meeting in November 2011. Given the concerns about the gaps and contradictions in the Review, the GWP Steering Committee (SC) decided that the best way forward would be to consider all the recommendations and identify specific areas on which additional/new action could be focused by GWPO and the Network, to enhance Strategy implementation and delivery over the next two years, to the end of 2013. Eight such focus areas were identified and are presented in this document.

Recommendations for which there was no substantive justification or which were minor, were not considered as priority for action. All the Mid-Term Review recommendations and GWPO's comments on them are presented in a separate Annex.

Delivery to 2013 – GWP´s 5-Year Strategy

The GWP Strategy 2009-2013 provides the guiding parameters and strategic goals for the whole Network, acknowledging its diversity. Within this broad framework, all the Regional Water Partnerships and GWPO have designed their own strategies, annual work plans, and monitoring indicators to work towards meeting the four Global Strategic Goals, which were defined within a participatory process during 2008. The four goals are provided below, and Table 1 summarizes the expected overall outcomes from the work of the Partnership and Network (from the 2009-2013 Strategy document).

Goal 1:   Promote water as key part of sustainable national development.
Goal 2:   Address critical development challenges.
Goal 3:   Reinforce knowledge sharing and communications.
Goal 4:   Build a more effective network:

Halfway through the Strategy period, the GWP Network now includes some 2,600 Partner organizations in 161 countries. There are now 80 Country Water Partnerships, which continue to be supported by 13 Regional Water Partnerships. The GWP Technical Committee develops publications to facilitate and spur dialogue. The GWPO Secretariat maintains its support to the Partnership, while facilitating the global agenda and monitoring delivery of the GWP Strategy. Despite the financial crisis which took hold in 2009, the GWP Network and the many existing Water Partnerships at sub-national, national and regional levels continue to implement the Strategy through the 5-year work programme and annual work plans.

Table 1 - Summary of Strategic Goals : GWP Strategy 2009-2013

Goal 1: Promote water as a key part of sustainable national development. *This goal focuses on improving water resources management, putting IWRM into practice to help countries towards growth and water security emphasizing an integrated approach, good governance, appropriate infrastructure and sustainable financing.* *Outcome 1a* Where policies and plans are in place, governments incorporate them into national development processes and implement them with support from others. *Outcome 1b* Where policies and plans are not in place or weak, governments develop them, incorporate them into national development processes and implement them with support from others. *Outcome 1c* Non-government actors, including GWP, civil society and external support agencies, work together to build local capacities and help governments implement their policies and plans.	**Goal 2: Address critical development challenges.** *This goal focuses on contributing to and advocating solutions for critical challenges to water security, such as climate change, growing urbanisation, food production, resource related conflict and other challenges as they emerge.* *Outcome 2a* National and regional policy makers, civic organisations, water managers and international development agencies take into account the links between water and climate change, and develop solutions for adapting the management of water resources to climate change. *Outcome 2b* National and regional policy makers, civic organisations, water managers and international development agencies address critical development challenges, particularly food security, urbanisation and conflict resolution. *Outcome 2c* International actors and multi-lateral policy processes work with a clearer understanding of the options available for tackling emerging and on-going challenges facing water resources through objective and incisive intellectual contributions from GWP and its partners.
Goal 3: Reinforce knowledge sharing and communications. *This goal focuses on developing the capacity to share knowledge and to promote a dynamic communications culture, so as to support better water management.* *Outcome 3a* Global entities such as UN agencies, multi- and bi-laterals, and the corporate world are better informed through GWP knowledge dissemination about issues related to managing the world's water resources. *Outcome 3b* Stakeholders, including governments, finance and planning ministries, NGOs, the private sector and youth, have better access to relevant and practical knowledge, and more capacity to share that knowledge. *Outcome 3c* GWP embeds a communications culture across the Partnership, and stakeholders at all levels take up strategic information and key messages.	**Goal 4: Build a more effective network.** *This goal focuses on enhancing the network's resilience and effectiveness through stronger partnerships, good governance, and measuring performance to help learning and financial sustainability.* *Outcome 4a* GWP strengthens and builds the capacity of RWPs so they carry out their work plans more effectively, and provide support to the Country Water Partnerships. *Outcome 4b* The Global Water Partnership Organization and the Regional Water Partnerships undertake a change process to improve organisation and management, and streamline financial, administrative and governance structures across the Partnership. GWPO and the RWPs fully incorporate an Outcome Mapping approach as a way to plan, monitor and evaluate the success of annual work plans. *Outcome 4c* GWPO, RWPs and Country Water Partnerships access new and diverse sources of funding for GWP activities while increasing funding from traditional sources

Mid- Term Review – findings and GWP action

The Mid-Term Review had some key findings acknowledged below, as well as many wide-ranging recommendations:

- GWP is at least as relevant today as it was 15 years ago!
- GWP is a recognized multi-stakeholder partnership with global outreach and national and local presence.
- GWP's "ownership" and identification with the IWRM approach is considered an asset.
- GWP's Network is considered as a major asset.
- GWP's current strategy is relevant and well designed, but the targets in the work programme are too ambitious. The current thematic re-orientation (GWP Future Directions Paper 2011) which focuses on key substantive themes is a move in the right direction.
- As an independent platform, GWP makes substantial contributions to global processes. It is visible in the international water arena, has strong convening power and a good reputation.
- The most important Strategy implementation successes to date are related to Goal1, namely promoting water as a key part of sustainable national development.

The GWP Steering Committee took note of comments on the MTR from the Steering Group, the Secretariat and the Financial Partners and decided that given the concerns (noted above) about the MTR, the best way forward would be to identify those key areas which had attracted the attention of the review and to find ways to improve strategy implementation in those areas while building on the GWP Future Directions Paper which addresses many relevant issues. *It was also noted that some of the actions identified could only be implemented if additional funding was available to GWP, beyond the current funding levels.* Eight focus areas were identified by the SC, in which action is needed as GWP completes its current Strategy. Under each of these areas, specific actions have been identified for implementation. In some cases, intensification of on-going activities is needed, while in others, new activities must be initiated to support on-going implementation. These focus areas are each linked to one or more of the Global Strategic Goals and therefore there is continuity in implementation of the Strategy.

The eight focus areas which have been identified for increased attention as GWP completes implementation of the current Strategy are:

1. Defining the role of Integrated Water Resource Management in addressing today's global challenges.
2. Increasing Partners' ownership of the Network
3. Using a results-based planning, monitoring and evaluation approach
4. Stepping-up global, regional and country-based fundraising efforts
5. Energizing the Technical Function
6. Energizing the Communication Function
7. Reviewing GWP's governance structure
8. Setting the stage for the next Strategy period, 2014 to 2019

Specific actions related to these focus areas, as well as responsibilities and timing are summarized in Table 2 below. Actions which require that GWP has higher than current funding levels are marked with an asterisk (*). A brief summary of the rationale for putting emphasis on each of the focus areas is included in subsequent paragraphs.

Table 2
Summary of Focus Areas and Related Actions
GWP Strategy Implementation in 2012/2013

Area of Focus	Actions	Responsibility	Timing
1. Defining the role of Integrated Water Resource Management in addressing today's global challenges.	**Develop and disseminate 2 policy briefs**	*Technical Committee and GWPO*	End 2012
	Rio+20 : Water Security for Growth and Sustainability	*GWPO*	January 2012
	IWRM as an Adaptive Tool for Global 21st Century Challenges	*Technical Committee, derived from the Background Paper on Water Security*	August 2012
2. Increasing Ownership of Partners in the Network	**Develop and implement strategies for Partner engagement**	*GWPO, RWPs and CWPs*	
	Strategy for promoting Partner benefits	*GWPO, RWPs and CWPs*	
	Strategy, using the Database, for engagement of women and youth organizations, and universities, academics and researchers who are active in the work of GWP *	*GWPO, RWPs and CWPs together with Strategic Allies*	
	Require each Region to have a full time Communications Officer	*GWPO Comms Unit and RWPs*	November 2012
3. Using a results based planning, monitoring and evaluation approach for Strategy	**Develop and use new reporting tool**	*GWPO*	July 2012
	Annual Monitoring Report	*ES & Network Operations*	May 2012
	Retention of an external M&E expert. ToR to be prepared. Budget 20,000 Euro*	*Network Operations*	June 2012
4. Stepping-up Global and Regional Fundraising	**Develop tools for improving funding and financial management**		
	Guidance Paper on	*Executive Secretary*	Present to SC in May 2012,

	RWPs registering as Legal Entities	*(Legal Officer, Finance, NO)*	present to RWPs at regional days in August 2012
	Fundraising to be a topic at the Regional Days in August	*GWPO and RWPs*	August 2012
	Paper on funding options for Work Plan 2013	*Executive Secretary (Finance, Network Operations, Legal Officer)*	August 2012
	Develop Reporting Guidelines (based on new funding options) to include mechanism for holding back core funding if reporting requirements not met.	*Executive Secretary (Comms, Network Operations, Finance, Legal Officer)*	November 2012
5. Energizing the Technical Function	**Make the Knowledge Chain work**		
	Guidelines on roles and expectations in implementing Knowledge Chain	*ES, (Network Operations, Communications) Chair of Technical Committee*	August 2012
	Regional workshops (*) with Technical Committee	*ES, (Network Operations, Communications) Chair of Technical Committee*	August 2012
6. Energizing the Communication Function	**Develop Communication Tools and Guides**		
	Conditions of Accreditation amended to include the recommendation that a full-time qualified Communications Officer be employed	*ES, Legal Officer*	Completed March 2012.
	Publications Guidelines	*ES (Communications, Technical Committee Chair)*	Completed April 2012.
	Explore the use of communications tools, such as discussion fora, video and e-conferencing	*ES (Communications)*	May 2012
	Develop action plan for	*ES,*	August 2012

	use of Partners Database to enhance communications	*(Communications)*	
	Have a Graphic Designer on call (*)	*ES, (Communications)*	May 2012
7. Reviewing GWP's Governance Structure	**Improving Governance**		
	Analysis of GWP Statutes and assessment of other organisations' statutes	*(ES)Legal Officer, GWP Chair*	Completed by end of 2012.
	Workshop on Organizational Options (*)	*ES and representative group*	Early 2013
8. Setting the Stage for the next Strategy Period, 2014 to 2019	**GWP Future Directions**		
	Draft Concept note for next strategy	*ES, Technical Committee Chair*	May 2012
	Draft process for Strategy development and organizational change	*Executive Secretary*	August 2012

Focus Area 1: Defining the role of Integrated Water Resource Management in addressing today's global challenges

Primary Actors: Partner organizations, Country and Regional Water Partnerships, GWPO

GWP's mission is to support the sustainable development and management of water resources at all levels, from local, community and watershed level to the district, provincial, state, and national level as well as regional level. An important tool to facilitate implementation of the mission is the integrated water resources management (IWRM) approach which brings sectors and disciplines together with a common purpose, ensuring environmental, social equity and economic considerations in the planning and implementation of programs for communities and nations. GWP's vision of a water secure world, takes into account maximizing the beneficial aspects of water, whilst minimizing the destructive aspects in relation to people. Because the IWRM approach is such a versatile and adaptive tool, it can be used by countries to help address the global challenges of today and tomorrow. It will be important for GWP going forward, to describe the application and relevance of the tool for countries as they tackle major global challenges (adaptation to climate change, food security, urbanization, energy demands, etc.)

Two documents are envisaged to help position IWRM in today's world. In the time before the end of the Strategy period, GWP has developed a policy brief *(Rio+20 Water Security for Growth and Sustainability)*, issued to RWPs, CWPs and Partners prior to the Rio +20 Conference which highlights the on-going use of IWRM as a follow-up to the commitments

made in Rio (1992) and Johannesburg (2002). A second policy brief, *(IWRM - Adaptive Tool for Global 21 Century Challenges)* will draw upon the Background Paper on Water Security being developed, to show how through Goal 2 of our Strategy, the IWRM approach is a versatile tool for countries to move towards sustainable development.

Summary

Action	Responsible
Rio+20 Water Security for Growth and Sustainability Preparation, dissemination, translation and circulation of Policy Brief (completed)	Executive Secretary (Secretariat, Technical Committee Chair, RWPs and CWPs)
The IWRM approach in tackling global challenges (***IWRM as an Adaptive Tool for Global 21 Century Challenges***) Title to be confirmed. Preparation, dissemination, translation and circulation of Policy Brief before August 2012	Technical Committee, RWPs, GWPO

Focus Area 2: Increasing Partners' ownership and engagement with GWP

Primary Actors: Partner organizations, Country and Regional Water Partnerships, GWPO

The strength of GWP can be seen in the fact that the world-wide Partnership has continued to attract new Partners over the years, with a six-fold increase in the number of partners between 2004 and 2010, and a current growth rate of some 10% per year. The Mid-Term Review acknowledged that the GWP Network is a major asset of GWP.   While much effort has been put into growing the Partnership to date, there is now a need to increase focus on the existing GWP Partners, their ownership of and engagement in their Network.

The GWP Network has a tremendous reach and scope because of the voluntary contributions of time and effort, and in-kind contributions of resources, from a wide range of Partners and allies. These generous contributions give the Partnership its energy and strength, and support a diversity of activities at various levels across the Network. Conversely, however, the GWP Network also supports Partners in being more effective at what they do, because they can access the shared knowledge and the formal and informal linkages and contacts of GWP, to enhance their day-to-day work in their own organizations. This contributes, for example, to the individual success stories of a number of people who have risen over the years into positions of high political influence partly as a result of the additional experience and insights they have gained through being active in the GWP Network.

Now after 15 years of growth, GWP needs to analyze thoroughly the amazing potential of this world-wide Network to influence change at all levels, and to work out in detail how to leverage the Network more effectively in building water security. This is a formidable task but essential in order to show our Partners (including Financial Partners) what there is to gain from being part of this organisation. Leveraging the Network needs to take place at a number of levels and through various strategies.   The Partners' database which has recently been relaunched on a new platform, and continues to be developed, provides a great opportunity to

identify and engage different stakeholder groups. Several actions described below are designed to help with increasing ownership in GWP's mission.

- <u>Promoting the benefits of being a GWP Partner organization</u>: An emphasis has to be placed on spelling out the benefits which Partners gain from becoming more engaged in the Network. These benefits have to be visible externally whenever and wherever GWP is active (on websites, at conferences, in the Partners application form, etc).
- <u>Strengthening communications across the network</u>: Developing and disseminating stories of success around the partnership; encouraging exchange among Partners from different Regions (through workshops*). A network can only fulfil its vision and mission if communication is open and highly active at all times. The Partners Database is a pivotal tool for the Communication Function within the Network.
- <u>GWP gender and youth strategies</u>: Identifying specific ways to engage gender and youth groups/organizations as part of the gender strategy under preparation. This work has begun in earnest in 2012. On the issue of gender, it is aimed at supporting the Regions with their work to promote gender equity, and specifically empowering women´s organizations and women´s voices at all levels**.** With respect to youth, highlighting and attracting more youth organizations as Partners and supporting young water professionals and young leaders in the field, for example through scholarship arrangements with universities, internships and one-to-one mentoring opportunities are all being explored.
- <u>Universities Network :</u> Use the Partners database, the GWP ToolBox and the existing University Professors who are involved in GWP (Technical Committee members, SC, RWP and CWP office bearers, etc) to establish a network of IWRM Centres within the GWP Network, for curriculum development, postgraduate teaching, applied research, and project development support
- <u>Private sector engagement :</u> Currently 12% of GWP Partners (over 300 Partners) are private sector organizations, both large and small (of the remainder, about 18% are government bodies, approximately 30% are NGOs, another 30% are academic and research institutions, and 10% are "other" namely international organizations, media, etc). GWP therefore needs to engage more closely with the private sector for the future, and can also do so very effectively by partnering with new networks such as the Water Resources Group.
- <u>Continue to seek out new Partner organizations, especially from the water-use sectors, and those engaged in the major thematic areas identified in GWP's Future Directions Paper.</u> (Water Financing, Transboundary Water Management, Climate Change, Food Security, Urbanization)

Summary

Actions	Responsible
Strategy for Promotion of Partner Benefits	Executive Secretary (Network Operations/Communications)
Strategies, using the Database, for engagement of women, youth and university researchers and academics more actively in the work of GWP (*)	Executive Secretary (Toolbox Officer)
Engage full time qualified Communications Officers in each Region (**)	RWPs, Communications

Focus Area 3: Using a results based planning, monitoring and evaluation approach

Primary Actors: Regional Water Partnerships, GWPO- Secretariat

Outcome Mapping (OM) is the methodology which has been in use within GWP since 2007. OM inherently recognises that direct attribution of results to outcomes[2] is not possible in organisations such as GWP that don't directly deliver tangible "results" on the ground. Rather, OM methodologies seek to identify and report on the *plausible linkages* among outputs, outcomes and results across this *attribution gap*. Hence OM is about assessing contribution, rather than attribution. GWP Regions currently report on their activities in terms of outcomes and progress markers, in OM terminology, against their annual work plans and the 5-year work programme based upon the Strategy. However, the current development assistance environment is now focusing more on direct results and impact on the ground. This is a challenge for GWP as a strong policy, advocacy and knowledge-focused network, which also supports practical actions at various levels in countries and regions.

The Mid-Term Review stated that the OM approach is "too ambitious and resource consuming" and should be "replaced by a simpler and more realistic results-based planning framework".

As part of the way forward, GWP will present an analytical Monitoring Report for the first time this year in addition to GWP in Action. Up to now, outcomes have been reported against the annual workplans in detail, but without summary and analysis. Furthermore, an external M&E expert will help to explore how GWP should focus its reporting more on programmatic results and on incorporating benefits gained by secondary beneficiaries, in a more quantitative approach.

Summary

Actions	Responsible
Analytical Monitoring Report	ES & Network Operations
Retention of an external M&E expert. ToR to be prepared. Budget 20,000 Euro	Network Operations

Focus Area 4: Stepping up Global and Regional Fundraising

Primary Actors: CWPs, RWPs, GWPO

As already noted above, GWP's ability to implement **fully** the actions in this document is contingent on the availability of funds beyond current levels.

There will be renewed efforts to engage the donor agencies, regional development banks, the private sector, international finance institutions (IFIs) and philanthropic foundations for funding at global, regional and country levels. Increased efforts are needed by RWPs and CWPs, to explore all funding opportunities locally. Many development organizations are

---

[2] **Outcomes** are defined as : *"changes in relationships, activities, actions, or behaviour of boundary actors that can be plausibly linked to a programme's activities, although they are not necessarily directly caused by it"* (IDRC, 2001).

increasingly decentralized, with some of their funds only available at country or regional levels. However, some agencies cannot fund RWPs which are not legal entities, thus opportunities for RWPs to access funding are reduced as currently they do not have legal status. This is an issue which GWP is actively addressing, and several RWPs have now set up legal entities. Most CWPs have legal status in their countries, however where they do not, this issues are similar to those of the RWPs.

Incentives and different funding arrangements (some of which are discussed in the GWP Future Directions Paper) need to be explored further at all levels in the Partnership. Options for funding of the Regions need to be elaborated and agreed for the 2013 annual workplan. One option of interest would require increased seed funding to regions from 200,000 Euros to 500,000 Euros, thus enabling them to hold regional workshops, and bring on board additional full/part-time staff (for fundraising, communications etc). This could only be done with additional funding to GWPO. Another option is that Partners could be charged fees which would go to their Regions/Countries. This may necessitate a change in the Statutes at global level, and of RWPs and CWPs. Some CWPs already do charge a fee.

In addition an increasing number of funding organizations are looking to GWP to host, to manage and/or to implement water-related programmes and projects. This means that there could be a change in GWP's role in relation to such programmes. The question of how far GWP should go down this path needs to be discussed further.

Summary

Actions	Responsible
Guidance Paper on RWPs registering as Legal Entities	Executive Secretary (Legal Officer, Finance, Network Operations)
Rework the Conditions of Accreditation to take into account the fiduciary concerns related to RPWs/CWPs receiving funds which they manage themselves.	Executive Secretary (Legal Officer, Finance)
Fundraising to be a topic at the Regional Days in August	GWPO
Paper on funding options for 2013 Work Plan	Executive Secretary (Finance, Network Operations. Legal Officer
Develop Reporting Guidelines, based on new funding options (November 2012) to include mechanism for holding back core funding if reporting requirements not met.	Executive Secretary (Finance, Legal Officer)

Focus Area 5: Energizing the Technical Function

Primary Actors: members of the GWP Technical Committee, Regional and Country Water Partnerships, GWPO

At its core, the Technical Function is about linkages between the GWP Technical Committee and (1) the Global Secretariat, (2) GWP Regions, and (3) Strategic Allies. The Knowledge Chain was developed as a way to operationalize the Technical Function within GWP. Increased interaction among regional technical professionals and the global technical

committee is a key part of making the Knowledge Chain work. Regional and inter-Regional workshops (*) on the thematic areas addressed by the Strategy would be a very important part of the way forward. Expanding the use of alternative ways of communicating (such as video- and e-conferencing) must be urgently upscaled.

There need to be clear guidelines on roles of Secretariat and Technical Committee in implementing the Knowledge Chain. The publications guidelines are to be updated with the Knowledge Chain approach, and disseminated for use by the RWPs and GWPO (Secretariat and Technical Committee).

Summary

Actions	Responsible
Publications Guidelines for implementing the Knowledge Chain	ES, (NO, Communications), Chair of Technical Committee,
Regional workshops (*) with Technical Committee	ES, (NO Communications) Chair of Technical Committee

Focus Area 6: Energizing the Communication Function

Primary Actors: Partner organizations, Country and Regional Water Partnerships, GWPO

At the global level, communications have been given a high priority in Strategic Goal 3. To increase/improve communication at regional and country levels, several actions will be implemented:
- Regions need to recruit full-time qualified regional Communications Officers (*) and begin to systematically use modern technology platforms (websites, social media, databases). Once this regional commitment and investment has been made, this will enhance communications at country level and, ultimately, among the Partners of the Network. The new Conditions of Accreditation for Regional Water Partnerships recommend that a full-time Communications Officer be employed by each of the Regional Secretariats.
- Creation of discussion forums for the Regions within the Tool Box, e-conferencing and video conferencing should be explored and upscaled, for inter-regional and global-regional-country communications.
- Publications guidelines for use by GWPO (Secretariat and Technical Committee) will be prepared and disseminated.
- The new Partners Database will be explored to assess how it can best benefit partners, CWPs and RWPs.
- Strategic messaging is another area where we need to become more effective. Ensuring the quality of representation of GWP at public fora needs to be in place with technically sound materials, corporate presentations containing GWP´s key messages, for global events etc. The Communications Department will have a graphic designer on call to assist with the presentations(*).
- Finally, there needs to be far more use made of the public media: print and electronic media, TV and radio, journalist workshops all need to be better harnessed to deliver GWP´s messages and stories to key audiences.

Summary

Action steps	Responsible
Conditions of Accreditation amended to include the recommendation that a full-time qualified Communications Officer be employed.	(ES) Legal Officer
Publications Guidelines	ES, Communications, Technical Committee Chair
Explore the use of communications tools, such as discussion fora, video and e conferencing	ES, Communications
Develop action plan for use of Partners Database to enhance communications.	ES, Communications
Have a Graphic Designer on call (*)	ES, Communications

Focus Area 7: Reviewing GWP's governance structure

Primary Actors: GWPO – Steering Committee, Global Secretaria,t Sponsoring Partners, Financial Partners, RWPs

GWP is a complex Organization, Partnership and Network. It is governed by its Statutes. The Network has grown over the past 15 years and one can legitimately ask : does the current governance system serve the current Network as effectively as it could? The end of a Strategy period is a good time to review and consider the governance of the Organization to see if and where adjustments or major changes are needed.

This question is of interest to the Secretariat, Steering Committee, the FPG and the Sponsoring Partners. There is interest to define a formal role for the FPG, without making it a part of Network management. There is also interest in simplifying processes and ensuring that Regional "voices" are heard. The interactions between the components of the system are not always clearly defined. The GWPO Statutes (at global level) contain ambiguities which make them difficult to interpret and even more difficult for the executive leadership to manage.

During 2011 the GWPO Statutes were revised for the first time, and a process established whereby electronic voting by Partners can be used for subsequent amendments. This now makes it possible to undertake a thorough-going revision of GWP governance. An important first step in this area is to do an analysis of the current Statutes (which touch on almost all aspects of GWP's existence) to identify problematic areas, missing or out-of-date information, as the basis for dialogue and discussion. A review of governance structures for similar organizations will also provide valuable information for GWP to consider. Once this analysis is complete, a discussion of organizational options can be conducted by a representative group of GWP stakeholders, with the possible help of a facilitator to help pave the way forward to a more relevant governance structure for the Partnership.

Summary

Action s	Responsible
Analysis of GWP Statutes	ES, Legal Officer, Chair
Workshop on Organizational Options (*)	ES, GWP representative group

Focus Area 8: Setting the stage for the next Strategy period: 2014-2019

Primary Actors: all stakeholders and GWP Partners

As proposed in the Mid-Term Review, the focus of the next strategy period should build upon the current Strategy with its vision of water security for all. This vision can be achieved through implementing the broad approach of integrated water resources management, while working on improving water productivity and water efficiency, and reducing water risks, in every facet of the economy and society. At the same time, the gaps in the current strategy will need to be addressed to ensure that the organization remains effective, relevant and dynamic.

In 2012 GWP will begin to design and establish the process for developing the next GWP strategy. The strategic planning process will also incorporate discussions on organizational changes. GWP Partners and the Regions will need to be active players in this process, so that the next global strategy is developed in a participatory way and is fully owned by the Network in the way the current GWP Strategy has been. A draft strategy concept note, building on the GWP Future Directions Paper and taking into account financial considerations, will be discussed by the Steering Committee in May 2012 and by the Partners in August 2012.

In particular the concept will integrate a discussion of the interrelationships between water and energy as a thematic area in the next strategy; the integration of coastal zone management and freshwater management; as well as a fuller incorporation of climate risks and the major extreme events, namely floods and droughts, into the sustainable development and management of water resources. The roles of women, of young people, and of the private sector must become better defined and initiatives being taken under the Work Plan during 2012 are already setting the stage for this renewal.

Summary

Actions	Responsible
Draft Concept note for next strategy (May 2012)	ES, Technical Committee Chair
Draft process for Strategy development (November 2012)	ES

End Note

The 2012 Global Risks Report has for the first time identified water as one of the top five global risks. The GWP Network and Partnership must continue to grow and develop as a neutral platform and a trusted knowledge broker, positioning itself to be even better able to help countries address the urgent global water-related challenges that they face. The increased attention to the eight focus areas identified in this paper as the current Strategy

period comes to a close, will help pave the way for an even more dynamic and relevant strategy period 2014 to 2019.

Annex 1
Mid-Term Review – Recommendations and GWPO's comments

The main observations (highlighted separately) and recommendations of the Mid-term Review Team are consolidated in this Annex. The recommendations are spread throughout the report and sometimes the same recommendation is made in sections relating to different issues, or recommendations contradict each other. We have tried to group them under the following titles, to facilitate understanding:

1. GWP's Strategic/Thematic Focus
2. GWPO Operations
3. Performance of the Network/Partnership
4. Knowledge Management and Sharing, including the Technical Committee
5. Programme Management Cycle
6. Scaling-up the Strategy

Associated with most observations and recommendations is a commentary by the GWP derived from input from the Financial Partners Group, the Secretariat, the Technical Committee and discussions during the November 2011 Global Steering Committee meeting. In addition, there are notes on what GWP intends to do with them. The eight focus areas defined in the main report address the relevant and justified recommendations and provide a basis for action for the second half of the strategy period.

1. GWP's Strategic/Thematic Focus

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Observation : GWP is at least as relevant today as it was 15 years ago! **(page 27, 6.1)** • relevance has increased because of climate change • "normative" rather than "evidence based" • too little concerned with investments and development aspects **(Page iv, B4 – Relevance)** **(Page 4, 3.2)**	Agree emphatically with this statement of GWP's increased relevance today. It is not only "normative", as there is evidence of the progress made on the ground (ref. UN Water/GWP Rio+20 Survey on IWRM progress in countries, 2012; UNWater/GWP IWRM Survey, 2008). Governments need to move beyond IWRM plans to delivering results, through realistic financing strategies. GWP continues to support and contribute to this agenda, through implementation of its current Strategy.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Observation : GWP's 2 main assets: • Original introduction and subsequent development and "ownership" of the IWRM approach • Multi-stakeholder partnership with global outreach, and national/local presence o places the GWP in a good position to play a lead role in the process of water management "getting out of the water box" **(Page ii B1 – Context** **(Page 6, 3.6)**	1. Yes, GWP is intimately linked with the origins of the IWRM approach, derived from the Dublin-Rio principles, and Agenda 21. GWP is deeply involved with working through the IWRM approach as an adaptive tool to tackle emerging challenges. 2. Our challenge is to capitalise on this strongly recognized approach, and also to engage with the GWP Network more effectively (Focus Area 2).
Observation : Current strategy is relevant and well designed, but the targets in the work programme are too ambitious: • could be more focussed on priority issues • strategy should be valid beyond 2013 In spite of this, GWP has made substantial contributions to global processes **(Page ii B2, point 5)**	• As discussed during the November 2011 SC meeting, GWP regards the Strategy as "comprehensive" rather than "too ambitious". The 5-year targets are broad to allow for regional diversity. • GWP recognized the need to consolidate and focus reporting on a smaller number of key areas and developed the Future Directions paper which organizes our work under 5 key thematic areas. • Aspects of the existing Strategy are valid beyond 2013, and will be developed further through a participatory process in preparing the next Strategy. (Focus Area 8)
Observation Most important successes are in Goal 1 **(Page ii B2 point 6)**	GWP considers that more progress has been made on Goal 1 but all four goals are closely linked. Furthermore, important achievements in Goal 2 in the area of climate change adaptation appear to have been overlooked by the reviewers.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Observation : GWP doesn't have a fully convincing profile. In certain ways it is an academic network. In other ways, it is – or has the ambition to be - a Global Action Network. It also initiates training. Its thematic focus is relatively broad (e.g. water resources, water supply and sanitation, financing, training, policy and law development). **(Page 29, 6.5)**	GWP's mission is clear and has not changed. It is both a Partnership and a Network, and the focus of GWP's efforts is the sustainable development and management of water resources at all levels. Depending on priorities in the Countries and Regions, emphasis is put on different aspects of the mission.
Observation : Current thematic re-orientation is a move in the right direction. Crossing a geographic with a thematic approach has to be planned carefully, to ensure that the strong ownership and identity in the GWP network is maintained. **(Page iv B4 – point 15)**	Agreed and noted.
Recommendation : Maintain the main strategic design (vision, mission and 4 goals) of the Strategy through the next phase.	The next Strategy will evolve through a participatory process in the Network and Partnership and is expected to build on the current one. As noted above, this discussion will take place within the context of full stakeholder consultations during 2013.
Recommendation : Move away from "support to IWRM planning" to "support to IWRM implementation" **(Page iv B6 point 20)** **(Page 4 point 3.3)**	Implementation of IWRM is not defined by the Review Team, and can be very broad. GWP's supports the development of IWRM plans/strategies <u>and</u> their implementation by countries and regions, and in river basins.
Recommendation : Coaching for IWRM implementation: Less emphasis on knowledge production (ToolBox) than on establishing a network in which IWRM practitioners have easy access to coaches which can help them to solve problems. **(Page 31, 7.3))**	GWP provides different kinds of support at different levels and depending on the type of support needed. Network Partners are a key part of GWP's work in countries. A network of IWRM Centres is planned (Focus Area 2).

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Observation : As an independent platform, GWP makes substantial contributions to global processes: • GWP is visible on the international water arena • strong convening power (ref. panel in recent CP meeting) • has potential to position itself as an organisation that can succeed in launching multi-stakeholder dialogues • good reputation is manifest by GWP initiations to int. conferences and other networks • GWP contributed actively to UN Water IWRM global survey	Agreed. Playing this global role as an independent and <u>neutral</u> platform, bringing many and various stakeholders together across sectors and at different levels, is a continuing objective of GWP, and a unique role that GWP plays in relation to single-issue organizations, e.g., environmental groups.
Observation : Donors have a high opinion about the relevance of GWP but • donors "want to see more of implementation" and action on the ground. **(Page iv B6 point 19)** **(Page 5.6, 3.5)**	Ref. comments on "implementation" above. GWP does not implement IWRM plans for countries, but supports countries in the implementation at various levels, including the development of finaning strategies for investment. Focus Area 2 discusses leveraging the Network further for action on the ground..

2. GWPO Operations

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : GWP needs to consider if it wants to become an operational organization for programmes with global or continental reach or whether it wants to keep its participatory, bottom-up approach to strategizing and planning. **(Page 5 -6 point 3.5)**	Not clear what MTR is recommending. GWP is operational and at the same time it has a bottom-up and participatory approach. To some extent this recommendation is addressed by Focus Areas 3, 5 and 6.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : Adapt the capacity of the GWPO Secretariat to guarantee the following functions: • dialogue and representation at international level • launching and financing of global programmes • administration of steering and technical functions • communications • knowledge management • network management • financial management **(Page v B8 point 27)** **(Page 37, 8.5)**	In many respects these functions are already represented within the present structure of the Secretariat. Assuring continued cost-effective functioning of the Global Secretariat, including the Technical Function (ref. supporting GWP Technical Committee, and strengthening the Knowledge Chain) to serve the needs of the Network is a priority challenge for management, together with leveraging the Network and linking more strongly with Partner organizations. GWPO strives to maintain a slim Secretariat. See Focus Areas 4, 5 and 6, and the Future Directions paper.
Recommendation : Move human resources of the Secretariat NO positions to the regions **(Page 4 B3 point 11)** **(Page 37, 8.5)**	There was no basis given for making this recommendation. It was suggested as an option in a previous evaluation (2008) and then it was researched in detail, and discussed with the FPG, the SC, and the Regions. A decision was taken not to make such a move, which would involve a change in the policy of GWP as a whole, as well as in the organizational structure of the Secretariat. No new rationale has been put forward by the MT Review team to support this recommendation.

3. Performance of the Network/Partnership

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment

Recommendation :
Need to "rationalise the organisation"... a need for an organisational development process using external facilitation based on the following Review Team observations: **(Page 33, 7.7)**
 	
• complex organisational set-up
• lack of organisational accountability
   o increase accountability, and end contracts with regional chairs and coordinators who do not deliver results or agreed information to the GWPO secretariat. **(Page 33, 7.7)**
• functioning of steering at the global level
   o e.g. funding partners are not adequately represented in the SC
   o parallel structures of steering - SC and sponsoring partners
• little capacity of the steering and technical platforms due to overload of tasks in relation to capacity
• limited effectiveness at the regions
• capacity of Secretariat reduced since 2009 but workload remains the same:
   o Secretariat needs more time for strategic discussions **(Page 33, 7.7)**
• ambiguity between a culture of academic debates and the goals of an action network
   o does GWP want to be an academic debate platform or a programme that makes a difference? **(Page 29, 6.5)**
• stakeholders and partners at country level feel uninformed about policies and programmes in GWPO
(Page 34.35, 8.2)
(page v B8 point 24)
	GWP considers it important to review its current governance structure and systems in the context of preparing for the next Strategy period. Several different steps are being taken to that end. However, it will be more important to have thorough internal discussion of the necessary changes to be made. Many of the statements here have no underlying analysis. There are few specifics of what is broken and therefore what needs fixing. Various points are addressed under Focus Areas 2, 3, 5, 6, and 7.

Recommendation : Need to "modernise" the management of the partner network **Page 35.36, 8.3)** Define an objective and an agenda for action o a new convincing agenda beyond IWRM planning, to unify the partners and provide them with identity **(Page 36, 8.4)**	Again, there is no basis provided for this recommendation. GWP works on more clearly positioning the IWRM approach in today's world, and on leveraging the GWP Network. This is addressed by Focus Areas 1, 2, 3 and 8.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : Funding at the "lower limit of what would be needed to successfully operate a global organisation". More effective use of management structure is needed. • Regional Council meetings could, without doubt, be a "moment fort" as all the relevant GWP stakeholders – the network officer, RWPs, CWPs – would meet. It would be a perfect platform to address strategic issues and to strengthen relationship and collaboration among partners. But this opportunity is not always taken advantage of. **(Page 37-38, 8.6)** **(Page iv B5)** **(Page 28, 6.3)**	Agreed. With increased funding, a larger seed fund would be made available to the RWPs and the CWPs, to establish a firmer staff base and for activities. GWP will also explore, among other things, paying for outputs, providing incentives for cost-effective delivery of programmes, and encouraging regional fund-raising initiatives. See Focus Areas 3 and 4.
Recommendation : Strengthen regional and country platforms • The limited funding of 200,000 Euro per year hardly justifies maintaining a steering and management platform at the regional level. Funding would have to be significantly higher in order to keep the momentum in the network. **(Page 37-38, 8.6)**	As above. The current seed funding level provides a minimum infrastructure and staffing for the GWP Network to function.
Recommendation : Leverage funding at regional and country levels • use experience from regions that are successful	Agreed. Dealt with under Focus Area 4.

Recommendation :
Redefine operations in case of funding restrictions - 4 options presented by the Review Team with recommendations to proceed with option b or d:
    a) status quo with competitive funding
    b) reduce number of financially supported RWPs
    c) shift to thematic programme approach
    d) shift to only activities and projects that are co-funded by RWPs/CWPs
(Page 39-40, 8.9)
	These recommendations are inconclusive as they are based on an inadequate analysis of the options. The options recommended and their implications need to be analysed more fully. Co-financing of activities and projects both in cash and especially in kind, by Regions, Countries and Partners is already a reality (Focus Area 4).

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : GWP could benefit from a strategy to work more with pilot activities that can later, if successful, be scaled-out in appropriate environments. There are many activities going on in the GWP network, and some of them have the potential to become flagship activities, for instance setting up multi-stakeholder water user organizations. Introduce mechanism for "piloting" no system for systematically identifying good practices, testing them and then replicating them at a larger scale **(Page 23, 5.5)**	See below, and Focus Area 3.
Recommendation : Introduce a mechanism for piloting and a more competitive approach in 2012. **(Page 32, 7.6)**	A good recommendation, and a good present-day example is the WACDEP in Africa, which was modelled to some extent on the successful PAWD programme. See Focus Area 3.
Recommendation : Embark on organisational change process to make GWP more dynamic and fit to meet challenges in the future: - more strategic and less focussed on operational issues - new commitment of GWP to IWRM - adequate level of funding to be determined	See Focus Areas 1, 7 and 8.
Recommendation : High level retreat for 1-week with strategic thinkers, partners, staff, etc. - to discuss ways of adapting IWRM to new needs and realities, and set the direction for the organisation change process and the new strategy - establish 2 groups a) org. change group to drive the OD process b) a permanent think tank, including donors, to identify new challenges and opportunity for GWP/IWRM **(Page 42 43, 9.3)**	More strategic retreats and discussions to be held, within the governance review, the organizational change process and also in development of the next Strategy (Focus Areas 7 and 8).
Recommendation : All regions are able to find their own modus operandi that can produce results. **(Page 7 point 4.1)**	Overall this is a compliment to the regional structure of the Network, within which each already has its own *modus operandi,* expressing the diversity of GWP.

4. Knowledge Management and Sharing, including the GWP Technical Committee

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : Many interviewees state that the role of the regions needs to be more stressed in the production and dissemination of knowledge; the technical function of GWP needs to be organised in such a way that this is enhanced. **(Page 13 – Strengthening GWP Knowledge sharing)**	Agreed. Work on the Technical Function and the Knowledge Chain linking the GWP Technical Committee, the GWP Regions and GWPO continues to evolve, see Focus Area 5.
Recommendation : Many consider the documents produced by TEC too academic, and that TEC should provide more guidance for IWRM implementation and thus produce documents (also) of more applied nature. **(page 21, 5.4)**	Work on the Technical Function is being done, see Focus Area 5. Technical Focus Papers are now being produced, in addition to the Background Papers. The recommendations of the MTR are mostly based on anecdotes from interviewees, not on factual evidence.
Recommendation : One option mentioned that could address both the issue of insufficient regional participation and resource constraints within the TEC, would be to set up thematic teams with competent members from all levels of the network as well as research students under the leadership of specific TEC members. Such teams, which would be led by the relevant TEC member with competence in a particular subject area, could do research and prepare first drafts of documents to be further discussed and elaborated on in the TEC, which would not then as in the present case have to do all the work themselves. **(page 21, 5.4)**	Work on the Technical Function continues to evolve, see Focus Area 5. Engagement of the Regions and strengthening support and interaction between the Secretariat and Technical Committee are all part of the Knowledge Chain and the way forward.
Observation : Knowledge management not fully adapted to modern approaches/facilities	There was no analytical basis for this observation. Knowledge management is dynamic, "work in progress" under Focus Areas 5 and 6.
Recommendation : Knowledge chain is good, but needs to be "complemented"	This statement is unclear and it is not explained exactly which parts of the Knowledge Chain need to be complemented and how. Again the analytical basis for this is not provided. Focus Area 5.
Recommendation : Improve regional outreach of TEC by setting up thematic sub-groups with regional participation **(Page 31, 7.3)**	Work on the Technical Function continues to evolve during the last half of the Strategy Period. This recommendation will be considered together with others. Focus Area 5.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation/Observation : Need to introduce web 2.0 tools • web-site allows for information dissemination only and no sharing and/or collaboration **(Page 31, 7.3)**	Web 2.0 tools were all introduced in the current Strategy period: blogging, Facebook, Twitter, SlideShare, RSS feeds, e-newsletter, YouTube, Flickr, LinkedIn. Each one allows discussion or sharing by the public and is set up to do so. We are also looking at e-conferencing, and the web platform launched in 2010 is very flexible and is being used in various ways by the Regions. It is being developed to enable collaboration by Partner organizations.

5. Programme Management Cycle

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Observation : The OM-based progress monitoring report (May 2011) was useful... but difficult to crosscheck • correctness was largely confirmed by the parties in the regions **(Page 8 point 4.1)**	The OM and results-based monitoring system continues to evolve. Focus Area 3.

Recommendation :
Current OM-based planning and monitoring should be used to 2013
• OM should be replaced with a simpler and more realistic results-based planning framework
• OM is too ambitious and resource consuming
    o replace with simpler and more realistic RB planning framework
    o progress markers are very vague
(Page 30, 7.2)
	Implementation of the OM planning, monitoring and reporting system is a work in progress and continues to be refined with experiences gained in implementation. The overall OM approach is valid and relevant for a social change organization such as GWP. We are building on experiences, and also on the encouragement of the MTR (ref. next point), the FPG, SC and others to prepare a results framework incorporating OM. Focus Area 3.

Recommendation : Use DFID RBM consultancy to start the process of elaborating a new, simple, robust format for planning, monitoring and reporting • include performance indicators, milestones and baseline information • maximum of 12 performance indicators to make monitoring simple and practical • should be endorsed by the funding partners, tested, piloted and refined, ready for 2014 (**Page 32, 7.5**) o drastic simplification of planning and reporting system required at the GWP level (**Page 30, 7.2**)	Improved monitoring and reporting tools are being developed for use throughout the Partnership. Focus Area 3.
Recommendation : Work programmes for the next Strategy should be more realistic... donors must commit funds needed to achieve planned results (**Page 38, 8.7**)	Agreed and will be considered in the process for creating the next strategy. Focus Area 8.
Observation : Planned production of a more brief synthesis report is a step forward in making information more accessible	Agreed and production of such a progress review/report is taking place. Focus Area 3.
Observation Present planning is bottom-up and engages the regions (**Page 8 point 4.1**)	Agreed.
Boundary partners/actors only marginally involved in the programme planning and agreeing on progress markers • reduces the value of the work programme	The MTR did not provide any factual basis for this observation and no clear recommendation was made.

6. Scaling-up the Strategy

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : Analyse and strengthen the network, high-level roundtables, improve regional outreach of TEC, improve communications and networking/coaching (**Page 31, 7.3**)	Agreed that it is critically important to engage the Network Partners more fully. A range of options will be considered as part of the way forward. Focus Areas 2 and 6.
Observation : Future Directions paper is a good start. Moving from a geographic program (regions) to a thematic program approach can put the present participatory "bottom-up approach" at risk. (**Page 31, 7.4**)	The MTR did not explain why and how such a move could put the bottom-up approach at risk, and therefore it is not possible for us to comment on this specific point.

Mid-Term Review Observation/Recommendations	Comment
Recommendation : Analysis, strengthening and re-vitalisation of the Network even with the risk that many partners will leave GWP **(page 42, 9.2)**	Strengthening and revitalizing the Network will be a positive step forward. Focus Area 2.
Recommendation : Organise high-level round-tables aiming at engaging actors from sectors other than water... leading to declarations or other binding decisions • new convincing agenda beyond IWRM planning is not yet emerging **(page 42, 9.2)**	GWP will use new and various tools to determine the best way forward in engaging the various water using sectors on sustainable water management. Also, this will be an area which is emphasised in the new Strategy. Focus Areas 1 and 8.