



DELIVERING THE GWP STRATEGY 2009-2013

Report from the Consulting Partners meeting

*Stockholm, Sweden
15-17 August 2008*

Content

1. REPORT OF CONSULTING PARTNERS MEETING 2008	2
2. NOTE FROM THE ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY	3
3. MORNING PLENARY SESSIONS	4
3.1. Welcome, introduction and objectives of the Consulting Partners meeting	4
3.2. Annual Report and TEC Report	4
3.3. Governance issues – election of new Steering Committee members	5
3.4. Presentation of External Evaluation and Management Response	5
3.5. Presentation of Draft Strategy #3	6
3.6. Plenary discussion and clarifications	7
4. GROUP SESSIONS – THE STRATEGY	9
4.1. General discussion on Draft Strategy	9
4.2. Implementing the new Strategy – the four Strategic Goals	10
4.3. Plenary discussion	12
5. GROUP SESSION – GOVERNANCE AND ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE	14
5.1. How should GWP be organised to deliver the new Strategy?	14
5.2. Plenary discussion	16
6. PLENARY CONCLUDING SESSION	18
6.1. High-Level Panel to comment on GWP Strategy 2009-2013	18
6.2. Summary of Strategy discussions and next steps	19
APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF ACRONYMS	21

1. REPORT OF CONSULTING PARTNERS MEETING 2008

This is the report of the 2008 annual Consulting Partners (CP) meeting of the Global Water Partnership (GWP) that took place on 15-17 August in Stockholm (Hotel Hilton Slussen). The meeting brought together 165 delegates from 75 countries.

The theme of the CP meeting was “Delivering the Strategy 2009-2013”. In plenary sessions and working groups, the Consulting Partners, from more than 80 organisations and all members of the GWP network, contributed to the development of the Strategy. Regional representatives from the 13 Regional Water Partnerships (RWPs), GWP’s Secretariat and its Technical Committee (TEC) also attended. Other sessions included a presentation of a recent donor-initiated External Review and the Annual Report.

The programme of the CP meeting consisted of several components:

- Session 1: Report from the Chair, Acting Executive Secretary, TEC Chair and Introduction to the new Strategy
- Session 2: Working Group and Plenary Discussions on the Draft Strategy
- Session 3: Working Group and Plenary Discussions on the GWP Governance
- Session 4: Synthesis and Panel Discussion

This report summarises the breadth of debate in the plenary and work group sessions of the CP meeting and sums up the main overarching points from the three days of meetings.

2. NOTE FROM THE ACTING EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

The Global Water Partnership is a worldwide network with the mission to support countries with sustainable management of their water resources, spanning over 65 countries in 13 regions with more than 2000 partners.

The annual GWP Consulting Partners meeting brings together partners from diverse organisations and countries, giving the members the occasion to manifest their ownership of the widely spread GWP network through discussions of achievements and future activities.

Meeting in Stockholm this year, the focus was the 2009–2013 Strategic Plan. In plenary sessions and working groups, the Consulting Partners contributed significantly to the development of the Strategy.

The meeting also gave myself and the GWP Chair Letitia A. Obeng the opportunity to meet with many GWP partners for the first time. The meeting was a significant step for GWP. It showed that GWP will re-strategise, re-organise and re-energise for the future.

My conclusion at the plenary session the last day of the meeting was that the new Strategy was well received among the partners and that the discussions had been very constructive. Thank you for your contributions, stated here in this report.

Our task now is to make sure that the new Strategy will reflect the members' vision for GWP in the years to come.

Martin Walshe
Acting Executive Secretary

3. MORNING PLENARY SESSIONS

SESSION 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE CP MEETING 15 AUGUST 09.00-12.30
3.1. Welcome, introduction and objectives of the Consulting Partners meeting <i>Letitia A. Obeng</i>
3.2. Annual Report and TEC Report <i>Martin Walshe, Roberto Lenton</i>
3.3. Governance issues – election of new Steering Committee members <i>Letitia A. Obeng</i>
3.4. Presentation of External Evaluation and Management Response <i>Martin Walshe</i>
3.5. Presentation of Draft Strategy #3 <i>Martin Walshe</i>
3.6. Plenary discussion and clarifications

3.1. Welcome, introduction and objectives of the Consulting Partners meeting

The new GWP Chair, Letitia A. Obeng, welcomed the participants by presenting the following:

The aim of the meeting is:

- to have a robust discussion for input on Strategy, and
- to make sure that the GWP partners have full ownership of the Strategy.

The meeting is also the opportunity to:

- share and learn and discuss,
- brainstorm on the actions to meet our strategic goals.

3.2. Annual Report and TEC Report

The GWP Acting Executive Secretary, Martin Walshe, presented the GWP Annual Report, starting from the major activities conducted by each of the 13 RWPs and some inter-regional activities such as the establishment of the Lusophone Water Partnership or the support to Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) planning from South America and Central America Water Partnerships that resulted in the Lima Declaration.

Martin Walshe then presented the activities carried out by the GWP network as a whole, under the following themes:

- facilitating action – country dialogues, IWRM planning, work with the European Union (EU);
- knowledge sharing – Reference Groups, Learning Reviews, inter-regional meetings, knowledge sharing between Regions and between Regions and the Global level;

- at global level – financing water, alliances, outcome reporting;
- intellectual leadership – bridge between global policy matters and local concerns, TEC work forming an integral part of the GWP work plan, representatives of RWPs and Secretariat attending TEC meetings.

The GWP TEC Chair, Roberto Lenton presented some major achievements for 2007, as well as some future activities:

- release of a new brief on Climate Change and IWRM – TEC is currently working on a full Background Paper on climate change adaptation and water to articulate GWP’s “world view” of the issue;
- release of a new TEC Background Paper on water financing and governance;
- participation in the World Economic Forum;
- work with UN-Water to prepare “IWRM Roadmaps”, a joint publication of GWP and UN-Water released at the 16th United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD-16);
- leading the “Triggers of Water Policy Change” joint initiative with the International Water Management Institute (IWMI);
- publications on basin management and on how to integrate IWRM plans and national development strategies, released at the CSD-16;
- publication in 2008 of a new TEC book on “IWRM in Practice”.

The GWP Head of Finance, Catharina Sahlin-Tegnander, presented the annual financial report for 2007. She concluded her presentation by quoting the Audit Report for 2007, which stated that *“the annual account have been prepared in accordance to the stated policies and, thereby, give a true and fair view of the organisation’s financial position and results of operation in accordance with generally accepted principles in Sweden”*.

3.3. Governance issues – election of new Steering Committee members

Apart from the work with developing the new Strategy for the period 2009–2013, GWP is looking at the organisational structure of the secretariat, TEC and the partnerships. Within the Steering Committee (SC), the members are reviewing their role and composition to ensure that they maintain their effectiveness in the new strategy period. After a review of the Consulting Partners, GWPO will submit to the Sponsoring Partners, for decision, proposals pertaining to the role and composition of the Steering Committee in the future.

- The Nomination Committee longlisted 33 candidates for the Steering Committee and based on a list of criteria identified 7 people from a range of professions
- The 6 departing members will not be replaced yet – instead the appointment of new Steering Committee members will be in the context of governance changes that are under discussion

3.4. Presentation of External Evaluation and Management Response

Martin Walshe presented the Joint Donor External Evaluation of the GWP and elements of a Management Response.

Overall, the External Evaluation was positive, acknowledging that GWP has done a good job at consolidating, strengthening and growing the partnership over the 2004–2008 strategy period. In particular, GWP has set up good financial, management and accountability systems at an appropriate level of cost. In the evaluators' opinion, "*GWP remains a distinct and critical part of the global institutional landscape*". Their conclusion is that GWP must continue, and "*re-energise, re-strategise and re-organise*".

The development of the new Strategy is addressing the Evaluation recommendations on *re-energising* and *re-strategising*:

- a renewed and stronger focus will be given to climate change and emerging water challenges;
- the network will move beyond advocacy to supporting rationalized water management, to promote growth, environmental sustainability and equity;
- there will be a more strategic approach towards communications and knowledge management at all levels of the GWP network;
- whilst the central message of IWRM is still valid, the global advocacy role will be reinvigorated to remain relevant.

The development of the Strategy is also the opportunity to provide some ideas to address the third Evaluation recommendation on *re-organising*. A process of looking at options for organisational change has started:

- the structure of TEC is being reviewed to ensure a stronger connection between international and regional issues and to provide global intellectual leadership on water resource management;
- the RWPs and CWPs, which are the focus of the organisation, need to be strengthened, starting at the regional level;
- the role and location of Network Officers, the changing role of the Secretariat and the allocation and management of funding are also elements under review.

3.5. Presentation of Draft Strategy #3

Martin Walshe pursued his presentation by setting out the GWP Strategy Road Map after the CP meeting:

- key messages from CP meeting integrated into a 4th draft, to be ready on 30 September
- 4th draft presented to GWP Steering Committee during its meeting, 5–7 November
- comments from SC integrated into a final version, to be ready on 1st December
- implementation of the new Strategy from 1st January 2009.

The GWP's vision is a "*water secure world*" and the GWP mission is to "*support countries in the sustainable management and development of their water resources*".

During the last decade, the GWP has pursued its mission mainly by advocating the application of the Integrated Water Resources Management approach. However, it is not clear today whether countries are viewing water as a resource which is critical for development and poverty reduction; nor whether water management is being seen as a critical part of a response

to new challenges such as climate change adaptation, food security and energy security. GWP's challenge during the next five years is to ensure that it does.

In order to do so, GWP has set four strategic goals – an operational goal, an advocacy goal, a knowledge and capacity-building goal and a partnering goal. These four strategic goals were discussed in length during the afternoon work group sessions (see below).

In terms of GWP's organisation, an independent report identified 5 essential competencies for the GWP system:

- legitimacy (Sponsoring Partners, Nomination Committee, CP meeting)
- strategy and policy setting (Steering Committee)
- network knowledge and communication (Secretariat)
- technical and intellectual leadership (TEC, supported by the Secretariat)
- field-level action (RWPs, CWPs, AWP)

The “resourcing hub”, composed of GWP's donors (Financial Partners Group), is also a sixth, essential element in the GWP system.

The main objective of the organisational change process is to find ways to make the best use of these 5 competencies, and find the best relationships between these, in support of the “action hubs”.

3.6. Plenary discussion and clarifications

General

- There is a strong sense that GWP “undersells” what it does.
- There is a need to document the various in-kind and local contributions and this is being done already.
- There is a need to link technical process at regional and global level.
- Are the rapid changes something to worry about? No – Change is normal. Fresh air is good. In fact there is a lot of continuity in the network team.
- This CP meeting discusses the global Strategy – to be followed by regional strategies. In fact some regions have strategies already being prepared.
- A central concept is “Water Security”: how do we institutionalise it? It is not known so much and will cover a lot.

On Strategic Goal 1: Support countries

- Need to focus on grassroots action too and need intellectual support to capitalise on local wisdom.
- A solid capacity base is required to operationalise IWRM – this is now a critical bottleneck.

On Strategic Goal 2: Water management for climate change and other issues

- Besides climate change, focus on other issues too? Other important issues are food security and energy security.
- Need to be more opportunistic – take the regional work/issues and lift it to global level.
- Consider conflict resolution as a theme, including protection of water facilities.

- Consider for GWP to be involved in transboundary water management? In some regions there are openings.
- Need more attention to Urban Sustainable Planning and Management.
- Eco-system approach is important – but has no voice.

On Strategic Goal 3: Thought leadership and communication

- Need a stronger technical link at local/regional/global level, and vice versa.
- In regions there are many publications – we need to link this to global TEC: GWP has more potential than is being used.
- TEC is no longer working in isolation – already open to some regions and TEC members represent large range of backgrounds.
- Part of accreditation of RWP is that RWP has technical capacity – it is up to the region to decide the exact mechanism. Different models are already in place.

On Strategic Goal 4: Reinforcing the network

- GWP tries not to be hierarchical – GWP is somewhere inbetween a flat organisation and hierarchy – but tries to be a network of networks – autonomy of regions is cherished. Financial accountability has hierarchy however.
- Need to focus more on local fundraising to balance stabilisation of funding at global level. This requires strengthening the fundraising capacity of RWPs and CWPs.
- Work with local level – through Area Water Partnerships and Country Water Partnerships.
- Need to build young leaders.
- Need to avoid exclusion in GWP governance – and ensure gender balance.

4. GROUP SESSIONS – THE STRATEGY

SESSION 2: WORKING GROUP AND PLENARY SESSIONS DISCUSSING THE STRATEGY

15 AUGUST 14.00-18.00

16 AUGUST 09.00-12.30

4.1. General discussion on Draft Strategy

All working groups

4.2. Implementing the new Strategy – the four Strategic Goals

4.2.1. Work group #1 : Supporting countries to make the IWRM approach operational

Chair: Suresh Prabhu, GWP South Asia Chair

Number of participants – approx. 40

4.2.2. Work group #2 : Using the IWRM approach to address climate change and other critical challenges

Chair: Wayne Joseph, GWP Caribbean Chair, Chair of the Regional Chairs

Number of participants – approx. 40

4.2.3. Work group #3: Establishing a global communication platform to share knowledge and develop capacity

Chair: Ruth Beukman, GWP Southern Africa Executive Secretary

Number of participants – approx. 25

4.2.4. Work group #4: Reinforce the network for effective delivery

Chair: Michael Scoullos, GWP Mediterranean Chair

Number of participants – approx. 20

4.3. Plenary discussion

4.1. General discussion on Draft Strategy

- Good job done in capturing ideas that have been developed/put forward.
- Vision needs to be clear: is it clear what is meant with water security?
- Regional and country strategies may be more specific on specific regional challenges (ground water management for example).
- Comment on Mission statement: not to exclude some, GWP needs to take into account authorities, other forms of Governments and scales (Palestine for example) in the statement of its mission. Suggestion for the mission statement is therefore: “GWP mission is to support the sustainable management and development of water resources at all levels: global, regional, national and local”.
- All strategic goals are equally important.
- GWP should try to address more issues related to:
 - Urban water management
 - Implementation of legislation
 - Floods

- Groundwater
- Ecosystems
- Education/public participation
- Finance
- Link to critical challenges such as energy security, food security, etc.
- On the general approach:
 - Make it clear to the world - IWRM is the means to an end not the end itself
 - Need to link IWRM planning processes to democratic processes and connect to local levels
- On the partnership approach:
 - Involvement of local authorities in the partnerships should be further encouraged
 - More collaboration with non-water actors to be emphasized
- It is recommended to re-formulate the statement that GWP does not implement projects. At all levels partnerships implement projects within the GWP mandate and objective, mostly on process, though they do not engage in projects like building and maintaining infrastructure, etc.

4.2. Implementing the new Strategy – the four Strategic Goals

4.2.1. Outcomes from Work Group on Strategic Goal 1:

- GWP is not a direct implementing organisation – but a facilitator for promoting IWRM.
- GWP should work at sub-national level to promote IWRM and ensure food security.
- GWP needs to connect to small farmers livelihood strategies and their food security.
- GWP needs to promote better trade regimes globally – in support of water management.
- Capacity building and knowledge dissemination is important through:
 - sharing of case studies/best practices/failure cases,
 - use of local wisdom on efficient use of water – replicate those at national and regional level.
- Extra effort required to involve civil society.

4.2.2. Outcomes from Work Group on Strategic Goal 2:

General issues

- Need to work on emerging climate issues and perennial issues.
- Need to be sensitive to spatial and temporal scales.
- Need to provide a framework for regions to build on.

Need to develop Intellectual Leadership by:

- seizing strategic intervention opportunities to promote change in thinking about water issues,
- contributing to climate change agenda setting,
- contributing to developing thinking on Water Security,
- supporting capacity building of Regions through TEC.

Need to develop Intellectual Capital among others on:

- climate change at regional level
 - focus on adaptation
 - extreme events coping strategies

- IWRM perspective
- recognise local variations & knowledge
- water security linkages
 - food security
 - human & economic development
 - land management
 - environment
- risk management tools.

Need to develop the capacity to:

- communicate with the “non-water” world,
- communicate relevance of economic, social & biophysical dimensions
- cooperate with strategic partner organisations.

4.2.3. Outcomes from Work Group on Strategic Goal 3

- Communication is a collective responsibility. To convey this it is better to state: “...*communication culture*” instead of “...*communication platform*” (systems and behaviour).
- Reformulate the goal as: “*Position GWP as an advocate of water resources management through the creation of a global communication, knowledge and capacity building culture*” (intellectual leadership and substantive culture).
- There is a lot of knowledge at different levels of GWP and this needs to be harnessed and shared.
- GWP need to:
 - train communication officers for knowledge sharing,
 - facilitate the synthesis of best practices in every region,
 - support inter-regional exchanges of experience,
 - undertake training of trainers on IWRM – targeted information sharing mainly the Toolbox,
 - budget line for knowledge generation – at local and country level, best practices-sharing of the knowledge.

4.2.4. Outcomes from Work Group on Strategic Goal 4

With respect to strengthening the network:

- Proactively engaging non-water actors (energy, agriculture, consumers, business, media, etc) is important.
- Engaging universities/academia as well as young scientists was highlighted. The model of informal ‘Circles’ (like those existing on educators, parliamentarians, women, etc. in some RWPs) was suggested.
- The diversity of RWPs and CWPs is recognised.
- RWPs are a key level to strengthen for delivering the new Strategy, including for further supporting CWPs and AWP. In RWPs and CWPs that already function effectively, continuity is a critical condition for development. Permanent non-rotating secretariats enhance continuity.
- Regarding RWPs membership and decision-making bodies, a mixture of CWPs and regional members (networks) secures diversity, better access in multi-level processes and allows for engagement on issues that exceed eventual national bias and sovereignty difficulties.

- RWPs should further engage bilateral and multilateral donors, not only as funding agents but also as partners.
- Synergies in the broader regional/inter-regional level are also of great importance.
- CWPs should be strengthened.

With respect to reporting:

- Outcome Mapping is a possibly helpful tool to improve GWP reporting, but we should not abandon the “traditional” reporting (to donors, partners, wider circle) – a lot of info and knowledge will be lost. We need all.
- We should be cautious with the way we report achievements and advertise our attributions, particularly those related with multi-level and multi-partner processes.

Regional and country fundraising is important:

- Strategic synergies with regional political fora, multilateral and bilateral donors as well as governments in the regions are critical for successful fundraising.
- New donors should be explored eg. commercial companies, foundations, individuals, philanthropy, etc.
- RWPs and CWPs need capacity building on project proposal development (writing and lobbying). Secretariats are overwhelmed and may be assisted by external support.
- Development of capacity to efficiently absorb and handle funding is equally important as the capacity to raise funding.
- RWPs could invest part of their core-funding to project development.
- The reputation of the organisation is a great asset for fundraising.
- Good Host Institutions are very helpful for effective fundraising and critical when it comes to efficient handling and reporting.
- Incentives should be given by GWPO to RWPs for more fundraising.

4.3. Plenary discussion

4.3.1. General points:

- Emphasize focus on vulnerable groups, gender and Millenium Development Goals (MDGs) achievement.
- Outcomes as formulated should be looked with precision.
- Make clear to whom the text of the Strategy is addressed.
- Need to clarify the term ‘water security’.
- Focus more on water management in support of economic development and economic growth: water security is goal 2 and economic growth goal 1.

4.3.2. On Strategic Goal 1: Support countries to put into practice better water resource management for water security

- Instead of being advocate, think of ourselves as “catalyst”.
- GWP is not in the business of building capacity; we already have CapNet and WaterNet – GWP should “facilitate capacity building”.
- Need to think clearly on “promoting resource management” and define target groups.
- We have to talk the language of non-water professionals and show the relevance of the water agenda to other aspects.

- Need to support IWRM at local level, including supporting river basin management at local level.
- Consider developing a conflict resolution strategy at regional level supporting transboundary water management for water security.
- Promote regional and inter-regional dialogues.

4.3.3. On Strategic Goal 2: Promote water resources management to address climate change adaptation and other critical challenges

- GWP can set the agenda in climate change adaptation and not just follow it.
- A lot will come through support to regions: need to collate the information at regional levels from global and national, about strategies and bring it together in a rational way.
- It is not just about providing knowledge but developing the capacity to use the knowledge.

4.3.4. On Strategic Goal 3: Position GWP as the thought leader and pre-eminent advocate of water resources management through the creation of a global communications platform

- GWP has successfully raised “water” at the World Economic Forum – such activities should continue.
- Need to develop the position of GWP as an advocate of water resource management through the creation of a global communication and capacity building culture.
- Focus on more effective communication tools – not only paper based.
- Focus on pragmatic uses of the Toolbox and develop the Toolbox as the first stop shop.
- GWP intellectual leadership does not only concern TEC, but to harness it at all levels, we need to know whom we are communicating with in order to build capacities. TEC papers at all different levels play a meaningful role. We need to focus on content, behavior, and systems.
- GWP can provide technical inputs to regional and national debates.
- Consider using “water foot print”.

4.3.5. On Strategic Goal 4: Reinforce the network for effective performance

- Need to be cautious not to work “too much” at local level.
- Need to mainstream and integrate youth.

5. GROUP SESSION – GOVERNANCE AND ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE

SESSION 3: WORKING GROUP AND PLENARY SESSIONS DISCUSSING GOVERNANCE AND ORGANISATIONAL CHANGE

16 AUGUST 14.00–17.00

5.1. How should GWP be organised to deliver the new Strategy?

5.1.1. Work group #1: How do GWPO, RWPs and CWPs best work together?

Chair: Elisa Colom, GWP Partner Segeplan, Guatemala

Number of participants – approx. 30

5.1.2. Work group #2: What is the role of TEC at global, regional and country level and how does it work together?

Chair: Isam Abdel-Magid, GWP Eastern Africa Chair

Number of participants – approx. 30

5.1.3. Work group #3: How does GWP strengthen the capacity at regional and country level to raise funding and deliver actions adding value to regional and national agendas?

Chair: Hama Arba Diallo, GWP West Africa Chair-elect

Number of participants – approx. 45

5.1.4. Work group #4: Should any elements of GWP global governance be improved?

Chair: Reginald Tekateka, GWP Southern Africa Chair

Number of participants – approx. 20

5.2. Plenary discussion

5.1. How should GWP be organised to deliver the new Strategy?

5.1.1. Outcomes from Work Group 1: How do GWPO, RWPs and CWPs work together?

- RWPs and CWPs do not compete: they are complementary with different roles and functions. Both have to be strengthened.
- Roles for the five key competences should be re-worked.
- We need to deliver better at the country level. Regions need to better support and equip CWPs and GWPO strategically.

5.1.2. Outcomes from Work Group 2: What is the role of TEC at global, regional and country level and how does it work together?

- TEC is isolated without capacity to support local level. If TEC wants to prepare material, it should rely more on regional or local expertise.
- Regional TECs best understand local issues but are currently isolated and need to be linked to global debate. Links between technical function in GWP at different levels needs to be improved.
- Need to have clear TEC working mechanism and system of engaging its experts within GWP. TEC working programme planning mechanism should include regional and local technical functions. At same time we should not overload TEC – and think of the entire technical functions in GWP with TEC being part of it – but not all of it.

- Stronger technical functions would help discussion on IWRM at regional and local level.
- Method is needed to formalise the connections between national, regional and global level TEC functions – also to capitalize on broad network of information.
- Cooperation around thematic issues.
- Financial issues are important – avoid expensive arrangement.

5.1.3. Outcomes from Work Group 3: How does GWP strengthen the capacity at regional and country level to raise funding and deliver actions adding value to regional and national agendas?

- Countries and regions should be helped to overcome legal barriers related to their registration.
- GWP could strengthen capacities of countries and regions to prepare high quality proposals and also train good implementation.
- GWP should intervene with the donor community to convince them of the importance and priority to be given to IWRM.
- GWP should ease understanding of different funding opportunities.
- In order to attract support from partners and the donor community, all efforts should be done to attract high level leadership of the national structure as well as its membership to establish credibility.
- At the national level, all efforts should be made to tap funding from:
 - national budgets,
 - national projects and programs,
 - private sector including commercial entities, foundations, individuals.

5.1.4. Outcome from Work group 4: Should any elements of GWP global governance be improved?

The discussion focused on the draft Governance Paper and in particular the five core competencies for GWP, i.e. Legitimacy, Strategy, Network Management, Policy Agenda Leadership and Field-level Action.

- The idea of the CP meeting being largely based on representation from RWPs and CWPs is supported: this could bring cost savings as well as make the roles of the Chairs more strategic/governance oriented and clearly different from that of the Coordinators (operational).
- However, one cannot have all Chairs of CWPs in the CP meeting as they would control the meeting and reduce importance of RWPs – need say 3 CWPs per region.
- Need to decide if GWP aims to move from a shareholder model as at present to a stakeholder model as this impacts on governance structure, especially the SC.
- In general: is it realistic or useful to keep increasing the number of partners? Dangerous to have them in name only as can be misled and cause confusion and chaos. To improve governance, need more clarity on “partners”. Need to identify real partners from “paper” partners. The position of the international partners (not linked to a region) needs to be considered as they have different status.
- The paper is weak on the SC (there is a separate process to discuss this and the two processes need to be linked).

- Generally favourable reaction to the recommendation on the SC in the Governance Paper – especially the larger link to the CP meeting –, but need also to take care of accountability issues.
- RWPs need to be able to work without referring to GWPO for lots of routine matters – gives empowerment and legitimacy. Decentralise resources but recognise need for better capacity in RWPs and hosts.
- “Intellectual independence” of TEC is important and should not be sacrificed: functions should drive the structure of TEC.
- Essential to bring TEC and Secretariat – but not necessarily merging function of Executive Secretary and TEC Chair.
- The TEC members could then operate with intellectual independence but also be focussed on GWP priorities. This would help bring SEC/TEC closer, avoid TEC/network inconsistency, relate global/TEC activities etc. It could improve synergies across the network.
- The present system of having 5-6 RWP representatives in TEC is better than before but there is a need to rotate the representatives as the unrepresented regions are disadvantaged and those attending do not consider other regions.
- TEC should work with other partners to write papers so they get the best expertise. The experience of CEE working with TEC on their sanitation book was very positive.
- There is limited understanding of the governance systems in the Network and this should change.
- Cost effectiveness should be important considerations in the entire governance and organisation, including costs of CP meeting, TEC, GWPO and partnerships.
- Best to initiate changes incrementally and have transitional arrangements to test ideas – no wholesale change.

5.2. Plenary discussion

- The recommendations of the Governance Paper certainly go in the right direction.
- The CP meeting should be more legitimate and represent the implementing part of the GWP. In the CP meeting there should representation of RWPs and CWPs – rather than of “partners” at random. The meeting should be more of a “stakeholder” than a shareholder representation.
- In the Steering Committee 50 % of members appointed should be appointed from the Sponsoring Partners, and 50% from CP.
- The move to devolve the financial administration is supported. One needs to closely look where to expand staff strength.
- To improve their autonomy, the regions should be supported in fundraising.
- The advocacy role is very much with the regions – not so much with TEC or secretariat. The role of TEC is more technical. There is need for maximum synergy: the merging of functions of Executive Secretary and TEC Chair is not supported.
- More clarity is needed on the role of partners at different levels, especially those partners not attached to a RWP or a CWP.
- There is a need to retain flexibility throughout the organisation and not have “one size fits all”.

- In the last strategy period, the focus was on RWPs and CWPs – we need to consider moving a level closer to the field. At the same time we need to see whether we can then still deliver. We need to make the best use of resources and not spread too thin.
- We need to have the global leadership and become more visible. For this the relevant elements of GWP need to be strengthened.

Concludingly:

- Change should happen progressively so that it does not destabilize the network. Also changes to statutes take time.
- The technical function in GWP is critical – how it works, where it sits: the form of TEC needs to follow the function.

6. PLENARY CONCLUDING SESSION

SESSION 4: CONCLUDING SESSION

17 AUGUST 16.00-18.00

6.1 High-Level Panel to comment on GWP Strategy 2009-2013

Letitia A. Obeng

Ravi Narayanan (Vice Chair, Governing Council, Asia-Pacific Water Forum)

Anders Berntell (Executive Director, Stockholm International Water Institute)

Phera Ramoeli (Southern African Development Community Water Division)

6.2. Summary of Strategy discussions and next steps

Martin Walshe

6.1. High-Level Panel to comment on GWP Strategy 2009-2013

Ravi Narayanan stressed the need to develop workable approaches to help solve the technical, social and institutional challenges facing GWP Partners.

From a technical point of view, Mr. Narayanan sees four main challenges:

- climate change – GWP needs to develop workable approaches to adaptation
- groundwater regulation and management
- urban challenges
- water quality.

From a social point of view, he thinks GWP needs to:

- focus on stakeholder dialogues – social processes and dialogues are usually lagging behind
- move from “policy in intention to policy in practice” – this should be a priority
- understand the role of the private sector, in technology, agriculture, irrigation.

As for the external environment, critical issues are:

- institutional changes
- government structures and trajectories
- decentralisation
- communication technology – e-governance, etc.
- financial intermediation.

Anders Berntell highlighted the need for an integrated approach to decision-making. We are doing water resources management because this is the only way to foster development. In that sense, strategic goal one addresses the political nature of GWP's work.

Mr. Berntell explained that water is often managed by those outside the water sector. For example, if water use in the agricultural sector in Egypt was cut by 10% then the water available for households would double. Those outside the water sector need to realise and internalise the fact that they are managing water resources. Mr. Berntell added that the need to reduce our water footprint is critical if conflicts are to be reduced.

Phera Ramoelli discussed the close relationship between the Southern African Development Community (SADC) and GWP. He said the draft Strategy was closely aligned with the vision and mission of SADC and that he anticipated many opportunities for future collaboration.

Letitia A. Obeng told the audience about her work experience and why she was so dedicated to achieving water security for every child, woman and man. She thanked the GWP community for embracing her and said that during her short time with the organisation she had learned a great deal and was excited about chairing the Partnership during the next strategic phase.

Finally, Anders Berntell and Martin Walshe took the opportunity of the High Level Panel plenary session to present the Stockholm Junior Water Prize (SJWP) managed by the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI). The SJWP is an international competition that brings together the world's brightest young scientists encouraging their continued interest in water and the environment. SIWI is looking for national organisers who will be responsible for arranging national contests and nominating candidates to the international final. More information about the SJWP was distributed to the participants if they want to co-operate with SIWI in the organisation of this international competition.

6.2. Summary of Strategy discussions and next steps

General:

- Strategy well received and constructive discussion

Notable omission:

- Urban water management

Areas to be strengthened:

- Gender and youth
- Transboundary water management
- Conflict management
- Eco-systems
- MDGs

Improvements required:

Vision

- Improve: how “water security” is expressed

Mission

- Focus: water management at all levels

Goals

- Clarify: that all goals are equal

Strategic goal 1:

- Operationalising IWRM and linking in with the local level
- But also work on IWRM at transboundary level
- Focus on economic growth, development and MDG achievement

Strategic goal 2:

- Take it beyond climate change and address water security, including urbanisation, food security, energy, conflict
- No more rhetoric on adaptation – work on how to do it

Strategic goal 3:

- Instill a communication culture: communication is everybody's business
- Capturing and sharing knowledge throughout the network
- Engage with other groups
- Communicate not by the written word only
- Communicate better the difference we make

Strategic goal 4:

- Fundraising:
 - Means of engaging with other players (not only donors)
 - Just do it!
- Partners and alliances:
 - Broaden outside water sector and outside UN/donor funded community
 - More interregional working
- Strengthen regions to support countries better
- Result-oriented processes
- Performance measurement
 - Focus on the contribution we make
 - Enhance our reputation (= important asset)

Organisation change

- Useful feedback
- Change to take place gradually
- Need greater clarity around five competencies
- Focus on the functioning of TEC as demands are many

Next steps

- Prepare CP Report
- Circulate 2009-2013 Strategy Draft 4 for comments
- Update the current report on governance and consider options in larger detail

APPENDIX 1. LIST OF ACRONYMS

AWP	Area Water Partnership
CP (meeting)	Consulting Partners (meeting)
CSD	United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development
CWP	Country Water Partnership
EU	European Union
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWPO	Global Water Partnership Organisation
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MDGs	United Nations Millenium Development Goals
RWP	Regional Water Partnership
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SC	Steering Committee
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SJWP	Stockholm Junior Water Prize
TEC	Technical Committee
UN	United Nations