

GWP's First Ten Years: Reflecting Back and Looking Forwards

The Global Water Partnership's Consulting Partners Meeting

Stockholm
18–20 August 2006

October 2006

The background documentation and presentations prepared for the meeting are contained in the CD attached to this report.

CONTENTS

List of Acronyms	2
Note from the Executive Secretary	3
1. THE 2006 STOCKHOLM MEETINGS	4
2. PLENARY SESSIONS	
Welcome and Introduction	5
Session 1 GWP Feeding into Regional Processes	6
Session 2 GWP in Different National Governance Systems	7
Session 3 GWP at the Sub-National Level	8
“Devils’ Advocates” panel discussion	9
Governance Issues and Nomination of Steering Committee members	10
3. BREAKOUT SESSIONS	
Session A IWRM plans	11
Session B The ToolBox	13
Session C Research into Use	14
Session D Alliances	16
Session E GWP Partnerships	17
Session F GWP’s Performance	18
Special Side Meeting : ADB-GWP collaboration on water activities	20
4. SUMMING UP	
Summary	21
VIP Panel Discussion	22
5. 10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION PROGRAMME	24
THE MEETING AGENDA	25
EVALUATION OF THE GWP CONSULTING PARTNERS AND NETWORK MEETINGS 2006	28

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMCOW	African Ministerial Council on Water
APs	GWP associated programmes
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AWP	area water partnership
CACENA	GWP Central Asia and Caucasus partnership
CWP	country water partnership
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
GWP CP	GWP consulting partners
GWP SC	GWP's steering committee
GWP	Global Water Partnership
GWPO	GWP Organisation
ICID	International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage
ILEC	International Lake Environment Committee Foundation
INBO	International Network of River Basin Organisations
IPTRID	International Programme for Technology and Research in Irrigation and Drainage
IWA	International Water Association
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	integrated water resources management
NARBO	Network of Asian River Basin Organizations
PAWD	Partnership for Africa Water Development
BPD	Building Partnerships for Development in Water and Sanitation
RWP	regional water partnership
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SAS	GWP South Asia partnership
SEA	GWP Southeast Asia partnership
SEARNET	Southern and Eastern Africa Rainwater Network
SEAWUN	Southeast Asian Water Utilities Network
TEC	GWP Technical Committee
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WUN	water utilities network

Note from the Executive Secretary

A series of meetings were held in Stockholm in August 2006 to mark the Global Water Partnership's (GWP) tenth anniversary. These meetings saw the largest ever gathering of GWP partners and culminated in a tenth anniversary celebration in the presence of GWP's patron Prince Willem Alexander of the Netherlands and the Crown Princess Victoria of Sweden.

The GWP decided to bring the network together at this mid-term point of our Strategy 2004–2005 to do a reality check and reflect on what GWP is and how it works, what it has achieved and consider its future challenges and directions. This report highlights the outcomes of the Consulting Partners meeting that was held 18–20 August, 2006.

The Consulting Partners meeting covered a diverse range of issues and topics and, rather than record all that was said and done, we have tried to streamline the outputs into something short, readable and meaningful. In doing so, we apologise if we may have inadvertently missed or misinterpreted some points and hope that you will understand our dilemma when faced with such a rich amount of information.

The background documentation and the PowerPoint presentations shown in the Consulting Partners meeting and in the Network meeting that preceded it are available to view from the CD-ROM that is issued with this report. We hope that this information will be useful for promoting the work of the GWP and in planning your future work.

Emilio Gabbrielli
Executive Secretary

1. THE 2006 STOCKHOLM MEETINGS

On 16 and 17 August, over 200 representatives from GWP's regional, country and area water partnerships from over 100 countries attended a GWP network meeting in Södertälje near Stockholm. Regional representatives from the 14 regional water partnerships (RWP), GWP's secretariat, and its Technical Committee (TEC) also attended. (The network meeting was informally referred to as the "Country Water Partnership" or "CWP meeting" as it brought so many representatives from the country water partnerships together for the first time.)

GWP has grown rapidly in recent years. The meeting provided an invaluable opportunity for GWP to restate its vision for the benefit of new partners, to carry out a 'reality check' on its identity, and to reflect on its future direction. It also showcased the organisation's strengths and the diversity of its networks, and gave the opportunity for members to reflect on GWP's governance structures, its 2004-08 strategy, experiences from the regions, and the challenges the organisation faces. During the meeting significant progress towards a common understanding was made on existing and future country water partnerships (CWPs).

Prior to the meeting each country partnership prepared a short paper (a 'two-pager') on their contribution to improving water management. These also highlighted the CWPs' support to government efforts for establishing integrated water resource management (IWRM) and making water efficiency plans as called for by the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development.

The 13 regional water partnerships used these two-pagers to prepare regional syntheses that, in turn, formed the basis of a brief paper on GWP's progress globally. For the first time in GWP, translations of all of these papers were made into Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish. These papers informed meeting discussions and supplied the background for

reflecting on the implementation of GWP's 2004–2008 Strategy. They will serve as the building blocks for GWP's 2007–2008 work plan.

The network meeting was followed on 18 to 20 August by the annual consulting partners meeting. This meeting was attended by more than 400 participants with the participants in the preceding network meeting joined by additional partners and colleagues from GWP regional partnerships, associated programmes, alliance partners, donors, technical committee and steering committee members. Important topics of debate from the network meeting were carried over into the consulting partners meeting.

Simultaneous interpretation in five languages – Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish – was provided for both the network and the consulting partners meetings to ensure the proceedings were fully understood by the majority of the participants. In fact, there was a strong call in the network meeting that more emphasis should be placed on making translations of GWP's products in local languages if GWP is to become more effective.

At the consulting partners meeting representatives from GWP's regional, national and sub-national partnerships presented examples of their work and explained the challenges they face. More in-depth scrutiny of GWP's five main output areas were carried out in 'breakout' group sessions on national level IWRM planning, working with and in alliances, putting research into use, the IWRM ToolBox, GWP partnerships, and measuring GWP's performance. A side meeting was held to negotiate a collaborative agreement between GWP and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) to work on water issues in the Asia-Pacific region.

This report summarises the breadth of debate in the plenary and breakout sessions of the consulting partners meetings and sums up the main overarching points from the five days of meetings.

2. PLENARY SESSIONS

Welcome and introduction

The GWP Chair, Margaret Catley-Carlson, welcomed the participants. She noted that GWP was at a “hinge period” where GWP needs to reflect and talk about how the network moves forward for the next ten years. In doing this it was important to assess how can GWP could benefit from what has done and what has been learned during its first 10 years.

The GWP had done a good job in raising red flags, but now needed to move away from convincing people that something needs to be done to actually helping them implement better water policies and practices for more sustainable social and economic development.

The GWP Executive Secretary, Emilio Gabbrielli, provided a brief overview of the programme and context of the Consulting Partners meeting that was to review the achievements, difficulties and challenges of the GWP in the context of the 2004–2008 Strategy. He noted that the GWP had evolved from the period from its inception in 1996 to the 2nd World Water Forum in 2000, which had largely focused on global issues, into a period focusing on regional actions from 2000 to 2002. This had been followed by a move into country level activities, a period marked by the call at the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development for “. . . all countries to have IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans by 2005.” Though much work was currently being done at country and regional level, especially supporting governments with the development of their IWRM plans, GWP was still very much present at the global level. The Executive Secretary proceeded to highlight some of the year’s achievements and milestones – notably the second informal stakeholder survey giving the status on the 2005 WSSD

target on IWRM planning, the 4th World Water Forum in Mexico, and the IWRM planning programmes – before concluding with details of the consulting partners meeting agenda and 10th anniversary programme (please refer to the CD for the full presentation).

The GWP TEC Chair, Roberto Lenton, presented the principal outcomes of TEC’s work since the 2005 consulting partners meeting in Guatemala meeting:

- At the 4th World Water Forum in Mexico GWP had a low representation but high visibility. The IWRM theme paper set the tone for discussions on GWP’s philosophy towards IWRM.
- TEC published the Catalyzing Change series. To help address how IWRM can catalyze change at national level TEC has produced a Background Paper on IWRM at urban level (available on the CD).
- A volume on IWRM case studies is being planned and these will focus on practical problem solutions to convince policy makers of the value of integrated approaches to water resources development, management and use.
- The next major challenge is indicators, monitoring and evaluation. GWP is contributing to the monitoring of IWRM planning process through its informal baseline stakeholder surveys.
- In the future, TEC will be looking into traditional topics and provide a knowledge base on basin management, asking if river basin organisations are the way to go forward vis-à-vis basin management, IWRM and infrastructure.

Session 1

GWP Feeding into Regional Processes

Conveners: Torkil Jønb-Clausen (Senior Advisor), Gabriela Grau (Network Officer, Secretariat), Mike Muller (TEC member). Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson (GWP Chair).

The presentations

Placing water on the Association of Southeast Asian Nations' (ASEAN) agenda: Establishing the Working Group on Water Resources Management

Mai Flor, ADB, Philippines

Water Governance and Southern African Development Community (SADC)

Ruth Beukman, GWP Southern Africa

The main points from these two presentations were:

- GWP started at the global level and then established partnerships at the regional level. The feeding of information from the regional to the global level has been critical for GWP's development. The role of the regional partnerships in providing an umbrella for country level activities is widely recognized.
- The GWP regional partnerships have gradually established links and credibility with the regional political bodies such as the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). This has not always been easy.
- Regional level interactions can create an enabling environment for country level partnerships to learn and perform more effectively as well as to support regional bodies such as ECOWAS, SADC, and ASEAN on water matters.
- The regional partnerships are critical for linking important country-level issues to global-level debates such as those held at the World Water Fora in The Hague, Kyoto and Mexico; and in pan-regional bodies such as the African Ministerial Council on Water (AMCOW).

- GWP has been instrumental in promoting the setting up of water resource units in the regional bodies, including in ECOWAS and ASEAN.
- GWP plays an important role in transboundary water issues at the regional level and as a facilitator, neutral broker and 'midwife' at the country level where, through its informal multi-stakeholder base, it supports governments to develop IWRM plans.

Key messages

The different regions have the following experiences on working regionally.

- The Mediterranean and European regional partnerships promote progress at the national level as there are few significant national political differences to hinder the partnership's work. The recognition of GWP as a neutral platform opens up action on the ground.
- In Africa and South Asia it is more challenging to address water issues at the regional level because of political differences. There is no consensus on transboundary water issues at the regional level in South Asia. However, there has been some good experience with GWP's area partnership linkages within countries in the region.
- In West Africa many catchment areas cannot be considered on a local level as they include a number of different countries. The challenge here is to link country specific processes with regional ones through more informal connections.

It was agreed that the IWRM process needs to be put into a regional context by promoting area partnerships in shared river systems.

Next steps

Regional level partnerships are particularly useful to help smaller or weaker countries in regions with well-established linkages for water resource management. In other regions, such as in Asia, GWP still has a role to play. But one size does not fit all. GWP should promote itself as a neutral broker. The challenge is for GWP to influence water management issues without jeopardizing its neutral standing while continuing to promote the IWRM approach.

Session 2 GWP in Different National Governance Systems

Conveners: Johan Holmberg (Senior Advisor), Aly Kerdany (Network Officer, Secretariat), Simi Kamal (TEC member). Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson.

The presentations

IWRM Through Partnerships Within Hierarchical Systems in Central Asia

Vadim Sokolov and Bulat Yesekin, GWP Central Asia and Caucasus

This presentation showed how water partnerships in a region characterised by more hierarchical societies has facilitated IWRM planning through regional level interventions. Regional partnerships in Central Asia have brought about an enabling environment at the country partnership level.

Water and Peace in Fragile States

Simon Thuo, GWP Eastern Africa

This presentation showed how country level interventions for improved water and IWRM planning can act as a bridge to reconcile conflicts and promote peace. The question was raised of how far GWP is equipped to 'intervene' between conflicting countries.

Experiences from Partnerships at Work in West Africa

Mam Dagou, GWP West Africa

This presentation reflected on how country water partnerships can make positive impacts at the sub-regional level by engaging with river basin (natural) networks and by developing alliances between existing programmes to feed experiences into national development planning processes.

Main discussion points

- How can country water partnerships bring about positive reforms?
- How far GWP's country water partnerships (and possibly GWP as a whole) can meet the many expectations and demands on them. Other organisations may be better placed to carry out certain tasks.
- How far is it possible for GWP to assist at different levels with clear instruments and guidelines for establishing and successfully managing water basin organizations and water user associations?

- How to best approach inter-sectoral integration and dialogue and successfully include ecosystem approaches.
- How to secure political buy-in to IWRM amongst legislators and at the executive level.
- How can GWP help prevent politicians from using improved water services as campaigning tools?

Key messages

- The three presentations showed how there are no sharp distinctions between GWP's regional and national activities as each influences the other on water resource management.
- A unique feature of GWP is the strong links it has forged between its multi-stakeholder platforms and formal government systems. However, it was recognized that multi-stakeholder processes can be time-consuming and 'sensitive' especially in countries with hierarchical governance systems.
- IWRM planning can help solve water resource conflicts between and within nations. National level IWRM processes operate according to a country's system of governance structures with IWRM being more difficult to carry out in hierarchical societies than in more democratic societies.
- It is crucial that GWP's networks target national level strategies, policy, and legislation to complement its influence on regional processes.
- The decentralisation of rural water resources management is both a challenge and a blessing. Policies and regulations may exist, but capacities, knowledge, resources and tools, and full understanding of mandates may not. This makes the proper application of IWRM planning difficult. More guidelines and comparative studies are needed on decentralised and centralised water resource management.
- GWP's area water partnerships need to be empowered so as they can help bring about change. The country and regional water partnerships need to identify how they can become empowered to become influential change advocates.
- Area water partnerships are the only level of GWP platforms where gender issues can realistically be addressed, where the financing of IWRM projects is possible from local resources, synergies and community mobilization.
- For its success, GWP needs to form strong alliances with strategic country, regional and global partners.

Next steps

- In the Horn of Africa, GWP should use its influence in the water sector to promote dialogue between the parties to the conflicts that plague the region. The potential rewards are high, but it is a difficult task.
- In the poorest countries, GWP must demonstrate that it can contribute to reducing poverty by involving communities in its water partnership coalitions.
- In countries where hierarchal systems of governance predominate, GWP should focus on forging upstream contacts with governments where IWRM concepts may not yet have taken hold.

Session 3

GWP at the Sub-National Level

Conveners: Khalid Mohtadullah (Senior Advisor), Mercy Dikito Wachtmeister (Network Officer, Secretariat), Harmut Brühl (TEC member). Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson.

Convenors' remarks

Since the late 1990s, area water partnerships at the sub-national level have emerged within countries as useful mechanisms to implement IWRM, especially in India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, and Bangladesh, and also in Ethiopia and Bulgaria. In these countries area partnerships provide effective multi-stakeholder platforms to address water-related issues locally with local resources in locally appropriate ways. This session illustrated through case studies how area partnerships can promote integrated water resource management, and reflected on the importance of these type of partnerships for GWP.

The presentations

The Role of Area Water Partnership in Achieving Water Security (India)

Asha Verulkar, GWP South Asia

The Godavari River basin in Maharashtra, India is under increasing pressures from urbanization, increasing population, the rapidly growing water demands for irrigation and from industries, the over-exploitation of groundwater, and pollution. These pressures are leading to serious conflicts between users. An area water partnership was set up to bring together the various stakeholders into a neutral forum to discuss and try and resolve water resource problems. This partnership is driven by its vision to provide safe, potable and sufficient water with minimal pollution from domestic,

industrial, and agricultural sources. It has made considerable progress by providing training, raising awareness, monitoring water quality and by involving students, teachers and other stakeholders in safeguarding the area's water resources. This has brought about a greater sense of ownership of the resource and the realization of the care it needs for sustainably providing water to all users.

Mai River Area Water Partnership (Nepal)

Upendra Gautam, Nepal

The Mai Area Water Partnership evolved out of the need to improve water management in the Mai river basin. A panel of concerned stakeholders and experts looked at the different demands for water from the basin and identified the institutional gaps that were preventing proper management of the resource. The study findings were presented to a well-attended local workshop. This led to the setting up of an area water partnership by a local NGO to address local water issues. It is serving as a neutral stakeholder forum to promote dialogue and action for the sustainable management of the basin's water resources. This partnership was set up in spite of an on-going Maoist insurgency and political instability and has managed to create much social capital from the strengths of the basin's stakeholders.

Local Action Through Varna Area Water Partnership in the Black Sea Basin (Bulgaria)

Milkana Mochurova, Bulgaria

Area water partnerships have been set up in Bulgaria in Blagevgrad in 2000 in the West Aegean, in Rousse in 2001 in the Danube, and in Varna in 2001 in the Black Sea area. These have been set up to involve local institutions in solving local problems by building trust and building on synergies. Their activities have been implemented by local host institutions.

The partnerships have mainly worked on awareness raising and capacity building. In this work the partnerships have forged close contacts with river basin directorates, regional environment and water inspectorates, schools, universities, water supply and sewerage companies and NGOs. Activities were initially confined to conferences, publications, training stakeholders, disseminating information, and roundtable discussions, but have subsequently started to meet the training needs of local industries. The partnership is being led by water issue researchers from the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences.

The Bulgarian experience shows how area water partnerships can promote IWRM at the local level; can engage important sectors in public events; extend

capacity building beyond the capital city, and across all important sectors, local authorities and NGOs; and is supporting the local implementation of river basin management plans.

Main discussion points and Key messages

- There was great support for area water partnerships, particularly from South Asian participants as they have made it possible to deliver IWRM at the local level and to influence policy making.
- These partnerships provide a great opportunity to build local social capital and improve access to resources.
- These partnerships have encouraged reform in the water sector and brought grassroots perspectives to the reform process in line with ground realities as the partnerships have interacted with policy makers and donors.
- Bringing area water partnerships up to scale requires considerable effort in capacity building in IWRM at the local level.
- The Bangladeshi participants cautioned that stakeholders expect these partnerships to attract project and other financing. The problem is that a failure to attract funding can undermine a partnerships' local credibility.
- Actions for improved water management at the local, national, regional and global levels are interconnected and equally important for GWP to meet its objectives whilst IWRM processes can help harmonise approaches by different actors at all levels.
- Country level IWRM interventions can have a significant impact on reducing poverty in developing countries.
- It is very important for GWP to facilitate the empowerment of local stakeholders for the effective use of local resources and good participation.

Overall the discussions suggested that while area water partnerships are a very promising mechanisms for implementing IWRM at the local level and for influencing policy, it may be too soon to generalize from the mostly South Asian experiences as a way forward for all of GWP's regions. It was agreed that regions that see a benefit should go ahead and experiment with the concept and draw on others' experiences.

Next steps

The potential of area water partnerships and the interest shown in forming them elsewhere shows that more

strategic work needs to be done to guide the concept's wider adoption. It was suggested that GWP's technical committee engage with regional partnerships to monitor the performance of area partnerships. Monitoring findings could then be used to inform the production of guidelines for promoting and improving area partnerships.

Panel of 'Devils' Advocates'

Panel: Judith Rees (TEC member), Tabeth Chiuta (IUCN Southern Africa); Jean-François Donzier (International Network of Basin Organizations, INBO), Wouter Arriens (Asian Development Bank); Mohammed Al-Eryani (Yemen), and Dianne Dillon-Ridgely (Chair, River Network, USA).

The above plenary sessions focused mostly on what has worked well in the first ten years of the GWP partnerships. Following these sessions a panel of six 'devil's advocates' led critical discussions on how effective GWP has been at the regional, national, and sub-national levels and how GWP can improve its performance in the next ten years.

The panellists initially commented on how GWP has functioned in the past decade in relation to what it should do in the future. There was general agreement that GWP has been very successful in raising awareness about IWRM. The main challenge is now to demonstrate how to implement this concept. The following questions were raised:

- is GWP ready and willing to move from the theoretical, conceptual approach to a more practical approach?
- how should this move be made? and
- can GWP turn the increased awareness into action on the ground?

Discussion continued on what GWP should focus on in the coming years. The organisation has grown quickly and some questioned whether it has grown in the right direction. Some panellists suggested that GWP needs to put more effort into the local level in area water partnerships. However, it was also pointed out that GWP should not set up organisational entities at all levels for the sake of creating a complete organisation and area partnerships should only be set up in response to real needs and demand. The point was raised that area partnerships are perhaps best suited to meet temporary, specific needs rather than to serve as permanent institutions.

Some panellists felt that the discussion on which level GWP should target was of lesser importance. One view was that all levels are equally important as environmental problems go beyond national borders and consequently involve stakeholders at both local (sub-national), national, regional and global levels. It was emphasised that experience and knowledge sharing needs to take place at and from all levels.

Another view was that GWP needs to demonstrate concrete results and that this was more important than at what level this happened. This could be done by taking on certain projects as demonstrations of how to implement IWRM in order to influence others in a similar direction. GWP would not necessarily have to drive these projects but should collaborate with others in attracting support and in rolling them out.

The panellists then identified concrete 'products' that GWP could provide to help it move from the conceptual phase of IWRM on to action. One major product should be practical and target-specific guidelines with performance indicators on how to implement IWRM. Other 'products' could be:

- action to help resolve water conflicts;
- organising consultations;
- building political support for IWRM;
- synthesizing and communicating experiences to influence global debate; and
- developing fit for purpose knowledge transfer mechanisms (as opposed to the approach of one solution fitting all situations).

Further suggested products were:

- research on key IWRM implementation issues and into the measurable outcomes of different IWRM methods;
- educational elements such as video games and demonstrating results from cases studies and projects;
- appointing champions to promote integrated approaches to water management;
- the better use and promotion of the associated programmes; and
- holding retreats for participants on elements of water resources management.

The main contributions to the 'product' list from the floor were:

- transboundary water management;
- area water partnerships;
- external review teams reporting directly to the board on improvements in water management as a direct result of GWP's work;
- an IWRM analytical framework;

- development and management plans for water resources where the ultimate purpose is to support equitable welfare of people;
- from Vision to Action documents; and
- a handbook of water diplomacy.

The chair's final question to the panel was why GWP is having difficulties in bringing about tangible results and accomplishments from its activities? Parts of the panel disagreed with this and argued that GWP is producing results.

Others suggested that the lack of results is because GWP's main focus has been on setting up of the organisation and its structures. It was also suggested that tangible results have been slow to come because IWRM is a complex and difficult concept to communicate and is one that takes time to implement whilst some of the country and area water partnerships have only been established recently and have not had the time to achieve much. Another issue is that GWP mainly works in partnerships and so GWP's specific role and achievements can be difficult to separate out from other's contributions. A response to this was that GWP should not necessarily report on just its own role but should also report on others' contributions. The final suggestion was that GWP focuses its effort on a few cases where the implementation of IWRM can be clearly demonstrated.

Day 2: Governance Issues and Nomination of SC members.

The Executive Secretary provided a brief report on governance issues that highlighted the the development of the network of partnerships and the associated Policy on Partners, the Conditions for Accreditation for the regional and country water partnerships, and the development of area water partnerships.

The funding profile 2002–2006 of the network was presented showing a steady trend of funding (core funds) to the network via the Stockholm Secretariat; a steady flow of restricted funds at the local level; an increasing flow of restricted funds that are largely provided to support the IWRM planning programmes in the regions and countries; and an increasing proportion of funds are being allocated to the regions every year.

The Acting Chair of the Nominations Committee, Ingvar Andersson, presented the Nominations for the Steering Committee that were to be presented to the Sponsoring Partners for approval:

Regional Pool:

- Zhimin Meng, Director General, Department of International Cooperation, Science and Technology, Ministry of Water Resources (China).
- Barbara Schreiner, Deputy Director, General Policy and Regulations, Department of Water Affairs & Forestry (South Africa).
- Alf Simpson, Consultant (Australia).

Global Pool:

- Jean-François Donzier, General Manager of the International Office for Water & Permanent Technical Secretary of the International Network of Basin Organization (INBO), (France).

Please refer to the CD for the full presentation.

3. BREAKOUT SESSIONS

Session A IWRM Plans: Reflecting on Experiences and on Where GWP goes from here

*Conveners: Daniel Lopez (Programme Officer, Secretariat) and Madiodio Niassé (Chair, GWP West Africa);
Chair: Madiodio Niassé.*

Session objectives

The session was well attended. The presentations were very interesting and showed that integrated water resource management (IWRM) planning is well understood in Eritrea, Senegal and Malawi. Unfortunately there was only limited time to accommodate the high demand for discussions on the points raised.

The session's objectives were to:

- introduce the programmes that GWP has been involved in for supporting the preparation of IWRM plans;
- present and reflect on country water partnerships' experiences and the challenges GWP faces in facilitating programmes and the IWRM plan preparation process; and
- identify lessons learned that will help shape possible GWP's facilitation mechanisms in the next few years and in particular on how to help countries move forward in meeting the IWRM target. (A formal review of progress by countries towards meeting the IWRM target will be made at the 16th meeting of the Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD-16) in April 2008.)

Presentations

A1 The Challenge of the Eritrea Country Water Partnership to Include Relevant Players and Balancing Their Inputs

Ato Mebrahtu Iyasu, Director General, Water Resources Department, Eritrea

The presentation revealed how the strong political will in Eritrea to improve water management has led to the country giving priority attention to strengthening its institutions for integrated water resources management. Awareness about IWRM is being built by visiting different countries and regions and by linking up with local stakeholders. These meetings are informing the situational analysis that is presently carrying out. The Eritrea Water Partnership faces the challenge of broadening its partnership base and of promoting the increased involvement of all major stakeholders in water management.

The issue of incentives for participating in IWRM was raised in this presentation. Although IWRM has good political support, it has been found that simply putting the mechanisms in place does not guarantee participation. It is a new approach and so needs new thinking on how to attract involvement and support. Also, alongside improved funding it is recognised that institutional capacity building is crucial for sustainable IWRM.

A2 Problematic of the Elaboration of an Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Management (AP-IWRM) in Senegal

Babacar Dieng, Chair, GWP Senegal

This presentation highlighted the importance of reaching local communities with simple, clear and relevant messages about water management and of giving IWRM concrete content in the exploitation and use of water resources at all levels.

Senegal's IWRM planning process has almost completed its stakeholder consultations. These followed a regional approach down to the local level. It is proving a challenging task to summarise and prioritise all the broad inputs that have been gathered. An additional challenge is to maintain this process as a government priority when the government has changed and ministries are being reorganised and new section chiefs and staff appointed.

Two of the main results have been:

- the mission and objectives of Senegal's Water Partnership becoming well known through central, regional and local level workshops; and
- the under-preparation Action Plan for Integrated Water Resources Management that is being supported by all main stakeholders.

A3 Challenges in the IWRM Planning Process (Malawi)

Sam Kainja, Partnership for Africa Water Development (PAWD) project manager

The Permanent Secretary for Malawi's Ministry of Irrigation and Water was a very welcome participant in this presentation. The speaker told how Malawi's IWRM planning process is well interlinked with national development strategies. This has led to the budgetary allocations for water increasing by almost 30% for the current financial year.

Important policy links have been made as:

- the Malawi Water Partnership (MWP) facilitated the review of the country's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) to identify any shortfalls in it relating to IWRM; and
- the Malawi partnership facilitated the inclusion of IWRM in the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy (the successor to the PRSP) through the Ministry of Irrigation and Water Development and the Ministry of Economic Development.

The main challenges to carrying out IWRM in Malawi are:

- the slow acceptance of change by the main institutional stakeholders;
- limited progress in harmonizing policies and laws;
- much of the core team on the Partnership for Africa Water Development being made up of only junior personnel; and
- the fact that tangible results need to be delivered soon as many people's hopes have been raised.

Main discussion points

- How can GWP sustain stakeholders' commitment and interest in the IWRM planning process?
- How can GWP, through its country and regional water partnerships increase understanding about IWRM at the grassroots levels and make it meaningful for poverty reduction?
- Is GWP providing the right support for IWRM planning and implementation?
- How to improve the mechanisms that are currently in place?

Key messages

- IWRM is recognised as a means to reconcile conflicts especially between neighbouring states over water use and over transboundary waters. However, some participants questioned the extent to which GWP can add value and care was needed to avoid confusing what are usually very complex issues.
- IWRM plans should be government-led with country water partnerships facilitating plan making and implementation.
- Political will is a precondition to start and sustain IWRM. Broad-based political support is needed for IWRM to be sustained amidst changing policy environments with GWP as the facilitator, governments as the 'drivers' and citizens as the owners.
- It is a strategic necessity to bring other ministries, such as finance, into the IWRM process to bring water issues to a higher level of strategic importance in government policy making and to attract more resources and support.
- It is essential to make IWRM planning processes part of national development strategies and governments' commitments need to be translated into funding.
- The decentralised management of water brings both benefits and challenges because of the lack of capacity at the local level and unclear mandates. This points to the need to better define the role of GWP's area water partnerships as they may not be suitable for all regions and should in some cases be task-based rather than formal partnerships.
- It is essential that water resource projects are based on genuinely participatory planning and that they focus on solving practical problems. Because of their participatory nature, plans create expectations and so it is important that they are implemented.
- Local capacity for IWRM planning needs to be developed.
- More guidance is needed on the difficult task of integrating the gender perspective in the IWRM planning process.
- Thinking beyond IWRM plans to the ideal scenario for sustainable water management can help in designing plans and other processes.
- Key donor partners must be kept informed throughout IWRM planning processes.

The country specific key messages were as follows:

- Eritrea — political buy in is essential; a leader or champion agent is needed to initiate sustainable IWRM planning; incentives are needed for effective stakeholder participation; and the adoption of IWRM is difficult.

- Senegal — the concept of IWRM needs translating into understandable concepts for local communities to feel a sense of ownership; political support has been maintained even in times of political change; and the question of how to make the concept of IWRM operational in the context of water resource exploitation and management?
- Malawi — policies and laws need harmonising; IWRM is a new way of operating and is slow to be accepted; it is important to deliver tangible results after raising awareness; and the Ministry of Finance's commitment to the IWRM process led to a 30% increase in the water budget.

Next steps

- GWP partnerships and GWP's technical committee (TEC) should clarify their roles in the action phase of IWRM plans.
- The process of preparing IWRM plans needs documenting as the experiences, processes, priorities and levels of political support differ country by country.
- The GWP network should aim to capture the lessons learned and make them available to the wider water community to further support IWRM.

Session B The ToolBox

Convener: Carlos Aguilar (ToolBox Officer, Secretariat); Chair: Mike Müller (TEC member); rapporteur: Vanessa Cabanelas (GWP partner, Mozambique).

Session objectives

- To inform GWP partners about the current status of GWP's ToolBox (a web-based package to assist in IWRM decision making) and the actions undertaken at global and regional levels.
- To discuss the scope and objectives of the ToolBox in the context of the current and foreseen needs of GWP's partners and the ToolBox resources.
- To find out the views of GWP partners on the ToolBox strategic definitions proposed at central level, and in particular those related to the ToolBox's target audience and the main levels at which resources should be focused on.
- To find out GWP partners' views on delivery mechanisms and approaches for making the ToolBox more effective to address their knowledge and information needs.
- To identify initiatives, organizations and experiences that could strengthen the ToolBox and partners interested in supporting its development and dissemination.

The presentations

B1 The IWRM ToolBox: Status and Strategy

Carlos Aguilar, GWP Secretariat

Since its inception, the ToolBox has been adapting to the evolving needs of the GWP network. However, there are still gaps in the thematic content of case studies and their regional origin. The next phase of the ToolBox's development must account in a balanced way for the needs, obstacles and opportunities that exist throughout the GWP network. This development must happen with the full participation of end users.

B2 The Emergence of ToolBox

Jan Hassing, Danish Hydraulic Institute

This paper discussed how to go about planning and implementing IWRM and what lessons have been learned from putting IWRM into action.

B3 Lessons and Regional Linkages through the ToolBox in the Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and Central Asia and Caucasus (CACENA) Regions

Danka Thalmeinerová, GWP Central and Eastern Europe

The ToolBox has been a valuable resource in GWP's Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) and the Central Asia and Caucasus (CACENA) regions as it:

- contributes to building the capacity of water resource stakeholder organisations;
- stimulates joint efforts by water experts who previously acted in isolation or in competition; and
- provides useful illustrations of IWRM in action.

Some of the main shortcomings are:

- in the CEE region: the ToolBox competes with EU guidelines;
- in the CACENA region: the ToolBox tools seem to be too advanced to be implemented immediately, and the language barriers mean that a printed version of the ToolBox would be more accessible than the internet site; and
- both regions rely on budgets received through the GWP secretariat.

B4 IWRM ToolBox: Capacity Building and IWRM Planning – the Case of Southern Africa

Andrew Takawira, GWP Southern Africa

The Southern Africa water partnership has used the following in capacity development programmes for its target groups:

- the GWP IWRM ToolBox as a key resource for improving practical understanding about IWRM;
- the Lower Manyame case study to guide the implementation of IWRM; and

- the ‘catalysing change’ and ‘questioning’ approaches as key resources for IWRM planning.

B5 GWP-SEA/Malaysia Water Partnership (MyWP) ToolBox Initiative

Jin Lee, GWP Southeast Asia

The GWP ToolBox suffers from the following two major limitations:

- the lack of a comprehensive and detailed information structure for capturing, storing and sharing case study information; and
- a lack of case studies that illustrate how the 50+ tools can help water professionals address specific issues related to the integration aspects of water resources management.

The development of the MyToolBox website (<http://www.gwptoolbox.org/>) using the Multicentric Information Framework is a pioneering example of how the document-centric, user-centric and computer-aided thinking computing paradigm can be implemented.

Discussion points

- Who should the target audience be?
- What modes of delivery are most effective?
- What areas of content are missing?

Key messages

The experiences of consulting partners confirmed that:

- the ToolBox is both used and useful at national and regional levels;
- the ToolBox can and should be adapted to suit local needs;
- information technology can support empowerment at the local level; and
- more content including case studies, guidelines and references are needed.

The ToolBox aims to serve a wide audience, but its core target audience should be planners, executors, regulators and present and future advisors at the national level.

There was a consensus that:

- the website, the CD and book are useful resources;
- language is a major barrier to ToolBox dissemination;
- country water partnerships should participate in translating ToolBox materials into local languages (beyond the current major languages); and
- regional and country water partnerships should become more involved in promoting the ToolBox and providing related training.

Next steps

- Support the translation of ToolBox materials into regional languages, including Arabic, Chinese, and Portuguese and other national languages.
- Support the development of local ToolBox-related initiatives.
- Ensure the availability and accessibility of ToolBox products on the internet, as CDs, and in printed form.
- Develop a problem-focused interface on the ToolBox website as an entry point for professionals.
- Put more emphasis on the questioning approach on the ToolBox website. Note that the ToolBox cannot give all the answers but can often assist in framing relevant questions.
- Include a Frequently Asked Questions section on the ToolBox website.

Session C Research into Use: How to Encourage the Practical Uptake of Research Outputs

Convenors: Paul Vehmeyer (Programme Administrator, Secretariat) and Ruth Beukman (Coordinator, GWP Southern Africa); Chair: Akiça Bahri (TEC member); rapporteur: Yang Xiaoliu (TEC member).

Session objectives

The session looked at how research generators and users interact and what role GWP’s networks can play in bringing the two together. It covered outputs 2 and 3 of GWP’s 2004–2008 Strategy and was co-convened by the International Water Management Institute (IWMI).

The session objectives were:

- to highlight the role research has played in the first 10 years of GWP’s networks;
- to present lessons learned on the interaction between researchers and policy makers;
- to give practical and innovative examples of the interactions between researchers and practitioners;
- to review the methods of interaction that bring research into use; and
- to identify the way ahead on GWP’s collaboration with IWMI and the use of GWP’s own network can help improve the practical uptake of research outputs.

The presentations

C1 Research Influencing Policy and Strategy: The Southern African Regional Perspective

Kenneth M Msibi, GWP Southern Africa

Ken Msibi showed how research findings and existing knowledge resources have influenced the water policies of the Southern African Regional Development Community (SADC). He emphasised the need to filter research findings for their relevance to the regional situation and identified the challenges to enhancing the relevance of research in the context of IWRM.

C2 The Interaction Between Research and Stakeholders: The Lerma-Chapala Basin Case, Mexico

A Jorge and T Hidalgo, Mexican Institute of Water Technology (IMTA)

This paper presented the case of the Lerma-Chapala basin in Mexico. The five provinces in this basin each nominate experts to a technical committee that develops different scenarios with a scientifically-developed and validated basin water allocation model. This close interactive work between researchers and users has built up trust between the different stakeholders and has led to a joint agreement on water distribution in the basin.

C3 Water for Food, Water for Life, and Managing Water For Agriculture: Methods Of Interaction

Domitille Vallee, International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

Domitille Vallee shared experiences on the Comprehensive Assessment of Water Management in Agriculture and the Dialogue on Water, Food and Environment initiative where different disciplines and different types of organisations (IUCN, WRI, IWMI and UV) have come together. She highlighted the challenges of understanding each other as network participants have different languages, definitions, and ways of working. For defining joint programmes, these differences have to be overcome by learning to listen to one another more and by creating sufficient space for joint interactions.

C4 Research into Use: Ideas for the Way Ahead

Frank Rijsberman, International Water Management Institute (IWMI)

Frank Rijsberman spoke of the challenge provided by donors, such as the UK Department for International Development (DFID), insisting on research showing clear impacts and the challenge for GWP to show its worth as a facilitating network and matchmaker to reach practitioners. He proposed using impact pathways to link IWMI through GWP to practitioner

organisations. Through outcome mapping each could be held responsible for the outcomes over the next three to five years whilst remaining in the chain of boundary partners jointly working towards sustainable water management and the achievement of the millennium development goals (MDGs).

Main discussion points

The main question put to participants was how to bridge the gap between research and how to applying its findings. Discussion focussed on the interaction between researchers, policy makers and practitioners, and the role GWP could play in facilitating this.

Key messages

- Research tends to focus on outputs but should focus more on outcomes (changes in behaviour). This happening would link research to its practical uptake.
- Producing communication material is not enough to ensure the practical uptake of research findings. There is a need to closely interact with potential users of new ideas and technologies and to make sure there's a mutual sharing of knowledge.
- Through scientific monitoring, researchers can play a role in translating and communicating community-based knowledge and its impact to policy makers.
- Research has different dimensions in time and space. Research findings have the strongest influence on decision making at an intermediate level in time and space. Other kinds of research findings will have to be translated in to actions at this intermediate level in order to have a similar influence.
- Community-based IWRM has existed for centuries. Through scientific-based monitoring, researchers can play a role in translating this community knowledge and its impact to policy makers.
- Country water partnerships are excellent platforms to bring researchers, policy makers and practitioners together to promote the application and uptake of promising research outcomes. They should engage in pilot IWRM projects to facilitate learning by doing. The wider GWP network can help record and share experiences.

Next steps

IWMI and GWP will seek DFID funding for an innovative proposal for bringing together a range of national and international organisations to promote more uptake of promising research findings in countries that lag behind in achieving the MDGs.

Session D Alliances

Convener: Björn Guterstam (Network Officer, Secretariat); Chair: Torkil Jønych-Clausen (Senior Advisor); rapporteur: Simi Kamal (TEC member).

Session objectives

The session objectives were to hear from allied organisations about their experiences of cooperating with GWP at global, regional, country and local levels, and to critically discuss factors that assist and inhibit cooperation.

The presentations

Participants were split into the following two groups.

Associated programmes: Panel 1 included the following GWP associated programmes (APs):

- river basins, chaired by Jean François Donzier of the International Network of River Basin Organisations (INBO);
- gender, chaired by Joke Muylwijk of the Gender and Water Alliance;
- capacity building, chaired by Paul Taylor of CapNet;
- floods, chaired by Torkil Jønych-Clausen of the Danish Hydraulic Institute (DHI).

The discussion: GWP's associated programmes exist both to serve GWP and to implement their own programmes and meet their own objectives many of which are congruent with GWP's work. All associated programmes are network based and have similar partnership structures with some overlapping GWP's regions. Partnerships between GWP and associated programmes are quite unstructured and the programmes feel there is inadequate cooperation from GWP. Principles of complementarity have not been clearly established between GWP and the programmes and between the programmes. Mutual benefits to associated programmes and to GWP tend to be implicit and are not stated or aggressively pursued.

GWP allies: Panel 2 was made up of the following GWP allied organisations:

- The Global Forum on Oceans, Coasts, and Islands, chaired by Biliiana Cicin-Sain;
- The irrigation community: the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage (ICID) and the International Programme for Technology and Research in Irrigation and Drainage (IPTRID), chaired by Peter S Lee;
- World Water Council, chaired by Paul van Hofwegen;

- United Nations Development Programme, chaired by Jürg Staudenmann.

The discussion: GWP's allies are independent organisations and so a more proactive and formal mechanism is needed for generating synergies. Roles and responsibilities need to be clearer with statements and commitments that can be reasonably met. There has been a long standing demand from many GWP regions for more work on oceans, coasts and islands. ICID and IPTRID focus on integrated land and water management and on agriculture (water for food). The World Water Council sees the need and has a desire to work with GWP. UNDP focuses on water, environment, poverty and related issues at regional and country levels.

Main discussion points

The key points of the discussion are summarised in the key messages and next steps below.

Key messages

- All associated programmes and allied organisations have a good will towards GWP. However, the limited capacity of some programmes and alliances means that not all of GWP's global initiatives can effectively reach the country and grassroots levels. This is where the GWP network can play an important mutually supportive role.
- Amongst the associated programmes, there are big differences in global collaboration and managing collaboration on the ground with the uneven presence and use of associated programmes in GWP's regions. The implementation of IWRM is just beginning and the associated programmes need to be clearer about their roles in this new context.
- The allied organizations all presented areas of future cooperation where they can provide extended platforms for IWRM.

Next steps

- Organize regular forums of GWP, associated programmes, GWP's technical committee (TEC), ToolBox and others.
- Carry out joint activities including publications.
- Jointly approach donors for financing associated programmes in support of GWP.
- Increase GWP's facilitation of regional engagement by associated programmes.
- Make associated programmes more demand-driven including by responding to requests from the GWP network.
- Appoint an associated programme representative to GWP's steering committee.

- Bring allied organizations more formally and forcefully into GWP's agenda and programmes.
- Assess relations with allies not present at the session and in particular the groundwater associated programme, rainwater harvesting (the Southern and Eastern Africa Rainwater Network — SEARNET), the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), and the lakes programme (International Lake Environment Committee Foundation — ILEC, IUCN, the International Water Association — IWA, and the World Wide Fund for Nature — WWF).

Session E GWP Partnerships: Are They Real and Effective and What Can We Learn from Others?

Conveners: Khalid Mohtadullah (Senior Advisor) and Daniel Valensuela (Network Officer, Secretariat); Hartmut Brühl (TEC member); rapporteurs: Liviu Popescu (Chair, GWP CEE) and Kenneth Rivera (Chair, GWP South America).

Session objectives

To consider how to make all levels of partnerships more efficient and effective for promoting and implementing integrated water resource management.

The presentations

E1 Water and Sanitation: Sharing BDP's Experience with Partnerships

David Schaub-Jones, RO Building Partnerships for Development in Water and Sanitation (BPD)

E2 The Value of Partnerships from a Government's Perspective

Mykola Babich, Ukraine

E3 The West Africa Experience: Transforming the Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC)

Dam Mogbante, GWP West Africa

E4 Partnerships at River Basin Level in China: the Yellow River Conservancy Commission

Liu Xiaoyan, China

The main points from the presentations were:

- partnerships should be formed only where common complex problem exist;
- the importance of the internal governance of partnerships;
- the size of partnerships should be defined according to needs and interests; and
- partnerships should be optimised by identifying the main strategic partners.

Partnerships were analyzed from the perspective of GWP and outside institutions as shown in the following table.

Outside perspectives of partnerships	GWP's perspective of partnerships
Are about dialogue and fundraising	Are mainly for cross-sectoral dialogue
Are rarely voluntary	Are voluntary
Are rarely trust-based	Are trust and confidence based
Are tailor-made	Have guidelines and rules
Are not permanent: are transitional	Have a more permanent focus
Rarely have a common vision	Have a common vision (IWRM, strategy, Dublin)

Main discussion points

- Are the characteristics in the above table still valid and will GWP have the same characteristics in 10 year's time?
- GWP should analyse its main characteristics and better define partnership roles and responsibilities.
- GWP needs to consider how it can develop its partnerships whilst retaining its corporate identity and its shared vision.

Key messages

- Partnerships with governments are a precondition for IWRM implementation at the national level.
- Partnerships can also be developed throughout regional, country and area water partnerships, community based organisations, basin organisations and in other ways.
- Partnerships should evolve to meet needs. However, it is usually available funding support that fosters partnerships for implementing projects. They often do not evolve independently.
- It is very important to define and periodically evaluate roles and responsibilities.
- Partnerships with a strong shared learning component will grow into credible and useful partnerships.

Next steps

It is recommended that:

- GWP reinforces its partnerships to solve the needs of multiple stakeholders and to make them vehicles for reforms in policies and in practice;
- the development of partnerships should be seen as both a process and as the creation of institutions;
- partnerships must in most cases be tailor-made;
- the representation of all major stakeholders in partnerships is very important for their credibility and sustainability; and
- the sharing of experiences is important for the sustainability of partnerships.

Session F GWP'S Performance: Are We Doing the Right Things and Do We Do Them Correctly?

Conveners: Alan Hall (Network Coordinator, Secretariat) and Jacques Rey (GWP partner, Sweden); Chair: Beris Gwynne (Fundraising and Network Support, Secretariat); rapporteur: Vangelis Constantianos (Coordinator/Executive Secretary, GWP Mediterranean).

Session objectives

Output 5 of the GWP Strategy 2004-08 (effective development and management of the GWP Network) is to ensure effective governance and efficient operation of the network and to ensure coherence across the network's components and activities. Effective management will protect the GWP brand and safeguard GWP as a neutral and inclusive platform. A key management tool is to measure how far GWP is meeting its objectives and carrying out its work plans. This will directly influence GWP's ability to obtain the resources it needs to achieve its goals.

This session aimed to:

- review GWP's approach to performance management;
- examine the differing approaches to monitoring and evaluation by drawing on GWP's experiences and the current thinking in the development community; and
- considering how to measure performance and how to use this to report on outcomes from GWP's work plans to achieve the objectives of the 2004-08 strategy.

Main discussion points

The session:

- provided an overview of the latest thinking on measuring the performance of networks taking into account the special nature of GWP as an influencing and facilitating partnership;
- reflected on what GWP is doing at all levels of its engagement; and
- facilitated an open discussion on the way forward by identifying and reflecting on key questions.

The presentations

F1 Session Opening

Beris Gwynne, GWP Secretariat

The latest external review of GWP recommended that GWP needed to better measure its performance and the performance of its networks. This is important for assessing impact and the value of GWP's actions, for making GWP more accountable to its users and

donors, and for better understanding strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.

Performance indicators can be of:

- process to monitor the implementation of actions;
- outcome to monitor the direct results of actions; and
- impact to monitor progress towards achieving goals.

Performance monitoring is a challenging new undertaking for networks as there are many intangibles and complexities involved in measuring how they operate.

F2 The Challenges for Performance Evaluation in an International Network

Ricardo Wilson Grau, GWP consultant

Ricardo Wilson Grau elaborated on the difficulties of evaluating international networks such as GWP by highlighting that theory and practice on the subject is still in its infancy. He noted that:

- international networks operate in environments that are complex, open, dynamic and unpredictable;
- networks are unique organisational forms; and
- stakeholders demand accountability and results but tend to see both from a project or programme perspective.

Requirements for an outcome evaluation were discussed and examples from the human rights, corporate social responsibility and environmental networks were provided.

F3 Capturing GWP System-Wide Performance: A Quick Review

Jacques Ray, GWP consultant

Jacques Ray explained how GWP's performance has been measured since its founding by referring to the strategy 2004-2008, the work programme 2004-2008, work plans, project proposals, activity and project reports, semi-annual reports, briefings to the SC, reports to the consulting partners, annual audited financial reports, external reviews, learning reviews and self assessments. However, these are not designed for performance measurement per se.

An overview of the two strategic planning cycles of GWP — 1997-2003 and 2004-2008 — was given. Emphasis was put on the operational linkages of the current strategy and work programme with the existing components and bodies of the GWP system and network. The links of the strategy with the outputs, outcomes and impact on IWRM development and application were also discussed with an example given of how some of GWP's regional partnerships have evolved.

F4 Experiences of GWP Performance Measurement at the Global Level

Roberto Lenton, TEC Chair

Roberto Lenton gave an overview of learning reviews as a tool for better understanding the performance and evolution of GWP's regional networks. Such reviews aim to address the two substantive issues of: are regional water partnerships doing the right thing? and, are these partnerships operating effectively? This must involve examining both the programme of activities and the governance arrangements in a regional network. It was noted that learning reviews should not be about control but should be designed to generate open debate and constructive criticism within. What matters is to generate action.

Learning reviews are a promising potential tool for performance measurement. The two learning reviews carried out so far on GWP have been useful for learning lessons. The self assessments carried out by the regional partnerships have been a helpful first part of the learning reviews to promote debate on substantive issues and to enhance ownership of the process. However, up to now, the learning reviews have only debated the performance of regional water partnerships and have not applied specific performance indicators.

F5 Experience of GWP Performance Measurement at the Regional Level

Vangelis Constantianos, GWP Mediterranean

This paper dealt with measuring performance from a regional perspective. It explained the existing means of measuring performance in the regions. It was noted that regions currently use process indicators more than outcome indicators (mostly linked with bigger projects) while impact indicators are hardly used. Lessons from the Mediterranean learning reviews were elaborated. Several remarks were made on the parameters such as governance, partnership, planning, and fund-raising that affect performance in a regional partnership. An example was given of performance indicators to measure capacity building initiatives on transboundary waters linked with the Petersberg Phase II/Athens Declaration process.

Main discussion points

The key points of the discussion are summarised in the key messages and next steps below:

Key messages

- GWP's 'audience' of partners, donors, and water users demand accountability and results.
- GWP is a unique and evolving organization that combines formal links between stakeholder organizations and multi-linked operational models. Its network operates under unpredictable, diverse and complex political, social and economic circumstances. The IWRM concept and is complex one.
- To measure its performance GWP needs to be fully aware and clear about its identity and its role and scope. In practice this is not straightforward.
- Performance measurement is directly linked with planning and requires clarification of the GWP impact chain.
- Long-term planning, particularly in regional and country water partnerships is often vulnerable as it depends on partners' demand, financing, donors' interest, and other factors.
- Expectations and performance indicators should reflect GWP's real 'size', its actual capacity and its pace of development.
- The 'footprint' of GWP's work includes outcomes at all levels (global, regional, national, and local).
- Qualitative and aggregated indicators are best for measuring GWP's performance.
- A complex system of measurement should be avoided otherwise too much time will be spent on reporting rather than on doing.

Next steps

- GWP should develop its own hybrid model to measure its performance with simplicity, clarity, continuity and reality driving the model.
- GWP should learn from how other established organisations and networks have measured their performances.
- A GWP working group should be formed to work on this subject including representatives from the technical committee (TEC), the secretariat, and regional, country and local GWP partner networks.

Special Side Meeting: Discussions on ADB-GWP Collaboration on Water Activities in the Asia-Pacific region

Convenors: Alan Hall (Network Coordinator) and Mai Flor (ADB, Philippines).

Session objectives

The side meeting was a closed session chaired by Margaret Catley-Carlson to consider an agreement between the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and GWP on working together on water activities in the Asia-Pacific region. The main outcome was agreement on a letter of intent between GWP's secretariat, the four Asian regional water partnerships (South Asia — SAS, Southeast Asia — SEA, CACENA, and China) and the bank.

The presentations

Alan Hall and Mai Flor outlined the proposed collaboration as being to provide support and to cooperate on:

- establishing water utility networks (WUNs) and a programme of water operators' partnerships in the Asia-Pacific region;
- developing IWRM plans and strategies and to develop river basin management in 25 basins in the region; and
- holding an Asia-Pacific Water Summit in 2007 in association with the Japan Water Forum (JWF)

Main discussion points

- Each regional chair gave their views on the proposed collaboration. All agreed to participate and to prepare an inventory of interested utilities to attend the proposed workshop.
- All regions were keen to participate in the basin development component and would suggest candidate basins to ADB.
- Some regions were concerned about the added value of the proposed associated programmes Water Forum. GWP-China had reservations about the value of this and said it would further consider its involvement.

Key messages

Water utility networks: Vadim outlined discussions in CACENA with the ADB office and stressed the need to articulate the added value of a water utilities network. He agreed to identify utilities and arrange invitations to a meeting. He cautioned that this was a new area of work for CACENA and may take longer to activate than in other regions.

GWP's South Asia partnership referred to an earlier activity related to benchmarking of water utilities

supported by ADB that they can build on and stressed the need for an informal approach and the need to bring in 'autocratic' governments to tackle the regulatory side and not just the utilities. This could happen by twinning regulatory authorities.

GWP's Southeast Asia partnership stressed that bringing investment into the utilities can release funds from government budgets for other purposes and there was a high cost to the public of not reforming. Ministries of finance are therefore likely to be supportive. It was stressed that the initiative should be 'colour blind' with a mix of public and private involvement for maximum effectiveness. It was stressed that GWP should use the IWRM approach to improve utilities' awareness of up- and downstream effects of water resource use and the importance of good governance to attract more investment and to most effectively use resources.

Basins: This new initiative would form part of the Network of Asian River Basin Organizations (NARBO) initiative set up by ADB and others in the region. The four GWP regions were keen to participate in this activity and suggested possible basins.

GWP made a 'health warning' on river basin organisations (RBOs) and felt that river basin management should not automatically mean creating an organisation as different systems need different models (form should follow function) and such organisations may create jurisdictional conflicts and may not be financially sustainable. It was proposed that activities should include the performance management of river basin organisations, self assessment of basin management, the formation of basin water partnerships (akin to area water partnerships), and the training of peer reviewers.

GWP's regions should collect information on ongoing basin activities to avoid duplication. This should be linked to IWRM planning processes, such as in Indonesia, and the NARBO guidelines, and the ToolBox. A video conference was proposed for December to follow up on this idea.

The ADB-GWP agreement

The four GWP regions, GWP's secretariat and the ADB signed the letter of intent after some modifications were made in the light of the discussions. It was agreed that:

- GWP will facilitate the setting up of water utilities networks and will aim to introduce a more integrated approach within the utilities and help improve governance as a means to leverage more finance. Using the Southeast Asian Water Utilities Network (SEAWUN) as a model, the new water utilities networks will implement the ADB-GWP's

Water Operators Partnership Program to match strong and weak utilities through exchange or twinning programmes.

- GWP and ADB will work with other partners and in particular local associations linked to the International Water Association.
- GWP and ADB would organise a workshop in late 2006 (November) for the utilities from South Asia to establish a water utilities networks. The Central Asia and China utilities will be invited as observers. The GWP's Southeast Asia partnership (SEA) will take the lead with the existing SEAWUN serving as a model for other regions. The workshop will develop a programme for establishing the utilities networks and an outline programme of activities.
- GWP regions will draw up an inventory of utilities interested in joining the networks including information from ADB on its national urban renewal project. Utilities that are already GWP partners should be included. The GWP regions should also find out if any similar initiatives exist so as to avoid duplication.
- At the late 2006 workshop, SEAWUN will explain about the concept, functioning and benefits of water utilities networks and GWP will make links to IWRM including upstream and downstream linkages, for wastewater management and to link reforms to leveraging finance.
- ADB will explain the advantages of involvement and the increased funding available for viable utilities. Singapore's Public Utilities Board (PUB) agreed to help other utilities under a twinning arrangement.
- GWP and ADB will discuss proposals for the Associated Programmes Water Forum in 2007. ADB will organise a meeting on this later in 2006.
- GWP's secretariat and ADB agreed to allocate US\$ 50,000 each to implement the agreement. GWP regions will include these activities in their 2007 work programmes.

Note: after the breakout sessions and side meeting there was a brief plenary (Plenary 4) which involved reporting back from each of the breakout sessions.

4. SUMMING UP

4.1 Summary

The final plenary session was delivered by GWP's Executive Secretary Emilio Gabbrielli in the presence of GWP's patron HRH Prince Willem Alexander and HRH the Crown Princess Victoria of Sweden. The following paraphrased version of Emilio's speech sums up the concluding points from the five days of meetings.

This has been a unique opportunity not only for our network to come together for a 'reality check' on what we are about, but also for us to feel the real power and diversity of our extensive global network. During the past two days we have tried to create a common basis of understanding in all the levels of our network by reflecting on GWP's history, governance, strategy, experiences, difficulties and accomplishments.

The background documents on our country, regional and global level contributions provided useful food for thought before the meetings began and helped inform and generate meeting discussions. They have in particular helped us to focus on our progress towards implementing our 2004-2008 Strategy and will help to prepare our 2007-2008 work plan.

We reflected in the plenary sessions on the potential of our regional, national, and sub-national partnerships, and in the breakout sessions on our six key strategic areas of IWRM planning, alliances, putting research into use, the ToolBox, partnerships, and the challenge of measuring GWP's performance.

The five day programme has fostered much debate both within and outside the sessions on a range of important issues. The discussion has been rich and intense and has produced much useful material for us to reflect on what we have achieved and what we should do in the future. In the discussions we have committed to preparing the detailed proceedings within one month's time for distribution to the partnerships in English, French, Spanish, Russian and Chinese and possibly in Arabic Portuguese and other languages as per demand. The language issue is an important one to ensure that none of our partners are excluded from debate and sources of information.

I hope that all meeting participants — many of who are staying on for the World Water Week (20-26 August, also in Stockholm) — have enjoyed the chance to make new contacts, to experiences, to learn new lessons, and to gain a better understanding of the contribution that GWP can make to the improved management of the world's water resources.

It seems to me that our meeting has highlighted enough challenges and potential to keep us going for the next decade. Beyond this meeting GWP always welcomes feedback on how we can improve and innovate.

This morning some colleagues, the rapporteurs from the last two day's sessions and I identified the following five key conclusions from our meetings on issues raised consistently throughout the five days.

▪ **We must promote our niche contribution more**

We must promote GWP as a *knowledge broker* for sharing experience and learning across and between all levels. It is important that we move on from the broad concept of IWRM to digging deeper to focus on the specific elements of IWRM (as outlined in the ToolBox) so that we can help to directly bring about positive change for local communities.

The *partnership approach* must remain central to how we operate and we must continue to provide a neutral space for multi-stakeholder dialogue and for building consensus that is participatory and inclusive; but does not act as a brake on progress.

▪ **We need to be clearer about our role**

The meeting discussions concluded that our primary role should be as a *facilitator*. We also have the potential to act as a *moderator* and *mediator* in disputes over water resources.

It is very important that we clearly understand that the role of a facilitator is to manage and encourage *negotiation, agreement and cooperation* between vested interests and competing sectors on water resource issues. Although this work can be demanding and time-consuming and can take time to produce results, if applied skilfully and patiently it will lead to considerable useful outcomes.

To be an effective facilitator we must continue to *develop and strengthen our alliances* to ensure that words are translated into actions that achieve goals. We need to identify and use influential champions to catalyse change at all levels and especially at the country level. It is also crucial that we focus on initiatives and interventions that can produce results.

▪ **We must respect and take advantage of the diversity in our organisation**

One of our major strengths is the *diversity* of interests and perspectives in our organisation and its networks.

It is very important that we recognise the different contexts, cultures and climates and the different levels of activity within our network. The global, regional, country, basin and community levels of our network all have significant and different contributions to make. We need to constantly remind ourselves that IWRM is a *journey and not a destination*, and that people and countries are at different places along the path to better water management and development.

▪ **We need to make strategic choices**

This rising to prominence of water issues in the media and on political agendas since 2000 has raised expectations for change. We need to recognise that we cannot do everything and need to manage the large demand for our services by focussing on priority areas. We must make strategic choices to leverage and maximize return on our investments. This applies to investments of money, ideas, time and other inputs.

We must also become more of a learning network that uses knowledge to constantly improve the focus and efficiency of our operations. A key point here is that we need to give more attention to measuring our performance at all levels to inform our strategic planning.

▪ **We need to improve the ways we communicate**

Networking is fundamentally about communication. Participants stressed the value of periodic face to face meetings to improve communication across our extensive networks. We also need to improve communication with network outsiders and especially alliance partners and those outside the normal water domain. Our regional and country partners need to be more adventurous to bring in more key stakeholders and not just be preaching to the converted. Conversations with outsiders provide us with valuable reality checks on how we're doing and provide more lessons and experiences to help build more effective partnerships and alliances.

4.2 VIP Panel Discussion

Based on the outcomes of the Consulting Partners meeting and their knowledge of GWP, the panel reflected on the way forward for the network. A rich discussion followed and the key points made by each panel member are:

"GWP must now move from talk to action. People must get water to drink, farms need to be efficiently irrigated, and floods need to be avoided. All by yesterday!"

Arjun Thapan, Deputy Director General, Southeast Asia Department, Asian Development Bank, Philippines

“Ten years ago GWP was born in large part to fill the void and growing need for what we now know IWRM. In this past decade GWP has grown from its ‘infancy’ through an ‘early childhood’ and is now maturing as an intelligent and promising ‘adolescent’ organization – an early example of the much heralded new global institutional architecture. Not yet a mature adult, we know that GWP is smart, still growing, forming partnerships and finding its way – it will take time to see if GWP will become wise, as wisdom comes with age and experience. I’m confident that if all of us who are part of the spirit of GWP, and of IWRM, stay focused on the people and resources that we want to help and protect, and that we do so with the courage that has been a GWP benchmark so far...we will be able to be ‘proud parents of what began so modestly in 1996.’”
Dianne Dillon-Ridgley, Chair, River Network, USA

“GWP has made a fascinating journey over the past ten years, from a small secretariat in Stockholm with little international impact to a network with global coverage and one of the most important players on the international water scene.

For the future however, the main challenge is not to continue our internal discussions about the IWRM, but to reach out and include all the other sectors of the society, and make them realize that they are water managers. People working on agriculture, energy, transport, forestry etc. need to be made aware that what they do affects water, and understand how they can manage water in a more sustainable way.”

Anders Bertell, Executive Director, Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI), Sweden

“In its second decade, GWP will need to focus even more strategically on facilitating policy change. In doing so, it will need to build on the energy, creativity, and flexibility that comes with being a global network with various viewpoints but a common commitment to balancing economic efficiency, social equity and environmental in a sustainable manner, which has been the hallmark of its success to date.”

Roberto Lenton, Chair, GWP Technical Committee

“I hope that our two organisations, the two 10-year-olds in the water family, can continue to grow up side by side in this family that struggles so that access to water may be a reality for the greatest number. There are many themes to be addressed, and in the future, I think that the international water community, and within it, GWP and WWC, will have to focus increasingly on concrete action in the field. Our struggle will become ever more determined.”

Loïc Fauchon, President, World Water Council, France

“I think the two major contributions of the GWP are having built the GWP network and getting IWRM firmly and broadly accepted everywhere. But implementation on the ground is the only true measure of success and in facing the challenges of the future, we must strive to convert declarations, plans and targets into real action that is always pro-poor, pro-women, pro-environment.”

Ismail Serageldin, Director, Library of Alexandria, Egypt

“Over the last ten years GWP has established a vibrant network of partners who should now use their forces to galvanise governments, industry and civil society into actions that result in more sustainable water management.”

Prof Shantha Mohan, India

5. 10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION PROGRAMME

The following programme of music on a water theme, speeches and presentations was held in the Aula Room, Norra Latin, Stockholm on 20 August at the end of the consulting partners meeting. The programme was followed by a reception.

Opening music:

Kiruna – ‘Kulning’ style, song about water without words

Performed by Elisabeth Ask and Mooseart Music

Welcome by GWP Chair Mrs Margaret Catley-Carlson

Speech by representative of the GWP organization host country, Sweden — Mr. Jan Bjerninger, Department for Natural Resources and the Environment, Swedish Development Cooperation Agency

Organ music:

Theme from Spartacus by Aram Chatjaturjan

Performed by Sigvard Selinus

Keynote speech by GWP Patron Mr Ismail Serageldin: “GWP: Working for a Water Secure World” (*please refer to the CD for the presentation*).

Choir performance:

Pingst – Music: Oskar Lindberg, Text: Oscar Levertin
Sommarpsalm – Music: Waldemar Åhlén, Text: Carl David of Wirsén

Performed by St Jacob’s Chamber Choir

Presentation of gift by GWP China Delegates of a handpainted scene by a GWP Partner of a Chinese river valley illustrating the concept of Harmonious cooperation and inter-dependence among the various community groups as promoted by integrated water resources management.

Harp music:

The Little Fountain by Samuel O. Pratt

Prélude nr 4 op. 16 by Marcel Tournire

Performed by Gertrud Schneider and Izabella Sander

Launch of the GWP anniversary book *Boldness of Small Steps* and presentation of the GWP Awards for contributions towards establishing GWP by the GWP Patron HRH The Prince of Orange and the GWP Chair. Awards were presented to:

Maureen Ballestero/former Chair of GWP Central America

John Briscoe/former World Bank donor

Tabeth Chiuta/former Executive Secretary for GWP Southern Africa

Bert Diphoorn/former Dutch donor

Meike van Ginneken/former Network Officer for Central and Eastern Europe and Latin America

John Hodges/former British donor

Johan Holmberg/former GWP Executive Secretary

Torkil Jonch-Clausen/former GWP Technical Committee Chair

Simi Kamal/member of the GWP Technical Committee and GWP South Asia

Janusz Kindler/former Chair of GWP Central and Eastern Europe

Khalid Mohtadullah/former GWP Executive Secretary

Ismael Serageldin/former GWP Chair

In addition, the GWP Patrons, HRH the Prince of Orange and Prof. Kader Asmal, were presented the award in gratitude of their contributions to GWP. Also Crown Princess Victoria of Sweden was presented an award in appreciation of her participation in the anniversary celebration.

Concluding remarks by GWP Chair, GWP Executive Secretary, GWP Technical Committee Chair and, on behalf of the GWP network as a whole, Asha Verulkar from India.

Organ music:

Hornpipe by Georg Friedrich Händel

Images from the event can be viewed on the CD

"The Boldness of Small Steps" – How did we achieve progress? What were the underlying mechanisms?

AGENDA FRIDAY, AUGUST 18

Venue: Norra Latin conference centre, Aula room

Morning: 08.30–12.30 (4 hrs)	
Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson	
08.30–09.00	Welcome and introduction, reports from GWP network and TEC Margaret Catley-Carlson, Emilio Gabbrielli, Roberto Lenton
Plenary sessions GWP activities on the ground: regional, national and sub-national levels	
Session 1: 3 minute introduction by the convenor GWP feeding into regional processes Conveners: Torkil Jønch-Clausen, Gabriela Grau, Mike Muller	
09.00–09.20	Mai Flor, GWP Southeast Asia "Placing water on the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) agenda: Establishing the Working Group on Water Resources Management"
09.25–09.45	Ruth Beukman, GWP Southern Africa "Water Governance and Southern African Development Community (SADC)"
9.50–10.30	Feedback from the floor
10.30–11.00 Coffee Break	
Session 2: 3 minute introduction by the convenor GWP at different national governance systems Conveners: Johan Holmberg, Aly Kerdany, Simi Kamal	
11.05–11.25	Vadim Sokolov and Bulat Yessekin, GWP Central Asia and Caucasus "IWRM through partnerships within hierarchical systems in Central Asia"
11.30–11.40	Simon Thuo, GWP Eastern Africa "Water and peace in fragile states"
11.40–11.50	Mam Dagou, GWP West Africa "Experiences from partnerships at work in West Africa"
11.50–12.30	Feedback from the floor
12.30–14.00 Lunch	
Afternoon: 14.00–17.30 (3.5 hrs)	
Plenary Sessions continued	
Chair Margaret Catley-Carlson	
Session 3: 3 minute introduction by the convenor GWP at sub-national level Conveners: Khalid Mohtadullah, Mercy Dikito-Wachtmeister, Hartmut Brühl	
14.05–14.25	Asha Verulkar, GWP South Asia "The role of AWP's in achieving water security"
14.30–14.40	Milkana Mochurova, Bulgaria "Local action through Varna AWP in the Black Sea Basin"
14.40–14.50	Upendra Gautam, Nepal "Mai River AWP"
14.50–15.30	Feedback from the floor
15.30–16.00 Coffee Break	
16.00–17.30	Panel of "Devils Advocates": Judith Rees, Tabeth Chiuta, Jean-Francois Donzier, Wouter Arriens, Mohammed Al-Eryani, Dianne Dillon-Ridgely Has GWP been effective at these different levels and how can we do better?

18.00 Refreshments at the GWP Secretariat (location: Drottningatan 33)

"The Boldness of Small Steps" – How did we achieve progress? What were the underlying mechanisms?

AGENDA SATURDAY, AUGUST 19

Venue: Norra Latin conference centre, Aula room

Morning: 08.30–09.30	
Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson	
Rapporteurs: Helena Albinzon and Sofia Vanner	
Plenary session	
Governance issues, Nominations of SC members (1hr)	
Morning: 09.30–13.00	
Breakout sessions	
Six Parallel Sessions including 30min coffee break (11.00–11.30)	
Issues linked to the GWP strategy (3.5hrs)	
A. Output 1: IWRM Planning Reflection on experience so far and where from here?	Convenor: Daniel Lopez Co-Convenor: Madiodio Niasse TEC: Jennifer Davis & Humberto Peña
B. Output 2: ToolBox Are the tools we have the right ones? Do we need to develop new ones?	Convenor: Carlos Aguilar Co-Convenor: Danka Thalmeinerová TEC: Mike Muller & Judith Rees
C. Output 2 & 3: Research into use How can we get practical uptake from research outputs?	Convenor: Paul Vehmeyer Co-Convenor: Ruth Beukman TEC: Akissa Bahri & Xiaoliu Yang
D. Output 3: Alliances Do we link effectively with partners? How do regions and countries link up?	Convenor: Björn Guterstam Co-Convenor: Torkil Jønych-Clausen TEC: Simi Kamal
E. Output 4: Partnerships Are the partnerships real and effective? Are we an effective capacity building agent?	Convenor: Daniel Valensuela Co-Convenor: Khalid Mohtadullah TEC: Hartmut Brühl
F. Output 5: GWP Performance Do partnerships do the right things and do they do them right?	Convenor: Alan Hall Co-Convenor: Jacques Rey TEC: Roberto Lenton
13.00–14.30 Lunch	
Afternoon: 14.30–17.30 (3 hrs)	
Plenary	
Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson	
Rapporteurs: Lina Koochaky and Kirsten Pratschke	
14.30–15.00 Session Rapporteurs	Feedback from 3 plenary sessions held on Day 1
15.00–15.30 (3 minutes per person)	Feedback from the floor
15.30–16.00 Coffee Break	
16.00–16.40 Session Rapporteurs	Feedback from 6 parallel sessions held on Day 2
16.45–17.30 (3 minutes per person)	Feedback from the floor

"The Boldness of Small Steps" – How did we achieve progress? What were the underlying mechanisms?

AGENDA SUNDAY, AUGUST 20
Venue: Norra Latin conference centre, Aula room

Afternoon: 16.00–17.30 Plenary Chair: Margaret Catley-Carlson		
16.00-16.05	Introduction	Margaret Catley-Carlson
16.05-16.15	GWP and ADB relation: "A new step forward"	Arjun Thapan, Water Committee of the Asian Development Bank
16.15-16.25	Report from the CP	Emilio Gabbrielli
16.25-17.30	Panel to reflect and draw conclusions from the outcomes of the GWP CP 2006 in the presence of the GWP Patron HRH The Prince of Orange and HRH The Crown Princess Victoria of Sweden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carin Jämtin, Minister for International Development Cooperation (invited) ▪ Ismael Serageldin, GWP Patron ▪ Khadar Asmal, GWP Patron ▪ Luïc Fauchon, President of the World Water Council ▪ Sunita Narain, Centre for Science and Environment ▪ Anders Berntell, Executive Director of the Stockholm International Water Institute ▪ Roberto Lenton, Chair of the GWP Technical Committee

18.00-20.00 10th Anniversary Celebration
Final programme will be distributed at the Anniversary

Evaluation-GWP Consulting Partners and Network Meetings 2006

There were 96 respondents in total to the questionnaire:

Were your expectation of the meetings met?	Fully met	Met	Not met	
CP meeting	35	52	2	
Network meeting	40	40	0	

What is your opinion of the organization?	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
CP meeting	57	36	0	0
Network meeting	55	25	0	0

CP meeting

What is your assessment of CP meeting day?	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
Day 1 - Introduction GWP	43	39	2	0
Day 2 - Breakout Sessions				
IWRM Planning	8	25	2	0
Toolbox	9	12	0	1
Research into use	11	15	4	0
Alliances	11	12	1	0
Partnerships	12	12	1	0
Performance	8	7	2	0
GWP/ADB Water operators	8	8	1	0

Network Meeting

Assessment of the Network meeting?	Very good	Good	Poor	Very poor
Day 1 – Orientation Day	38	39	0	0
Day 2 – Breakout Sessions	32	42	4	0

A copy the report documenting the full details of the responses may be requested by e-mail from the GWP Secretariat in Stockholm: gwp@gwpforum.org

GWP Secretariat
E-Mail: gwp@gwpforum.org
Website: www.gwpforum.org