# Governance & Financing for the Mediterranean Water Sector







# Policy dialogues on water governance in Jordan and Tunisia

**Overcoming the challenges to private sector participation** 

Results from the policy dialogues carried out by the OECD and GWPMed with the financial support of the EIB (FEMIP Trust Fund) and SIDA



European Investment The EU bank





#### Pillars of the water policy dialogues **DIAGNOSTIC ANALYSIS** The policy and legislative R Α framework Ε С С TI 0 0 Μ Ν Institutional **Experience with** Μ roles & **PSP** Ε capacity Ρ Ν D Α Α Ν TI 0 Ν S Long term Transparency, accountability and financial value for money sustainability

## **KEY DIAGNOSTIC POINTS**

## Contrasted experience with PSP

- Tunisia:
  - Limited use & knowledge of PSP in the water sector
  - Shift in government approach towards PSP => water sector should be ready to impact decision making when the political conditions are in place
- Jordan:
  - Varied experience with both small and large scale private sector participation (PSP) projects
  - The country is on the verge of concluding mega project and risks failing reaping the benefits if right conditions are not in place

## Different institutional settings

- Tunisia:
  - Centralised setting.
  - Competent administration but limited PSP capacity.
  - SOEs (SONEDE & ONAS) with strong track record
- Jordan:
  - Responsibilities for water and PPPs are scattered across institutions – some overlaps and unclear allocation.
  - Responsibilities are in flux.
  - Corporatisation under way.

## Tunisia: a centralised setting



## Jordan: responsibilities in flux



## Common challenges

- A water sector under pressure: refugee crisis in Jordan, a business model showing its limits in Tunisia, rising costs.
- 2. Uncertainty & gaps in the legislative & regulatory framework for water and PPPs undermine legal clarity, opportunity and stability of water PSP.
- Limited financial sustainability of water operators, important subsidies & fiscal constraints put pressure on the WWS sector.
- Need for greater accountability mechanisms, territorial development & stakeholders' 9 engagement.

## Tunisia: pressure on water services



## SONEDE: financial pressure



Source: SONEDE and World Bank (2014).

11

## RECOMMENDATIONS

## Areas of recommandations Jordan Tunisia

- Managing PPPs in a fiscally 1. constrained environment through appropriate budget processes
- Reducing the regulatory risk 2. through supporting the development of a high-quality water regulatory framework
- Enhancing stakeholder 3. engagement to improve accountability and buy-in.

- What PSP for which 1 objectives and under which conditions of success
- Ensuring financial and 2. budget sustainability
- Enhancing stakeholder 3. engagement to improve accountability and buy-in

**Reform initiatives are underway in both countries => The** dialogues seek to support the existing efforts by providing a set of practical recommendations.

## Tunisia: what PSP for which objectives

- Forms of PSP need to be considered based on an evaluation of past experience, taking into account the appetite of the PS and sustainability / value for money
- Small scale PS could be considered in rural areas where SONEDE is not present
- Piloting BOT for water & wastewater treatment
- Consider forms of PSP that support greater technical & commercial efficiency, as well as quality services => ONAS is developing « Concession d'exploitation » and needs to embed the appropriate incentive mechanisms.
- Difficult to consider more complex forms of PSP

# Jordan: supporting the set up of a high quality regulatory framework

- Embed more systematically the instruments of good regulatory policy in the water sector to improve the efficiency and accountability of the regulatory framework for water.
- Improve clarity on the PMU's roles and functions, align its resources with its core work and establish appropriate accountability mechanisms to enhance the credibility of the regulatory framework.
- Continue the **corporatisation efforts** and strengthen the autonomy of water providers as they constitute the key pillars upon which the regulatory framework rests.

# Continue current reforms of the PMU

- Ensure adequate implementation of the Rules of Procedure in line with international practice (tariff regulation, performance monitoring, data gathering) ST
- Clarify the roles of various authorities and the coordination mechanisms ST. Ultimately, a founding legislation may be needed LT
- Strengthen the function of transparency through the publication of information on water operators ST
- Ensure separation within PMU between the team in charge of regulatory activities and those in charge of project development and PSP - ST
- Ensure the resources available to the PMU ST<sup>16</sup>

## Fiscally sustainable PSP in both countries

- Build PPP capacity throughout the administration. Set up strong dedicated PPP units and broad PPP capacity in all relevant authorities. Develop basic value for money methodology and standard PPP contracts
- Develop a strategic financial strategy for the water sector to stimulate policy debate on the feasibility of various policy choices
- Generate and publish a contingent liability report as part of the budget documentation to create transparency

# A call for greater accountability and stakeholder engagement

- The Arab Spring has pushed some MENA countries towards increased openness, transparency, integrity and inclusiveness
- This democratic transition resonates with a general trend in public policy of gradually involving a broad range of stakeholders at different levels
- The involvement of civil society can contribute to **improve acceptability of PSP** and **tariff increase** in water services

## **Common shortcomings**



## **Promising efforts**



Enhancing stakeholder engagement to improve accountability, transparency & buy-in

- Stakeholder engagement is a means to an end: it is a governance instrument that can help achieve better outcomes of efficiency, transparency, inclusiveness and equity
- It is a powerful tool to address territorial and institutional fragmentation, align objectives, improve accountability of decision-makers and support resultoriented action
- A menu of options can be considered to strengthen existing (formal and informal) engagement mechanisms

# Formal and informal engagement mechanisms

### **Formal mechanisms**

Citizen committee

**Consensus conference** 

**Decentralised assemblies** 

Stakeholder democracies

Innovative contracts &

partnerships

Interest-pay-say principle

Polls / Survey

Referendum

River basin organisations/councils

Shareholding

Water associations

### Informal mechanisms

Meetings / workshops / fora:

Web-based technologies

Focus group

Expert panel

Stakeholder mapping

Information hotlines

## Ways forwards



## OECD Principles on stakeholder engagement

**<u>1. Inclusiveness and equity</u>**. Map who does what, core motivations and interactions across all those having a stake in the outcome or likely to be affected.

**<u>2. Clarity, transparency and accountability</u>**. Define the ultimate line of decision-making, the objectives of stakeholder engagement and the expected use of inputs.

**<u>3. Capacity and information</u>**. Allocate proper financial and human resources and disclose needed information for result-oriented stakeholder engagement.

**<u>4. Efficiency and effectiveness</u>**: Assess regularly the process and outcomes of stakeholder engagement to learn, adjust and improve accordingly.

**5. Institutionalisation, structuring and integration**: Embed participatory processes in clear legal and policy frameworks, organisational structures/principles and responsible authorities.

**<u>6. Adaptiveness</u>**: Customise the type and level of engagement to the needs and keep the process flexible to changing circumstances.

# Tentative <u>indicators</u> for effective stakeholder engagement

### **Inclusiveness and equity**

Informed and transparent identification and selection of stakeholders to be involved in the engagement process, based on a clear understanding of their roles, responsibilities, interests, motivation and interrelations

Share of representation

Specific attention is devoted to the stakeholders outside the water sector (e.g. farmers, business, institutional investors, planners, etc.)

### **Clarity, transparency and accountability**

Clear understanding of the engagement process's framework in terms of line authority, level of engagement defined, proposed timeline, targeted objectives, expected outcomes, use of inputs and code of conduct

Clear understanding of the expectations









#### **Capacity and information**

Number of training sessions carried out to support the engagement process

Number of stakeholders attending the training sessions

Number of channels available to exchange information

Existence of a legal process to access information

Implementation of existing international agreements on transparency of information

Existence of mediation mechanisms when access to information is denied

Share of organisation's budget dedicated o stakeholder engagement

#### Efficiency and effectiveness

Regular monitoring throughout the engagement process (design, development, implementation) through quantitative data (monetary costs/benefits, etc.) and qualitative data (e.g. stakeholders' feedback, level of satisfaction, etc.)

Use of benchmarks and/or standards for assessment based on international norms and local practice as appropriate

Communication on the results of the engagement process evaluation with all stakeholders involved

Successful use of the inputs from the engagement process to achieve the desired outcomes

Fulfilment of the agreed-upon purpose of the engagement process

Careful appraisal of the indirect outcomes of the engagement process

Careful assessment of the short-term and long-term benefits yielded by the engagement process in terms of acceptability and sustainability, social equity and cohesion, capacity development and economic efficiency, and their degree of impact on the stakeholders involved

Development of agreed-upon compensation measures for the stakeholders negatively impacted by the engagement process

Definition of alternative and new approaches agreed-upon by all stakeholder involved to address the weaknesses of the engagement process identified in the evaluation exercise















Institutionalisation, structuring and integration	
Requirements for stakeholder engagement are in place within the organisation	
Charters and/rules of the game are clearly established	
A business case has been developed to support stakeholder engagement	
Reporting on the compliance with existing requirements is in place	
Adaptiveness	
Clear understanding of local specificities of the context prior to setting-up the engagement process (e.g. urban/rural areas, etc.)	
Ex-ante assessment of stakeholder's needs	
Development and analysis of different engagement scenarios (pros/cons, potential risks)	
Development of innovative/creative methods with new approaches and new stakeholders, including from outside the sector	

## Thanks for your Attention

#### **Contacts:**

Céline Kauffmann (<u>celine.kauffmann@oecd.org</u>) Aziza Akhmouch (<u>aziza.akhmouch@oecd.org</u>)





