Outcomes form the seminar: trend-related monitoring and evaluation on IWRM

IWRM is a solution on the search for its own problem.

Unnamed WSS expert

Stockholm Water Week 2007
Objectives and key questions

Objectives:
• Increased knowledge of on-going efforts to monitor IWRM
• Challenges (financial, organisational, capacity wise, political etc) involved in current IWRM monitoring activities clarified
• Inputs for defining IWRM (planning, implementation and impact) indicators clarified
• Ideas for the establishment of a formal monitoring and reporting mechanism in support of advancing IWRM at country level collected

• What are the ‘monitoring’ lessons learned from on-going IWRM implementation?
• Does the CSD 16 IWRM questionnaire capture all the important aspects?
• How can we monitor IWRM (process and impact) better?
• Which are the relevant indicators for good water management under the principles of IWRM?
• How could cooperation between ministries, sector institutions and statistical offices be improved and what support is needed?
• Does the international community need additional information to coordinate support efforts?
• Many uncoordinated IWRM surveys
• need for developing indicators
• CSD 16 questionnaire (for the CSD 16) being done right now
Manuel Dengo / UNDESA

- Global initiative for rationalizing water information (GIRWI)
- Monitoring of policy action of CSD 13
Niels Henrik Ibsen/IWRM task force

- UNEP sent out a questionnaire
- IWRM covers a lot of issues not to say it’s confusingly complex
- Results show inconsistencies and is probably related to lack of a concept for what we need to monitor
- Variable approach in doing the survey (individuals, group meetings)
Paul Taylor/ CAP-NET

• measuring impacts and not processes
Vadim Sokolov

- GWP analysed more the qualitative aspects than the CSD survey, that collected probably biased
Progress and non progress: what is the progress made today in trend-related M&E of IWRM

• Several surveys on implementing IWRM on the way but no results yet.
  – CSD 16
  – CSD 13 policy action
• Some surveys been done.
  – GWP 108 countries report
  – UNEP 60 countries covered
• There is a lot of overlap between the different surveys.
• The current surveys all are only concentrating on aspects of a process but not on impacts with practical measurable indicators.
• Results appear partially inconsistent.
Obstacles (and challenges) : what are the obstacles of achieving progress in the future in M&E on IWRM

- no consistent system of assessing and monitoring water management according to IWRM principles existing
- Such soft data are difficult to monitor and to assess, a consistent impact based monitoring system (like for WSS) is difficult to develop.
- There is a variety of IWRM understanding (positive: flexibility to address national priorities; negative aspect: what is it than at all?)
- Since this is process that exist only since 1992, we don’t have a baseline (on impact indicators).
- answers are always personal (from household to Ministries); transparency of data is a challenge for all these levels
- Impacts of IWRM take long time to materialise
- IWRM goes beyond the water sector itself and makes it a challenge
Prospects and proposals for the future: what are the prospects for future M&E on IWRM

- Define proxies by subdividing IWRM into manageable compartments/Identifying proxy indicators for that.
- Increased focus on what we are trying to achieve: sustainable development and management of water resources.
- We need to monitor consistent and meaningful process indicators (monitoring capacities or flows of money).
- Country specific and global indicators needed.