Target setting and reporting

Results of the second reporting exercise

Mr. Alisher Mamadzhanov
UNECE

http://www.unece.org/env/water/protocol_second_reporting_cycle.html
Background

- In accordance with Art. 6 Parties set targets within 2 years
- In accordance with Art. 7 every 3 years they report on their progress to MOP
- Reports shall be in accordance with the guidelines and a template for reporting adopted at MOP-2
- Pilot reporting cycle – 2009-2010
Schedule of second reporting exercise

- Announced at the fifth meeting of the Working Group on Water and Health (October 2012)
- Official letters to Parties and other States sent in December 2012
- Deadline for submission: 29 April 2013; 210 days before MOP
- Report on the status of implementation of Protocol released in September 2013
- Results also analyzed in the report of the Compliance Committee to MOP
Procedural aspects

- 23 out of 26 Parties reported, 3 non-Parties reported
- 14 reports were submitted on time
- 9 reports were submitted with slight delay – 1 month
- 3 reports were submitted with a major delay – 2 months
- 2 reports were very short and 2 others too long
- Most of the reports were submitted in English, for reports submitted only in Russian, secretariat provided working translation
- Reports submitted with a major delay could not be translated
Conclusions

- Targets: 14 claimed to have set; but some were drafts or referred to national legislation only
- Important to communicate targets to secretariat
- Relation with the EU legislation
- Public participation in target-setting improved
- Common indicators – important for those that have not set targets
- Improving trend: access to services, WRD occurrence and outbreaks, drinking water quality, surface water quality (WW treatment a challenge)
Conclusions cnt’d

- Significant improvement in the quality of reports compared to the first reporting exercise
- Significant increase in the use of the template and guidelines (e.g. Part IV of the report)
- Level of public participation in reporting has generally improved
- The use of inter-sectoral coordination mechanisms for reporting has improved
Challenges

- Not clear if countries set official targets under the Protocol
- Failure to set targets (in all areas)
- Comparability of data, use of baseline year, data sets
- Incomplete answers
- Public participation needs to improve
- Misunderstanding of some terms (aquaculture, storm water overflows)
- What to do with achieved/expired targets?