



**UNITED NATIONS
ECONOMIC
COMMISSION FOR
EUROPE**

**WORLD HEALTH
ORGANIZATION
REGIONAL OFFICE FOR
EUROPE**

CONCLUSIONS

of the regional workshop on linkages with other monitoring and reporting mechanisms related to water and health

Geneva, Switzerland, 3 July 2014

Summary

The regional workshop on linkages with other existing monitoring mechanisms related to water and health was organized in the framework of the work on improving governance for water and health and in particular on improving the quality of reporting included in the programme of work for 2014–2016 of the Protocol on Water and Health. It was organized back-to-back with the seventh meeting of the Task Force on Target Setting and Reporting (Geneva, 4 July 2014). This note summarizes the conclusions of the discussions during the workshop.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The regional workshop on linkages with other existing monitoring mechanisms related to water and health was held on 3 July 2014 in Geneva, Switzerland.
2. The meeting was attended by experts from the following countries: Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Georgia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.
3. Representatives of the following international and non-governmental organizations as well as academia were also present: UN-Water, World Health Organization (WHO), WHO Collaborating Centre for Health Promoting Water Management and Risk Communication, Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE), ECO-TIRAS International Environmental Association of River Keepers, National Water Partnership of Georgia, and the Eurasian National University under the Ministry of Education of Kazakhstan.
4. All presentations given at the workshop are available at www.unece.org/env/water/workshop_reporting_mechanisms.html

II. OBJECTIVES

5. The regional workshop's objectives were the following:

- a) Support the establishment of linkages between the reporting mechanism under the Protocol on Water and Health and other existing regional and global monitoring programmes such as the WHO / United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) Joint Monitoring Programme for Water Supply and Sanitation (JMP), the UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS) and the European Environment and Health Information System (ENHIS);
- b) Discuss possible ways to link target setting and reporting under the Protocol with existing national monitoring and information systems;
- c) Inform about proposed post-2015 development goals and indicators on water and sanitation and discuss the possible ways to integrate these into the national target setting process.

III. SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS

6. The workshop was opened by Mr. Pierre Studer, Chair of the Bureau to the Protocol. He referred to the mandate of the Task Force on Target Setting and Reporting, given by the Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol at its third session in November 2013, to implement a number of activities to improve the quality of reporting at the regional level, in particular by supporting the establishment of linkages with other monitoring and reporting mechanisms. He stated that the issues identified and proposals made by participants in the workshop would be discussed during the seventh meeting of the Task Force on Target Setting and Reporting (4 July 2014) and be considered for a possible revision of the *Guidelines on Target Setting and Reporting*, as well as the template for summary reports.

Session 2: Linkages between existing monitoring and reporting mechanisms related to water, sanitation and health and target setting and reporting under the Protocol

7. Different monitoring and reporting mechanisms related to water and health were presented, in particular:
 - The reporting mechanism under the Protocol;
 - The GLAAS, including country fact sheets; and
 - The monitoring of access to drinking water and sanitation under the JMP.
8. The secretariat highlighted the need to identify and utilize existing sources of data and indicators from national and international monitoring and reporting mechanisms. This facilitates situation analysis, the establishment of a national baseline and the identification of priorities under Protocol to set targets, as well as the preparation of national summary reports (in particular for part II of the summary report on common indicators). This usage of internationally available data sources also avoids duplication in reporting efforts.
9. Representatives of WHO introduced the JMP and GLAAS mechanisms and presented the latest results for the European region. They highlighted the complementarity between both mechanisms: JMP provides information on the access of the population to "improved" drinking-water sources and sanitation facilities; these estimates are based on an established standard set of definitions and comparable among countries and across time. Whereas JMP measures the water and sanitation sector outcomes, GLAAS monitors the inputs required to extend and sustain water and sanitation systems and services, i.e. analyses the factors associated with progress. The GLAAS process enables countries to discuss and identify national water and sanitation priorities and barriers to service provision. Twelve countries from the WHO European region participated in the GLAAS 2013/2014 reporting cycle.
10. National monitoring of access to water and sanitation services is based on national definitions and standards and aims to support the development of national strategies and the planning of measures, while global monitoring is based on internationally harmonized definitions and aims at international benchmarking and identification of priorities. Using global monitoring information for describing the national situation might therefore sometimes be inappropriate. However, various GLAAS indicators related to governance,

monitoring, human resources and financing of the water and sanitation sector could support baseline and target setting under the Protocol, as well as could become possible indicators for reporting.

11. Representatives from Albania, Georgia, Norway and Romania mentioned the need to identify clear national focal points to receive requests to become involved in GLAAS and JMP in order to facilitate the involvement of countries in those monitoring programmes. It was suggested that the focal points for the Protocol could also be JMP and GLAAS focal points.

12. Four groups then discussed how the reporting under the Protocol could be linked better to global monitoring programmes and shared views on the added value of GLAAS and JMP in baseline and target setting and in reporting under the Protocol. The outcomes are presented below.

a) There are national challenges to monitoring and reporting on water, sanitation and health

- A lack of inter-institutional cooperation at the national level is a common challenge. The different national institutions involved in monitoring the national status of water, sanitation and health (such as water, health, environment, housing, regional development, statistic departments, and/or service providers) need to be identified and their respective roles and responsibilities in monitoring (e.g. water quality, water related diseases, service quality, etc.) clarified.
- Mechanisms for intersectional cooperation and for data exchange exist in most countries; however, they are not always fully operational. Such mechanisms are useful to develop consolidated national reports, taking into account a broad range of data.
- International obligations to report on water, sanitation and health status often foster intersectoral communication and coordination at the national level, as they require data from different institutions.
- Some key stakeholders, in particular water and sanitation operators, need guidance and training on how to collect data, based on good practices, to ensure the production of data of harmonized quality. It would facilitate the aggregation of data and the reporting at the national level.

b) Data gathered through existing international monitoring systems on water, health and sanitation could help countries in setting a baseline situation, defining priority targets and reporting under the Protocol

- Global monitoring data can be used in baseline analysis and target setting under the Protocol. Particularly, GLAAS can support the analysis of gaps and weaknesses, in particular in relation to governance, human resources and financing. Such information could be translated into national targets under the Protocol. However, data collected under JMP are not suitable as they are insufficiently detailed.
- The current JMP mostly monitors access to water and sanitation. Future monitoring under JMP in the post-2015 agenda might monitor access in more detail: disaggregated data on access (e.g. by gender, wealth, or other settings than households) would support reporting under the Protocol in relation to equity of access to water and sanitation.

c) There is a significant opportunity to harmonize indicators used under the Protocol with indicators of existing global reporting mechanisms

- There is a need to harmonize definitions (such as urban vs. rural, public vs. private, large vs. small systems) and indicators used by national and global monitoring mechanisms. This would facilitate the development of a common database and unified reporting format.
- The revision of the JMP reporting in line with post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals (SDG) provides opportunity to harmonize definitions.
- Many indicators used under global monitoring mechanisms could provide useful information for the reporting under the Protocol.

d) Common indicators of the national summary reports under the Protocol should be revised to better reflect the situation of water, sanitation and health at the country level

- Common indicators used in the national summary reports under the Protocol provide a good overview of the water and health situation at the country level. However, some complementary indicators could be added, depending on countries' priorities, for example related to gender, equity of access to water and sanitation, affordability of water and sanitation services, financing mechanisms, professional capacity and level of education of service providers, wastewater treatment and reuse, hygiene practices, health promotion activities, etc.
- Monitoring under the Protocol at the national level can mask some subnational disparities within the country, for example in terms of water quality, water-related diseases or access to services.
- Some common indicators for monitoring water-related diseases are not appropriate. Other or additional pathogens should be monitored to reflect countries' priorities in this field.
- Indicators used in the national summary report should be reviewed vis-à-vis the Protocol priority areas as well as forthcoming water SDG targets. The possibility of including indicators for monitoring implementation of water safety plans (WSPs), equity of access to water and sanitation and status of small-scale drinking water and sanitation systems should be considered.

Session 3: Proposed post-2015 development agenda related to water, sanitation and health

13. A representative of UN-Water presented the key findings and recommendations from UN-Water for a proposed post-2015 global goal for water. The Open Working Group (OWG) had issued a "zero draft" which included a set of 17 potential SDGs, including a water, sanitation and hygiene related goal "Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all". The OWG proposal would be presented to the UN General Assembly in September 2014.
14. The secretariat introduced a document presenting opportunities for the Protocol to support the implementation and monitoring of an SDG on water, sanitation and hygiene in the post-2015 agenda. The Protocol could be a good instrument to support implementation of such a goal in the pan-European region as it offers a legal framework for setting national targets and reporting and its target areas address possible water SDG targets.
15. A representative of WHO specifically focused on the post-2015 monitoring mechanism for wastewater management, water quality and water resource management. She highlighted the existing gaps in monitoring wastewater management, wastewater reuse and water efficiency both under the Protocol and under global monitoring mechanisms. The representative of the Republic of Moldova confirmed that sanitation is often not sufficiently recognized in global and national agendas, while there is a need for more indicators to monitor sustainable sanitation. A representative of Kazakhstan highlighted the need to monitor effluents from industrial waste.

Session 4: Atlas on Water and Health - One-stop information source on water, sanitation and water-related diseases

16. A representative of the WHO Collaborating Centre for Health Promoting Water Management and Risk Communication presented how the Atlas on Water and Health could support reporting under the Protocol. The Atlas presents regional data on water, sanitation and health and supports analysis of such data from different data sources. It integrates a temporal dimension, making possible comparisons over time. She highlighted that, when reporting under the Protocol, Parties often use different units and methods to report on similar parameters, which makes it difficult to compare data in the region. The Atlas, which so far has been used mostly as a source of information, could support countries in reporting under the Protocol by proposing

an on-line summary report template. The Atlas could further combine data from different sources of information in addition, such as GLAAS and JMP.

17. Participants recognized that using the Atlas might indeed facilitate reporting under the Protocol. They highlighted that a short (2-page) country summary report linking water, health and environment would be very useful for communicating the main findings of the summary reports. Such a report could be inspired by the GLAAS country profile. Some participants advised to include reporting on non-communicable diseases in the reporting under the Protocol.

Session 5: Main messages and vision for future reporting under the Protocol

18. The Chair of the Bureau to the Protocol summarized that:

- Utilizing synergies between JMP and GLAAS and the Protocol will facilitate situation analysis, target setting and reporting under the Protocol.
 - Collaboration between the organizations responsible for global monitoring mechanisms and the Protocol bodies is necessary to reflect further on possible synergies between the different monitoring and reporting mechanisms. In particular, definitions should be harmonized.
 - The current template for summary reports under the Protocol needs to be revised to reflect priority areas of the work under the Protocol, for which progress is not currently monitored, such as WSP, equity of access to water and sanitation, as well as small-scale water supply and sanitation systems.
 - Monitoring and reporting on the status of sanitation is currently a main gap in the work under the Protocol. The joint secretariat should become involved in the reflection on possible common indicators for monitoring sanitation in order to facilitate harmonization and synergies between forthcoming global monitoring efforts and reporting under the Protocol.
 - The Atlas on Water and Health could be developed further to support evaluation and improve communication of the progress realized under the Protocol.
-