

Case studies on target-setting

Meeting of Parties

Geneva, 14-16 November 2016



Target setting in an EU country – case study from Hungary

- * In Hungary, Protocol ratification and EU accession overlapped in time
- * Some targets are in line with the EU obligations (drinking water, bathing water, urban waste water) – legal pressure and financial support assist implementation
- * Several other targets are outside the scope of EU legislation (enclosed bathing waters, equity and affordability aspects, safe management, water related disease, information to the public, remediation of contaminated sites)

Lessons learnt:

- * Countries in the EU accession process can use the Protocol to phase steps towards EU obligations via intermediate targets, target dates and indicators
- * For member states, Protocol is a tool for going beyond EU requirement
- * The Protocol also allows for defining national priorities

Case study from Albania:

Merging coordination of water and sanitation policies under a single intersectoral structure

Thematic group “Water for people” is established and fulfilling obligations under the Protocol is included in its working agenda

Success factors and lessons learned

Challenges

- current regulatory framework approximated to EU legislation exceeds capacities
- overlap of institutional responsibilities
- low capacity at local level
- lack of an integrated monitoring system
- limited financial capacity

- High priority accorded by the Albanian Government
- Political will fostered inter-ministerial cooperation
- Engaging central and local government, private actors and civil society
- The baseline analysis highlighted problems and challenges

How to replicate this practice

- Formalize cooperation between responsible ministries and other stakeholders in the water sector.
- Make use of already existing appropriate mechanisms instead of creating a new one specifically for the target-setting process.
- Establish coordination mechanisms at local level, which could serve to realistically develop and efficiently implement local plans on water and sanitation.

Case study from Serbia: Baseline analysis benefiting from GLAAS

- * **Prerequisite:** Efficient coordination mechanism
- * Essential for prioritizing and setting targets
- * **GLAAS reporting cycle in parallel:**
 - * Complementary data collection tool – valuable source of information
- * **Challenges:**
 - * Data gaps
 - * First joint sectoral review
 - * Limited time frame
- * **Lessons learned / Recommendations:**
 - * GLAAS process facilitates baseline analysis
 - * baseline analysis is not a static but rather dynamic
 - * Publish the baseline analysis to raise awareness

Case study by MAMA-86: Public involvement on target setting

* **Challenges:**

- * Lack of understanding/acceptance of PP by authorities
- * Lack of capacities/resources to organize public consultations
- * Administrative reforms → staff changes in authorities

* **Role of MAMA-86 in overcoming challenges:**

- * Organization of public hearings and consultations
- * Raise funds to facilitate PP process
- * Communicate results of PP process to competent authority and Target-setting drafting group

* **Success factors:**

- * Experienced umbrella NGO with 19 branches at local-regional levels
- * Financial support by international partners
- * Government institutions willing to accept PP input

* **Recommendations:**

- * Involvement and support of NGOs/other stakeholders (capacity, financing)
- * Allocate dedicated and adequate resources

Case study from Norway: Developing a dynamic action plan to implement the targets

- * Ministry of Health and Care Services developed an action plan to achieve the national targets on water and health.
- * Designed to be a dynamic document subject to reviews to ensure that the most efficient measures.

Why is it a good practice?

- * Norwegian targets set at a general level
- * Action plan : flexible system with specific and realistic measures to be achieved within a shorter time frame, easing the review and evaluation of progress.
- * Concrete responsibilities of the different authorities concerned → increases commitment and a sense of ownership.

Overcoming challenges

- * Making the action plan concise, specific and realistic (content and time frame)
 - * Structure: 1) strengthened enforcement, 2) information, 3) organizing and competence, 4) knowledge and research, 5) international cooperation and 6) documentation.

Success factors and lessons learned

- * Short-term and realistic deadlines facilitates focus , stakeholder agreement and contributes to effective implementation.
- * Regular monitoring of progress and review of measures enabled dynamic and realistic achievement of targets.