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# Introduction (background, objectives, target audience)

The objective of the collection of good practices is to serve as a set of concrete recommendations for countries that are in the process of setting, revising or implementing their targets, as well as reporting on the progress achieved in accordance with the Protocol on Water and Health.

The collection aims at complementing the *Guidelines on the Setting of Targets, Evaluation of Progress and Reporting[[1]](#footnote-2)* (Target Setting Guidelines) by focusing on how the Guidelines have been implemented in practice.

Key success factors, challenges and lessons learned are identified and illustrated in the form of case studies contributed by Parties to the Protocol and other States that highlight some good (as well as bad) practices that may be of use to countries in all stages of the target setting process.



Figure 1. Logical framework for the process of setting targets

# Relevance to global and regional processes

* 1. 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

The Protocol on Water and Health has been positioned as a powerful tool to promote and operationalize the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030) and its Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

 With its strong integrated and intersectoral approach, its focus on prevention and on the whole water cycle and its attention to safety and equity aspects, the Protocol’s provisions and principles fully align with SDG 6: “ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all”. The Protocol can therefore be a tool to operationalize the implementation of Goal 6 and to foster its achievement in the pan-European region.

Moreover, the Protocol supports the implementation of other SDGs pertinent to water, sanitation and health, including Goal 1 on ending poverty, Goal 2 on improving nutrition, Goal 3 on ensuring health lives and well-being, Goal 4 on equitable quality education, Goal 11 on safe, resilient and sustainable cities and Goal 13 on combating climate change and its impacts.

The Protocol’s planning and accountability approach can offer its Parties and other States a practical framework for them to translate the ambitions of Agenda 2030 into specific national targets and action.

Activities under the programme of work of the Protocol are also expected to promote the implementation of such targets, offer guidance and capacity development and provide an intergovernmental regional platform to facilitate exchange of experience on the implementation of the water, sanitation and health aspects of Agenda 2030.

* 1. EU Directives

Setting targets in countries that are member States of the EU is an issue that deserves special attention. There is no comprehensive overlap between the scope of the EU directives and the legal provisions of the Protocol on Water and Health. While most target areas under article 6 of the Protocol are in line with the EU directives such as drinking water, bathing water, urban wastewater and water framework directives, other important potential target areas are rather complimentary to the EU legislation (equity and affordability aspects, enclosed bathing waters, remediation of contaminated sites and information to public, etc.).

Hence, as the Protocol requires Parties to address the entire water cycle, as long as the EU Member States have not set targets under the Protocol, they would not be considered to be fully compliant with the Protocol by only implementing EU directives, as the EU legislation does not fully cover the entire water cycle and some important dimensions of access to water and health.

The Protocol, however, provides EU member states with a platform for defining and addressing national priorities that are outside or beyond the scope of the EU legislation. Furthermore, the Protocol can also aid the setting of other objectives, more ambitious than those of the EU directives, to improve the situation with water resources and health and well-being of the citizens.

At the same time, EU member states are well-positioned to successfully implement the Protocol as once targets are set, including in areas not covered by the EU legislation, the obligations under the EU provide legal pressure and facilitate financial support for their achievement.

The first step of the target setting process - undertaking a baseline analysis, a crucial step in the Protocol’s target setting phase, is also a requirement in many target areas for the *acquis communautaire* with the consequent opportunity to establish synergies.

EU member states can also benefit from the Protocol as a tool for phasing implementation of the existing obligations (via defining intermediate targets, targets dates and indicators).

Similarly, the Protocol would be a useful tool for the countries that are in the process of approximation to the EU.

**Case studies by Czech Republic, Hungary and Slovenia - pending**

***The benefit of the existing EHP Environment and Health process on for supporting the target setting process – Slovenia (Pending)***

**Setting targets in areas not covered by the EU legislation – Hungary** ***(Pending)***

Since majority of the funds in the water sector comes from the European Union, major targets involving large-scale investments are in line with EU requirements. In other target areas, less resource intensive targets were identified, e.g. registry of enclosed bathing water or establishing legal requirement for water safety planning in water utilities.

Protocol as a complementary tool for other legal and policy tools - Slovakia

***Case summary***

*Slovakia established their targets in 2007 and revised in 2014.* *The Public Health Authority and the Ministry of Environment of the Slovak Republic are responsible organisations for the Protocol. Some of the national targets are related to the implementation of EU directives, international conventions and bilateral agreements and some address particular areas, e.g. water supply and sanitation, safety and quality of drinking water (with regard to pesticides, disinfection by-products, etc, determination of cyanobacteria and cyanotoxins, elimination of environmental loads, diagnostic of enteroviruses in bathing water, spreading of information about mineral water etc. After broad consultations and disseminations through expert forums, conferences and publications via magazines and web pages, the Slovak government approved the revised targets in 2014.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*Slovak Republic is a member of the European Union and has implemented requirements of European Union directives, European and national legislation requirements. Moreover many others relevant policy documents and tools (for example Agenda 2030, Agenda 21, Parma Declaration, NEHAP, CEHAP, Right to Water and Sanitation) are focused on main objective - to improve health of people, environment and living conditions.*

*The capacity building, sharing of information among sectors, strengthening of intersectoral cooperation, creation of national working group under the Protocol on Water and Health, etc are the additional benefits of the target setting process which are good practices. The most important result is that stakeholders acknowledged that by setting and fulfilment of national targets, water quality will improve which has positive impact on health of inhabitants and environment.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The main barriers/challenges in process of targets setting were deficiencies in basic background information about Protocol on Water and Health, its targets areas and responsibilities. Further, insufficient information what individual institutions perform (specifications, assignments of institutions, competencies, main problems etc). Weakness in this process of national targets fulfilment is lack of finance and personal capacities.*

*The first step in process of a new and revised national target preparation was organizing of intersectoral national meeting focused on information about the Protocol on Water and Health activities. Participants have been informed about objectives of the Protocol, its key activities and activities which have been done in Slovakia, the Program of work of WHO and UNECE, current priorities, water problem and gaps.*

*Problem is lack of human capacities, special skilled persons, because changes of jobs. This has a negative impact on continuity of Protocol on Water and Health implementation process.*

*For fulfilment of tasks and challenges in future (e.g. climate change impact) there is a need for increasing of financial budgets in all concerned sectors.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *quick exchange of information*
* *intersectoral cooperation*
* *reporting of achievements to national government*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *The Protocol is undeniable tool for the solution of existing and also for emerging problems  (cyanotoxins in water reservoir, enteroviruses...) not yet covered by EU Directives.*
* *Establishing an intersectoral working group for the target setting with persons also responsible for/involved in other legal and policy tools like EU Directives, etc*

# Institutional arrangements for setting and implementing targets

**Protocol text**

Article 6, paragraph 5 (a)

In order to promote the achievement of the targets referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, the Parties shall each establish national or local arrangements for coordination between their competent authorities;

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The process of target setting should be led by the main competent authorities (depending on national setting, the Ministry of Health and/or Environment), in close cooperation with a broad range of concerned stakeholders responsible for the overall implementation of the Protocol, including at highest governmental level.

In order to bring together all stakeholders concerned in the process of target setting and to create an appropriate coordination mechanism, depending on the country’s institutional set-up, either use could be made of existing structures and networks or a specific, inter-ministerial committee/working group could be established.

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* A tiered implementation arrangement is used by most partners: I- a smaller Drafting Group consisting of resource personnel from the main state stakeholders, an NGO representative, other resource personnel (often external consultants) and a coordinator; II- Stakeholder consultation group: Representing all stakeholders at the operational level; III- Higher level representatives of the stakeholders empowered with decision making authority.
* Formalisation of the groups with relevant mandates, especially the higher level representatives, is useful when allocating necessary human and financial resources. Resource personnel in state organisations often seemed to have limited capacities, despite their competence and willingness. Hence, the involvement of consultants provided comparatively better progress.
* Formal, accountable and continued cooperation is ensured by using existing national coordination mechanisms and platforms, such as the Steering Committees under the National Policy Dialogues or National Water Councils, as stakeholder group or/and implementation group. The working process was often able to start immediately due to well-established cooperation structures and long-standing relationships between committee and group members.
* Some countries formalised the target setting process for inter-ministerial collaboration as a part of the process of accession/ratifying the Protocol.
* Involvement of leading competent authorities and other stakeholders, including a shared buy-in by key ministries and sub-national (regional/local) authorities dealing with environment, water and health, is crucial to securing support during the target setting and implementation process.
* The formalisation of inter-ministerial cooperation (e.g. through a cabinet decision or a joint order/decision by the two leading ministries) is recommended to ensure its continuity and effectiveness. A formal structure will promote mobilisation of the involvement of other relevant ministries in the process.
* Involvement of higher management in ministries and departments at the technical level (e.g. at the level of head of department), in addition to the political leadership, proves valuable when coping with political changes and ironing-out other bottlenecks. Involvement of dedicated members with personal commitment and leadership (i.e. national focal points) in the inter-sectoral mechanisms is also highly productive.
* Securing an understanding of the obligations of ratification among government officials is important as generally raises awareness of the Protocol.
* Involvement of nongovernmental organisations representing the general public and branch organisations (e.g. waterworks associations) have proven to be highly productive in driving and promoting the process of setting and implementing targets, as well as pointing out specific challenges that might be less frequently addressed at national levels.
* Countries experience variable contributions and attitudes from state stakeholders. On some occasions, involvements were even counter-productive. Neutral facilitators and a select few devoted ambassadors (e.g. personal involvement of a high-profiled officer and support by a high-level decision maker) produced efficient solutions and good progress.
* Sharing experiences with other countries, through the Protocol meetings and by inviting resource personnel involved in coordinating the target setting processes, were acknowledged as productive.

Involving different stakeholders in target setting - Norway

***Case summary***

*Norway has chosen a three-tier model to draft, consult and endorse the national targets.*

*The Ministry of Health and Care Services (responsible ministry for the Protocol) in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, appointed the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (NFSA) to coordinate the drafting of targets in cooperation with relevant governmental bodies, such as the Norwegian Institute of Public Health and the Norwegian Environment Agency. Norwegian Water (Norsk Vann), the national association representing Norway's water industry was also included.*

*The Stakeholder Consultative Group at the ministerial level was formed with representatives from the Ministry of Health and Care Services (leader of the group), Ministry of Climate and Environment, Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The consultative group oversaw the drafting group’s work and progress, alongside providing a higher level consultative forum. The intention of the group was to provide a forum for discussing questions related to drinking water in general, and not only on matters solely connected to the Protocol on Water and Health.*

*The targets proposed by the drafting group were submitted to the consultative group for consultation and endorsement, followed by the government finalising the targets in 2014.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The organisation of the target setting process was successful as it secured the involvement of all relevant ministries by drawing from the experiences and knowledge of the directorates with their respective responsibilities related to drinking water, wastewater and disease control. Hence, any target setting proposals were made by the officials that were most knowledgeable on the status, needs, challenges and potential solutions for each target. The involvement of Norwegian Water secured shared understanding and helped describe the need and challenges at national and local levels.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The main challenge at the governmental level was the lack of understanding of the need for national targets under the Protocol, due to the perception of their comprehensive coverage through EU-regulations and directives. Furthermore, it is a commonly held understanding that water and water supply are concerns for the municipalities rather than for ministries. The problems in the sector were also generally perceived as very small.*

*Increasing awareness by documenting facts to politicians was the key to overcoming these challenges. Information related to the existing challenges was relayed and the Protocol was presented as a good tool to deal with the challenges. The need to take action was mentioned in all relevant budget documents, in white papers on public health and in proposals for new legislation. Ultimately, over the course of a few years, both the Parliament and the (changing) governments acknowledged the message.*

*Other sources of information helped the recognition of the targets, such as the independent report made by the Association of Consulting Engineers of Norway and the National Waterworks Association that identified water and sanitation as areas in need of action where standards were sinking.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Establishment of the implementation groups representing board stakeholder groups unveiled the perceptions challenging the target setting process, and also enabled dealing with them strategically.*
* *Stability in the group of personnel dealing with the preparation and development of the targets and the target setting process.*
* *Working on harmonising the understandings of the needs, challenges and actions required at all administrative levels, took more time than the two years foreseen by the Protocol.*
* *Setting targets and winning acceptance of the need to set targets takes time and effort because the Protocol remains an unknown entity in comparison to the EU Directives among e.g. politicians.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Create a platform or use an existing platform where the different authorities can meet and discuss challenges.*
* *Consider involving several levels of administration – it is vital that the challenges are recognised at all relevant sectors and levels.*
* *Acknowledge that it may take longer time than others report. Take the necessary time to create a consensus.*

An inter-sectoral body with a mandate for coordination - Hungary

***Case summary***

*Hungary was among the first countries to ratify the Protocol. The Government Decree 213/2005 declared the ratification of the Protocol and appointed the ministers of Health and Environment to facilitate the national implementation. An inter-sectoral body - the Special Committee on Water and Health - was established under the Public Health Inter-ministerial Committee (Stakeholder Consultative Committee) and mandated to coordinate implementation at the operational level.*

*The Special Committee (Drafting Group) involved various governmental bodies and institutions responsible for environment, water management, health, water utility regulation, public health and epidemiology. Non-governmental organisations were also represented, mainly by professional associations of water utilities, enclosed bathing water operators and environment protection NGOs.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*Target setting areas under the Protocol cover many areas of expertise and responsibilities, some of which are outside the scope of the main responsible institutions. A dedicated inter-sectoral body with a coordination mandate is therefore a key element in successful implementation. Each stakeholder should propose targets in their respective work areas. The inter-sectoral body assesses these proposals and look to prioritise and decide approvals.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The target setting process in Hungary started very early, well before the publication of the Guidelines for Target Setting and Reporting. Hence, it was a challenge to build the process without relying on previous experience. Though the target setting process itself was not hindered, the lack of guidance resulted in broadly defined, non-measurable indicators in some target areas. This challenge was managed during the revision of the targets when the rationale of indicators was better understood.*

*The Special Committee also served as a platform for information exchange on other related areas outside the direct scope of the Protocol by bringing together various expertises in connection with water and heath, which was a positive added value.*

*Five years after the ratification of the Protocol, major governmental reorganisation resulted in the abolition of the lead committee – the Public Health Inter-ministerial Committee, thus terminating the formalised mandate of the Special Committee on Water and Health. However, the members of the Special Committee continued – and still continue – to interact in a more informal way. However, further progress under the Protocol is highly dependent on the personal dedication of the involved experts. Initiatives were taken to revive a formal re-establishment of the Special Committee. Official mandate facilitates the involvement of government officers and allows for allocating budget to the actions of the Special Committee. In the absence of a dedicated budget line, activities are dependent on funding provided by the participating institutions.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *A formalised inter-sectoral body with a mandate for coordination is essential to successful implementation.*
* *Strong personal commitment among the members of the drafting group.*
* *Availability of funding should be taken into account to set realistic and achievable targets.*
* *Prioritising less resource intensive targets (e.g. data acquisition, dissemination etc).*
* *The same Special Committee should be involved in progress reporting, to enable identifying needs for revision etc.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Countries should aim to establish a formalised inter-sectoral body for the coordination of target setting, implementation and reporting. The body should have wide representation of expertise including water management, water utilities, public health, epidemiology, environmental protection, agriculture etc. The involvement of NGOs provides a critical feedback to the government-based bodies.*
* *The target setting body should have an allocated budget for its activities.*
* *Both target setting and reporting should be coordinated by the panel of experts in the inter-sectoral body. This extends the scale of expertise and enables the panel to summarise potential targets, discuss their relevance and jointly set priorities. An inter-sectoral coordinating body also enables consistent and reliable reporting.*
* *Targets should be in line with the financial realities and remain cost-efficient in target areas where sufficient resources are not available.*

Use of existing organisational structures for target setting - Germany

***Case summary***

*The drafting group In Germany was an ad-hoc group established at the national level with representatives of the Federal Ministry of Health, the Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety, the German Environment Agency and the Robert Koch Institute, including the national focal points for the Protocol on Water and Health. This group developed a baseline analysis for the target setting areas stipulated under article 6 of the Protocol and developed draft targets for the areas where action was deemed appropriate.*

*Stakeholder Consultation was conducted by using existing mechanisms. Germany is a Federal Republic with 16 Federal States. Coordinating the target setting process with the Federal States was necessary to achieve consensus for the targets and their implementation. This was achieved by coordinating the development of the baseline analysis and draft targets through existing mechanisms. Hence, coordination was conducted with the already existing joint working groups on water, drinking water, wastewater and bathing water, which include representatives of the Federal States and the Federal authorities at the national level, in addition to the German Technical and Scientific Association for Gas and Water. Feedback from the respective working groups was incorporated and the targets were finalised and submitted in 2011.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The organisation is considered good because it secured the involvement of all relevant ministries and national institutions, and involved the relevant bodies at the Federal State level. The target setting process was able to make good use of existing structures while steering at the national level, as working groups in this area were already well-established in Germany.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The Federal States needed convincing of the added value of the Protocol on Water and Health, a new international tool that represented a new approach. This may have been caused by mainly involving the national level Federal authorities in the Protocol processes, rather than the Federal States themselves directly. The Federal States were made aware of the process through updates via email and during regular meetings about the status of target implementation and further activities under the Protocol, for example under the activity on small-scale water supplies and sanitation systems.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The target setting process took advantage of already established and well-functioning working groups and lines of communication. As a result, the implementation of the Protocol avoided being perceived as additional work on top of already ongoing activities by integrating into the already existing cooperative structures existing between the national level Federal authorities and the sub-national Federal States’ level.*
* *Knowledge about the Protocol and acceptance of the target setting process increased by involving the Federal States and – as appropriate - other stakeholders at an early stage of the target setting process. Increasing awareness of the Protocol and the related needs have been an important factor.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *In the context of a Federal State or a similar structure; if already in place, existing structures of cooperation between the national level and the Federal States should be used.*
* *If these structures do not yet exist, they could be established under the Protocol. They may be used beyond this purpose, for other cooperative activities.*
* *Both national and federal levels must be involved.*

Using new organisational structures in parallel to the existing ones - Albania

*During a consultation process with the Compliance Committee of the Protocol regarding its implementation, the establishment of a mechanism for ensuring inter-sectoral coordination among responsible authorities was advised as an important factor to ensure successful implementation of the Protocol. This advice was in line with the Albanian Government’s recent actions in the water sector, and was to be one of its policy priorities. The group on Integrated Management of Water Policy and the sub-thematic group “Water for people” were established through two orders by the prime-minister. The responsibility of the subgroup "Water for people" is to facilitate the process of formulation and implementation of government policies and strategic objectives aimed at improving the quality of water supply, sanitation and urban waste water treatment, ensuring the fulfilment of standards and the protection of the aquatic environment and public health.*

*The subgroup is led by the Ministry of Transport and Infrastructure and composed by the Ministry of Urban Development, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Agriculture, Rural Development and Water Administration, Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Economic Development, Tourism, Trade and Entrepreneurship and Ministry of European Integration. The chair of the subgroup is held by a high-level official while its member positions are held by mid-level officials.*

*At the request of the chair, the meeting can be attended by representatives of other institutions of central and local government, business, civil society and academia. The thematic subgroup meets at least twice a month.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The formalisation of institutional arrangements is considered a good practice because the new sectoral approach aims to ensure inter-sectoral coordination. This process guarantees a high level management structure that facilitates the preparation, implementation, monitoring and integrated regulation of policies in the water sector. Ultimately, it provides a coordinated action with regard to the implementation of the Protocol’s provisions, as well as a forum for regular exchange of information on its implementation.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The process of institutional arrangement was a smooth process thanks to the government’s high priority of the water sector. During the analysis undertaken by the subgroup the following challenges were identified:*

* *Completion of the EU Acquis Communautaire approximation;*
* *Cases of overlapping responsibilities among different institutions related to water management;*
* *Human resources capacity building, mainly at the local level;*
* *Lack of an integrated monitoring system;*
* *Limited financial capacity.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Political will and formalisation of an inter-ministerial cooperation resulted in the involvement of all responsible ministries.*
* *Involvement of high-level and mid-level officials;*
* *Involvement of other institutions of central and local government, private actors, civil society, etc.;*
* *Analysis of the situation highlighted problems, then formulated and implemented policies in important economic sectors. This brought about the desire for a new approach to inter-sectoral coordination and sustainability of work.*

***How to replicate this practice ?***

* *It is very important to formalise the cooperation between responsible ministries and other stakeholders in the water sector. The involvement of all related stakeholders ensures more responsive and accountable outcomes.*
* *In cases where a similar mechanism exists, it is efficient to use it instead of creating a new one. The same mechanism could be established at the local level.*

***Opportunities and challenges of broad stakeholder involvement – Ukraine***

***Case summary***

*Ukraine has been a party to the Protocol on Water and Health since 2003. According to the order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine from 2003 “On implementation of the Action Plan for implementation of the Law on Ratification of Protocol”, the Ministry of Environmental Protection is appointed as the central executive body responsible for controlling the implementation of the Action Plan and serving as the focal point for communicating with the Protocol Secretariat.*

*The Ministry of Environmental Protection established an Interdepartmental Consultative Group (Project Steering Committee) on Protocol implementation consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Environmental Protection (Chair), Ministry of Health, Ministry of Communal Services, Secretariat of the Cabinet of Ministries, State Water Committee and the State group on policy analyses and development on water management issues. The Working Group also included a team of observers with representatives from the Protocol on Water and Health UNECE/WHO, Ad-hoc Project facilitation mechanism, the Norwegian government (financing agency), National Implementing Agency and the International Implementing Agency.*

*A Project Reference Group (Working Group) was established and comprised of operational level representatives from the members of the Consultative Group, supplemented with members from the State Fishery Committee, State Geological Service, Ecological Inspection, NGOs, professional associations and academia.*

*Understanding the complexity of requirements of the Protocol’s target setting format and procedures, the Ministry in May 2008 requested the Project Facilitation Mechanism [[2]](#footnote-3)of the Protocol to provide international assistance to Ukraine for the national targets setting process. An agreement was signed by the Ministry of Environmental Protection, who nominated national consultants to the project, while the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs appointed the Norwegian consultants. The consultants formed the targets drafting team, which frequently reported to the Project Reference Group.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*А large number of stakeholders have been involved in the process of working on the development and establishment of the targets, through a three-tiered structure: Drafting group, stakeholder group (Project Reference Group, PRG) and a higher-level Consultative Group (Project Steering Committee, PSG) working as a team and achieving good results within a short period. All three teams were appointed by the ministry responsible for the Protocol, underpinning a sense of ownership. Both PRG and PSG represented a broad group of stakeholders, including NGOs.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*Limited financial and human capacities at the lead ministry were compensated by support from an international donor with funds and human resources. Political and administrative changes in the middle of the target setting process caused changes in the composition of the PRG and PSG, which substantially delayed the process. Priorities were developed mainly within stakeholder organisations, without broad consultations with other stakeholders. However, substantial work by an umbrella NGO (MAMA 86) improved the targets through extensive public consultations.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Ukraine’s experience shows that multi-stakeholder consultations during the process of target setting and implementing targets are a great advantage in securing support during the target setting and implementation process.*
* *External financial and human resources assisted the Ministry of Environmental Protection in overcoming inadequate capacities.*
* *Involvement of an NGO provided inputs outside the Consultative Group.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *The drafting and stakeholder group(s) should represent all relevant stakeholders, including NGOs.*
* *Financial assistance from UNECE and other donors ensure faster and efficient progress.*

Starting target setting with formal collaboration – Serbia

***Case summary***

*The Republic of Serbia became a party to the Protocol in 2013. Soon after, the target setting process commenced by signing an inter-ministerial agreement between ministries responsible for health, environmental protection and water management. The agreement resulted in the establishment of the National Working Group (NWG), the Drafting Group, led by the Ministry of Health. Good inter-sectoral collaboration was crucial to**setting the national targets and target dates in a timely manner. An additional success factor was the dedicated work of national team members.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*This case study illustrates the usefulness of implementing and undertaking all the essential steps of the target setting process, starting with the establishment of good and efficient coordination mechanisms and inter-sectoral collaboration. Commencing the process soon after the ratification of the Protocol, and further effective time management, resulted in setting national targets and target dates within two years of becoming a Party to the Protocol.*

***Overcoming the challenges***

*The lack of both awareness and involvement of higher management in stakeholder ministries were addressed through the workshop held in Belgrade, supported by UNECE and WHO/Europe. This workshop gathered high level officials of both ministries and helped them realise their respective roles in the implementation process. Subsequently, the ministries accepted their duties, tasks and the need to support the promotional process at the local level to ensure cooperation with local agencies, institutions and NGOs. Barriers were overcome by identifying them at the regular meetings of the National Working Group (NWG), minimising their impact or avoiding them altogether.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *An efficient coordination mechanism for target setting and carrying out the baseline analysis led by the Ministry of Health commenced soon after the ratification of the Protocol.*
* *Good and effective inter-sectoral cooperation between different institutions at the national level ensured efficient joint action.*
* *Regular meetings of the NWG helped form clear and concrete tasks assigned to each team member responsible for relevant areas of work within specified time frames and deadlines.*
* *Effective time management and timely target setting.*
* *Dedicated work of the NWG members.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Establish an inter-sectoral working group to secure efficient collection of data for the baseline analysis by coordinating responsible institutions and experts;*
* *Share experience and lessons learned on the target setting process and implementation of the Protocol at the national and international workshops. It serves as a guide and stimulus for other countries with similar institutional set ups, helping them follow the described models and create successful stories in their countries.*
* *Advocacy of good practices and lessons learned gathered from national experiences could be of great support to countries with similar conditions and challenges, e.g. neighbouring countries.*

# Development of baseline analysis and prioritisation of issues

**Target Setting Guidelines**

A baseline analysis should be carried out for each specific target area of paragraph 2 (a) to (n) under the Protocol’s article 6. Based on existing sources of information to be compiled for the purposes of the Protocol, a baseline analysis should be made that encompasses a systematic and thorough review and assessment of the legislation, policy documents, data and information that describe prevailing conditions and provide expert judgments.

Analysis of data on the water, sanitation and health situation should help to identify specific problematic areas that require focus and attention. A preliminary assessment of key issues and problems should be made for each specific target area, based on the results of the baseline analysis.

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* The development of the baseline analysis is recommended to start as soon as possible after ratification, to enable successful establishment and publishing of targets within two years after ratification. It was found useful to start the development process immediately, in parallel with the ratification, in countries requiring more than two years for the initial target setting process.
* The scope of the baseline analysis should be defined at the outset of the process. It should be developed by the experts concerned to ensure that the focus remains on the most important issues while substantiating the existing problems. A vision on possible future targets will effectively direct the baseline analysis.
* Data for baseline reports may be originating from various sources. They could also taken from statistical databases, reports to GLAAS, MICS, JMP, other reports to WHO and EU. However, it is necessary to secure the quality of data included in the baseline report.
* In some cases, highly aggregated data (e.g. national averages) can camouflage specific problems, including those linked to local issues. It is therefore important to look at disaggregated data and/or rely on expert knowledge from sub-national and local levels.
* The absence of consolidated data in an area should not prevent the setting of targets. Gathering basic evidence on the issue, for instance through a rapid assessment, can become an integral part of the development of the baseline analysis. Expert judgment can also provide initial direction. Moreover, filling specific data gaps and/or strengthening the national monitoring capacity can become the focus of a target.
* Developing a comprehensive baseline analysis in all 20 target areas may be demanding. Complementary data collection tools or existing baselines developed in other contexts can be valuable sources of information and support the exercise. For example, participation in GLAAS[[3]](#footnote-4) results in a comprehensive analysis of strengths and challenges in water, sanitation and hygiene and has been proven to supplement baseline analysis and target setting under the Protocol.
* For EU Member States, it will be important to look beyond compliance with relevant EU Directives (e.g. on drinking water, bathing water and urban wastewater). A baseline analysis may identify prevailing conditions and issues of concern that may not be easily picked up through analyses of data reported under relevant Directives. Furthermore, the Protocol also requires looking into areas that are not explicitly addressed by the EU *acquis communautaire*.
* The baseline analysis is an important tool for further discussions on targets and should therefore be widely disseminated to reach out to all stakeholders. Its publication, for example through posting on the national Protocol website, and broad distribution are good practices.
* It may be useful to involve other regional partners in the development of baseline analysis.

Baseline analysis benefitting from GLAAS – Serbia

***Case summary***

*An inter-ministerial agreement between ministries responsible for health, environmental protection and water management in Serbia established the National Working Group (NWG), led by the Ministry of Health, to engage in the target setting process. The NWG conducted the baseline analysis as the first technical step in order to systematically review the legal framework (national and international) and the water, sanitation and health situation in Serbia. The analysis was essential to setting priority issues and implementation actions under the Protocol, and to Serbia’s participation in the GLAAS reporting cycle for 2014. The data gathered through the GLAAS process complemented and contributed to the baseline analysis. The baseline analysis was published as an electronic publication in order to disseminate and communicate its results to the public.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The establishment of good and efficient coordination mechanisms and inter-sectoral collaboration is important in the development of the baseline analysis.*

*The development of the baseline analysis proved to be a good practice and a tool for assessing the water related environmental and health situation in the country, including the national and international legal frameworks. The analysis became essential when prioritising the areas that would be addressed as targets. The development of the baseline analysis was initiated promptly after the ratification of the Protocol in order to meet the deadline. Throughout the GLAAS process, which commenced simultaneously with the development of the baseline analysis, the NWG learned to identify drivers and bottlenecks, knowledge gaps, strengths, weaknesses and challenges, as well as priorities that led to successes.*

***Overcoming the challenges***

*The data gaps and their poor quality in the baseline analysis was a significant challenge. This obstacle was overcome by setting targets such as rapid assessment of drinking water quality in rural areas, assessing water, sanitation and hygiene in schools, and improvement of data collection methodology for WASH in schools.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Regular meetings of the NWG with clear and concrete tasks assigned to each team member responsible for relevant areas of work within specified time frames and deadlines.*
* *Data collected through the GLAAS process complemented and facilitated the development of the baseline analysis.*
* *Publication of the baseline analysis ensured outreach to relevant stakeholders and the public.*
* *Dedicated work of NWG members.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Establish an efficient coordination mechanism with dedicated members.*
* *Provide efficient collection of data for baseline analysis through existing mechanisms like GLAAS and supplement with contributions from a broad National Working Group.*
* *Publish the baseline analysis to raise awareness.*

Use of existing organisational structures in developing the baseline analysis - Germany

***Case summary***

*In Germany, the development of the baseline analysis was coordinated with the already existing joint working mechanism to secure the involvement and ownership of the sub-national Federal States. An ad-hoc group was established at the national level comprising a broad list of stakeholders, which included the national focal points for the Protocol, to develop the baseline analysis.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The use of existing structures facilitated the involvement of the Federal States as well as contributions to and ownership of the baseline analysis.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The process required convincing the Federal States of the added value of the Protocol, a new international tool in view of the other processes where they were involved. Raising awareness through regularly updating the Federal States via email and during their regular meetings was helpful.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The baseline analysis benefitted from the already established and well-functioning working groups and lines of communication.*
* *The involvement of all relevant stakeholders at the national and Federal levels was instrumental in the efficient development of the baseline analysis.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Involvement of existing structures is strongly recommended to gain the advantage of access to formal working groups and established communication lines.*

**Case study: Belarus (pending)**

# Definition of draft targets

 **Protocol text**

Article 6, paragraph 2:

For these purposes, the Parties shall each establish and publish national and/or local targets for the standards and levels of performance that need to be achieved or maintained for a high level of protection against water-related disease. […]

Except where national or local circumstances make them irrelevant for preventing, controlling and reducing water-related disease, the targets shall cover, inter alia: […]

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The Protocol requires Parties to establish and publish national and/or local targets for the standards and levels of performance that need to be achieved or maintained for a high level of protection of human health and well-being, as well as for the sustainable management of water resources. Paragraph 2 (a) to (n) of article 6 of the Protocol identifies, inter alia, the general areas within which countries are required to set targets.

Targets, as commitments made to achieve a specific level of protection of human health and water resources, quality or service, should be understood in a very broad sense and not necessarily as quantifiable parameters only. For assessing progress and reporting purposes, reliable and valid quantitative and/or qualitative indicators need to be identified to measure progress towards targets.

For EU countries, several targets set may be closely related to existing EU requirements. Targets established under the Protocol can support and complement implementation of EU Directives in different ways by:

(a) Improving compliance. In a case where a Party faces compliance problems regarding specific obligations under the EU *acquis communautaire*, by setting targets it can develop a strategy to progressively improve such compliance;

(b) Complementing obligations of EU Directives. Parties may establish either more detailed or specific targets that go beyond current requirements of EU legislation or additional targets in areas that are currently not covered by EU legislation and which nevertheless are needed to address national problems.

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* Setting targets in all areas identified by the Protocol proves to be difficult. However, it is the only way of reflecting the Protocol’s holistic approach and ensuring compliance with its provisions. Prioritisation of issues is successfully carried out by setting short, medium and long-term target dates following an incremental approach that takes the capacity and resources available into account.
* The work carried out under the Protocol on surveillance, small-scale systems, equitable access and safe and efficient management of water supply and sanitation systems can be helpful to inform the definition of specific targets.
* Setting targets under the Protocol by Parties that are also members of the EU allows dealing with specific or emerging problems beyond the scope of EU legislation, or with a different approach or ambition.
* Targets should be SMART (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, Time-related).
* The drafting and approval process can be carried out in three stages; drafting (by a dedicated working group), consultation and intermediate approval (stakeholder discussions, including within NPD processes), approval (by two or more relevant ministries).
* The protocol target areas cover the whole water cycle, therefore it is required that Parties address all target areas in the process. Hence, it is advisable to create an understanding on this requirement among all stakeholders involved in the target setting process.

## Examples of targets in the target areas required under the Protocol

This section illustrates different possibilities of covering the following target areas (article 6.2 (a) to (n)) as well as other target areas with examples of targets set in different countries:

(a) The quality of the drinking water supplied, taking into account the Guidelines for drinking-water quality of the World Health Organization;

(b) The reduction of the scale of outbreaks and incidents of water-related disease;

(c) The area of territory, or the population sizes or proportions, which should be served by collective systems for the supply of drinking water or where the supply of drinking water by other means should be improved;

(d) The area of territory, or the population sizes or proportions, which should be served by collective systems of sanitation or where sanitation by other means should be improved;

(e) The levels of performance to be achieved by such collective systems and by such other means of water supply and sanitation respectively;

(f) The application of recognized good practice to the management of water supply and sanitation, including the protection of waters used as sources for drinking water;

(g) The occurrence of discharges of:

(i) Untreated waste water; and

(ii) Untreated storm water overflows from waste-water collection systems to waters within the scope of this Protocol;

(h) The quality of discharges of waste water from waste-water treatment installations to waters within the scope of this Protocol;

(i) The disposal or reuse of sewage sludge from collective systems of sanitation or other sanitation installations and the quality of waste water used for irrigation purposes, taking into account the Guidelines for the safe use of waste water and excreta in agriculture and aquaculture of the World Health Organization and the United Nations Environment Programme;

(j) The quality of waters which are used as sources for drinking water, which are generally used for bathing or which are used for aquaculture or for the production or harvesting of shellfish;

(k) The application of recognized good practice to the management of enclosed waters generally available for bathing;

(l) The identification and remediation of particularly contaminated sites which adversely affect waters within the scope of this Protocol or are likely to do so and which thus threaten to give rise to water-related disease;

(m) The effectiveness of systems for the management, development, protection and use of water resources, including the application of recognized good practice to the control of pollution from sources of all kinds;

(n) The frequency of the publication of information on the quality of the drinking water supplied and of other waters relevant to the targets in this paragraph in the intervals between the publication of information under article 7, paragraph 2.

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The Guidelines provide detailed guidance on how to decide upon specific targets in the different areas of article 6 paragraphs 2 (a) to (n) and how to choose relevant, target-specific indicators to measure progress towards such targets. They also provide indications on issues related to the baseline analysis, the identification of problems and the prioritization on the basis of which targets and target dates are set in the different areas.

Each thematic area is provided with a non-exhaustive list of issues to be considered for the process of target setting, which should serve as a starting point for a self-assessment. Parties will need to look at the proposed lists from their specific perspectives and may need to address additional issues depending on their own needs and situations. The process of target setting shall be accompanied by the identification of suitable target-related indicators to measure progress which might be of a quantitative or a qualitative nature.

*Table 1. An overview of target examples and their relevance to EU Directives and SDGs*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Target area and target example** | **EU** | **SDG** |
| **I. QUALITY OF THE DRINKING WATER SUPPLIED (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (a))** |  |  |
| * Reduction of non-compliance of drinking water quality according to national standards by xx% by 20xx.
 | X | 6.2 |
| * To improve collection and publication of drinking water quality monitoring data through development of an electronic information system
 | X | 6.2 |
| * Develop water safety plans for settlements by 20xx – in x major cities; ii - by 20xx – in xx rural communities.
 | X | 6.2 |
| * To develop plan for the improvement of microbiological and chemical quality of drinking water in rural areas
 | X | 6.2 |
| * To develop and establish a National program for improving quality of drinking water by 20xx.
 | X | 6.2 |
| * To adopt national legislation in health safety on drinking water quality by 20xx
 | X | 6.2 |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **REDUCTION OF THE SCALE OF OUTBREAKS AND INCIDENTS OF WATER-RELATED DISEASE (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (b))**
 |  |  |
| * xx% reduction of the occurrence of water-borne diseases compared to 20xx by 20xx: i) typhoid fever; ii) bacillary dysentery; iii) viral hepatitis; iv) diarrheal diseases; v) parasitic diseases
 |  | 6.2 |
| * To improve methodology for epidemiological investigation and assessment of water borne outbreaks
 |  | 6.2 |
| * Providing the latest equipment necessary laboratories for testing safety and quality of drinking water
 |  | 6.2 |
| * Regularly publish (once every five years) an overview of detected water-related epidemics, including identified causes etc.
 |  | 6.2 |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **ACCESS TO DRINKING WATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (c))**
 |  |  |
| * To improve the access to drinking water in urban areas to 97% in rural areas to 74% by 2020.
 | x | 6.2 |
| * Increase the access of children in schools and pre-school institutions to improve water supply sources
 | x | 6.2 |
| * Upgrade private water supply systems with unclear ownership/unsatisfactory water quality and security, or connect to existing water supply systems
 | X | 6.2 |
| * Mapping access to safe drinking water including underserved groups
 | x | 1 |
| * By 20xx ensure equal access to safe drinking water for children, pregnant and feeding women and elderly persons
 | X | 5.2 |
| * Secure 100% access to safe water to all educational, medical and social facilities
 | x |  |
|  |  |  |
| **IV. ACCESS TO SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (d))** |  |  |
| * To increase % of connections to centralized sewerage systems in rural areas
 |  | 6.3 |
| * Improve sanitation in educational facilities by construction of new sanitation systems including Ecosan toilets; xx by 20xx; a further xx by 20xx
 | x | 6.3 |
| * Mapping access to adequate sanitation including underserved groups
 | x | 1 |
| * Complete construction of waste water treatment plants and sewers for public use according to EU Directives
 | X | 6.3 |
| * To raise awareness of teachers, school staff and pupils on hygiene of the sanitation facilities in school
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Ensure by 20xx the development and implementation of technical regulations governing the construction and operation of improved treatment facilites, including small sanitation systems.
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Develop water and sanitation safety plans (WSSP)
 | x | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE OF COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS AND OTHER SYSTEMS FOR WATER SUPPLY (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (e))**
 |  |  |
| * Improve remaining 10% of water supply plants serving 5,000 residents that are below safety rating I or II, to safety rating I or II
 | X | X |
| * Leakages from the water distribution network shall be reduced to less than xx% by 20xx
 | X | X |
| * Non-planned interruptions in the water supply should be less than 0.5 hours on average per inhabitant per year
 | X | X |
| * Reduce economic losses due to water quality by securing improved small-scale water supply facilities and marginalised populations groups.
 | x | X |
|  |  |  |
| **VI. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE OF COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS AND OTHER SYSTEMS FOR SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (e) (continued))** |  |  |
| * Efficient collective sanitation systems in place
 |  | 6.3 |
| * Level of the population’s access to the centralized and local sewerage systems increased to xx% - for the urban population xx% - for the rural population
 | x | 6.3 |
| * Wastewater treatment levels as stated in the permits issued by the water boards
 | x | 6.3 |
| * Efficiency of the treatment plants increased
 | X | 6.3 |
| Many parties have only focused on the first part of this target area, water supply, while targets on sanitation are missing.  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **VII. APPLICATION OF RECOGNIZED GOOD PRACTICES TO THE MANAGEMENT OF WATER SUPPLY (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (f))** |  |  |
| * Meet the requirements for achieving "good status" for all waters as set out in the EU Directive by establishing a framework for the Community action in the field of water policy
 |  | 6.2 |
| * To increase the number of water utilities with Technical Safety Management confirmation and ensure compliance with the technical standards.
 |  | 6.2 |
| * To develop legislation for the implementation of Water Safety Plan in all water supply systems
 |  | 6.2 |
| * Regional associations of enterprises for collective and other systems of water supply and sanitation are established and operational
 |  | 6.2 |
| * To improve WASH survey in schools introducing new methodologies
 |  | 6.2 |
|  |  |  |
| **VIII. APPLICATION OF RECOGNIZED GOOD PRACTICES TO THE MANAGEMENT OF SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (f) (cont.))** |  |  |
| * Complete construction of waste water treatment plants and sewers for public use
 | X | 6.3 |
| * All sewerage works that serve 50 persons/person equivalents or more shall have a satisfactory internal control system that includes a risk and vulnerability analysis which covers the effects of climate change.
 |  | 6.3 |
| * Reduce nutrient inputs causing eutrophication, reduce the risks arising from harmful substances and protect groundwater
 | x | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| **IX. OCCURRENCE OF DISCHARGES OF UNTREATED WASTEWATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (g) (i))** |  |  |
| * Decrease of discharge of pollutants into water bodies (compared to 20xx): persistent organic pollutants - xx%; nitrogen – xx%; Phosphorus – x%
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Reduce the amount of wastewater discharge, mining, quarries and drainage water without treatment - xx% intermediate target in 20xx, xx% final target in 20xx - or inadequate treatment, xx% intermediate target in 20xx, xx% final target in 20xx
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Revitalization and completion of the wastewater treatment plants (WWTP)and construction of new prioritized WWTPs
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Ensure that leaks and discharges from overflows do not come into conflict with user interests such as drinking water, agricultural irrigation and bathing
 | X | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **OCCURRENCE OF DISCHARGES OF UNTREATED STORM WATER OVERFLOWS FROM WASTEWATER COLLECTION SYSTEMS TO WATERS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PROTOCOL (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (g) (ii))**
 |  |  |
| * Support the neutralization of stormwater overflows by direct harmless infiltration or runoff via settling ponds
 | x | 6.3 |
| * The total overflow for a treatment district should generally be less than two per cent of the produced pollution (phosphorus)
 |  |  |
| * Installations for the treatment of storm water that are currently discharged into natural water bodies in place
 |  | 6.3 |
| * To the extent that is financially viable, surface water should not be directed to the wastewater sewerage network
 | X |  |
|  |  |  |
| **XI. QUALITY OF DISCHARGES OF WASTEWATER FROM WASTEWATER TREATMENT INSTALLATIONS TO WATERS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PROTOCOL (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (h))** |  |  |
| * Develop and establish standards for the quality of effluents from treatment plants discharged into open water bodies, and related procedures by 20xx
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Reduction in the discharges of untreated wastewater in xx city; at least xx% by 20xx; by xx% by 20xx (compared to 20xx)
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Discharges from the municipal sewerage sector shall be in accordance with the requirements set in the Pollution Regulations or individual permits
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Increasing the efficiency of sewage by constructing new, modernized treatment plants - intermediate target in 20xx - construct xx units, xx modernized units. Final target in 20xx - construct xx units, xx modernized units
 | X | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| **XII. DISPOSAL OR REUSE OF SEWAGE SLUDGE FROM COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS OF SANITATION OR OTHER SANITATION INSTALLATIONS (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (i), first part)** |  |  |
| * Harmonization of the national legislation with EU Water Framework Directive
 | S | 6.3 |
| * To update the national Sewage Sludge Ordinance
 | S | 6.3 |
| * Prohibit discharge of sewage sludge into waters, according to Decree. Sewage sludge must be treated before placement elsewhere than in landfills, according to Decree. Reuse xx% of sewage sludge
 | S | 6.3 |
| * Increase safe utilisation and disposal of sewage sludge
 | s | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| **XIII. QUALITY OF WASTEWATER USED FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (i), second part)** |  |  |
| * A mechanism for the reuse of sludge from treatment plants and the dry ECOSAN toilets in agriculture and landscape management in place
 | x | x |
| * Organic waste products shall be used as fertilizer or soil conditioner as long as it is agronomically, environmentally and medically justifiable
 | x | X |
| * Carry out a baseline analysis on recycling and reuse of wastewater (legislation, health and environmental impacts etc) by 20xx
 | X | x |
|  |  |  |
| **XIV. QUALITY OF WATERS WHICH ARE USED AS SOURCES FOR DRINKING WATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), first part)** |  |  |
| * Meet the requirements for achieving "good status" for all waters as set out in the EU Directive
 | X | 6.3 |
| * Enforce the delimitation of the first-level sanitary zones to protect drinking water sources; xx% by 20xx; at least xx% by 20xx
 | X | 6.3 |
| * By 20xx, develop National strategy for the protection of water resources
 | X | 6.3 |
| * A GIS (Geographical Information System) that provides information on the quality of the sources of drinking water in place
 | x | 6.3 |
|  |  |  |
| **XV. QUALITY OF WATERS USED FOR BATHING (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), second part)** |  |  |
| * Achieving compliance of waters used for bathing with the standards of microbiological parameters in all recreational areas of national status
 |  |  |
| * Locations that are adapted for bathing should have excellent water quality in accordance with the EU Bathing Water Directive
 | x |  |
| * Draw up Bathing water profiles, according to EC directive
 | X |  |
| * To improve collection of bathing water quality monitoring data through development of an electronic information system.
 | X |  |
|  |  |  |
| **XVI. QUALITY OF WATERS USED FOR AQUACULTURE OR FOR THE PRODUCTION OR HARVESTING OF SHELLFISH (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), third part)** |  |  |
| * Meet the directives on requirements for quality of surface water drinking sources. Meet directives on requirements for public bathing areas - to at least "sufficient" level. Meet directives on requirements for aquaculture
 | X |  |
| * Decrease the percentage of non-compliance with physical, chemical and biological standards of water samples from ponds used for aquaculture
 | X |  |
| * Achieve compliance with EU WFD protection measure targets on fisheries. Initiate investigation on surface waters. Implement protection plans by 20xx
 | x |  |
|  |  |  |
| **XVII. APPLICATION OF RECOGNIZED GOOD PRACTICE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF ENCLOSED WATERS GENERALLY AVAILABLE FOR BATHING (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (k))** |  |  |
| * Draw up and issue a handbook of manmade bathing waters good operational practice
 | X |  |
| * To update the technical regulations on swimming pool water
 |  |  |
| * Achieve the quality standards for enclosed waters generally used for bathing
 |  |  |
| * To develop Best practice guide in accordance with the Rulebook of bathing water quality
 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| **XVIII. IDENTIFICATION AND REMEDIATION OF PARTICULARLY CONTAMINATED SITES (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (l))** |  |  |
| * Make a thorough inventory of contaminated sites, with preliminary assessments of possible health and environmental risks; use this assessment for future risks analyses and assessment of the ensuing need for decontamination, along with an economic evaluation of such an intervention
 | X | 12.4 |
| * To identify and establish Registry of contaminated sites which adversely affect waters within the scope of this Protocol
 | X | 12.4 |
| * Contaminated sites that threaten bodies of water covered by the protocol shall be risk assessed and treated/improved if necessary
 | X | 12.4 |
| * Plan and implement measures to reduce pollution of water from contaminated sites
 | X | 12.4 |
| * To strengthen appropriate legislations on waste reuse, recycle and safe disposal
 | x | 12.4 |
| * Follow Basel (Hazardous wastes) and Rotterdam (Hazardous materials) conventions
 | x | 12.4 |
|  |  |  |
| **XIX. EFFECTIVENESS OF SYSTEMS FOR THE MANAGEMENT, DEVELOPMENT, PROTECTION AND USE OF WATER RESOURCES (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (m))** |  |  |
| * Develop River Basin Management Plans also including health aspects
 | x | X |
| * Develop a strategy for managing the quality of water resources by 20xx
 | X | X |
| * Develop GIS databases for RBMPs with pollution sources, water abstraction sites, etc
 | x | x |
| * Implementation of targets relating to effectiveness of water system management plants etc are governed by Act on the Organization of Water Management
 | X | X |
| * Implementation of pollution control targets via Nitrate Action Programme II, monitoring drinking water resources for 200 groundwater basins, securing xxx groundwater basins, reporting on targets set by WFD goals
 | X | X |
|  |  |  |
| 1. **FREQUENCY OF PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION ON THE QUALITY OF DRINKING WATER SUPPLIED AND ON OTHER WATERS RELEVANT TO THE PROTOCOL (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (n))**
 |  |  |
| * Publish regular reports and consumer information on drinking water quality
 | X |  |
| * Establish a Clearing House under the Protocol on Water and Health by 2016
 |  |  |
| * Publish drinking water data on websites of all municipalities as Food Safety Authority
 | X |  |
| * Public awareness about water issues – manuals printing for the well owners
 |  |  |
| * Consumer information on water representatives in government, public accountability of protecting water resources, introduction of leading water technologies
 | x |  |

# Financial and economic matters related to the setting of targets

**Target Setting Guidelines**

Each set of targets needs to be linked to a clearly defined set of concrete measures. Such measures will be effective only when resources, including financial aspects are addressed during the process. While it may not be necessary or possible to undertake comprehensive cost-benefit analysis for all the possible targets under discussion, some sort of assessment of benefits in combination with the costs may be of help in getting political and financial support for actions. The process could be supported by appropriate political and financial strategies, which could help:

(a) To assess total investment needs of target setting;

(b)To identify investment needs for short- to medium-term targets;

(c)To identify policies and measures which are necessary to finance the achievement of the targets;

(d)To support claims of relevant ministries responsible for municipal services on the public budget;

(e)To prepare and make the case for external funding requests;

(f)To improve accountability;

(g)To improve monitoring.

**Lessons learned**

* Identifying concrete measures to be implemented in order to achieve the targets enables revealing the resource requirements that contribute to a more realistic set of targets and its efficient implementation.
* Although the lack of financial resources for commitments related to targets might not be a disturbance in the target setting process, it will certainly pose a problem in their implementation. Proposing financing of actions, where possible, is therefore valuable.
* Many partners have neglected the cost-benefit analysis, while some have reported potential costs or financing. However, a cost-benefit analysis will further justify prioritising actions as resources are usually limited.
* Cost-benefit analysis of each target may be challenging or not relevant. However, some sort of assessment of benefits in combination with an estimation of costs is of help in getting political and financial support for actions.
* Aligning the targets with pre-existing strategies and dedicated budgets is an efficient method to achieve target setting progress. However, the lack of secure funding should not be a limiting factor in target setting as the targets can also be a tool to attract additional funding at the national and international level.

Inputs to targets, actions and cost estimates from professional organisations - Norway

***Case summary***

*The Food Safety Authority and the Norwegian Environment Agency, tasked with formulating the Norwegian targets under the Protocol, found that the cost related to renewal of old infrastructure for drinking water and sewage, pipes in particular, presented the biggest economical challenge.*

*The Association of Consulting Engineers (RIF) is the Norwegian member to the International Federation of Charted Engineers (FIDIC) and publishes a survey on the status of public infrastructure in Norway. RIF points to water and sanitation as two areas where standards are poor due to aging pipes and the trends that show worsening conditions over time.*

*Norwegian Water, representing Norway`s water industry, has estimated that over 200 billion NOK (about 21 billion Euros) needs to be invested in maintenance up to 2030, with another 300 billon NOK needed in new infrastructure related to water and wastewater.*

*The reports from these associations, in addition to the results from inspection data from the Norwegian Food Safety Authority, were chosen as baseline data on the need and the costs of targets related to maintenance when suggesting the national targets. The data and recommendations from these sources were found trustworthy; hence, a new cost-benefit analysis was not needed.*

*All costs and investments for such infrastructure repair are paid by the consumer through Norwegian municipal taxes or directly to the service providers. 90 % of the population receives water from service provider companies owned by the municipality. The consumer cannot be charged more than the costs of running the service as all public systems operate under a set of laws that adhere to a “full cost recovery” principle.*

*As a result, only comparatively limited funds have been allocated to the follow up of the Norwegian targets. These funds are earmarked to activities of governmental bodies, such as the National Institute of Public Health.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*By building on estimates and suggestions published by non-governmental professional organisations, acceptance of the identified challenges and the cost of the measures needed to address the issues were achieved. As a result, the costs referred to in the Norwegian national targets are estimated by the sector itself.*

*By building on available reliable estimates the government saved time and money in setting the targets. A separate report to estimate the costs would have taken considerably longer time and probably delayed the formulation of the targets and actions by several years.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*Ministries such as the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation posed the main challenge by fearing that the economic burden would be too great for municipalities, smaller ones especially, as owners of water and sanitation infrastructure. As a result, it was agreed that the action plan for carrying out the targets needed to be consulted with other relevant ministries prior to implementation. Such a consultation was held in autumn 2015 when the agreement was reached and the action plan was accepted.*

*Furthermore, the Ministry of Climate and Environment chose not to be part of the action plan for reaching targets, based on the argument that some initiatives had already been covered through the implementation of EU-directives, such as the Water Framework directive. The issue is still to be discussed at the national level.*

*Small municipalities in Norway face challenges in many areas, not only in water and sanitation. The present conservative government has a policy of supporting the merger of smaller municipalities to make them more robust. This may help to make a change.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Possibility to use existing cost estimates carried out by a reputable stakeholder organisation saved time and resources during the target setting process.*
* *Placing the responsibility of the Protocol under the Ministry of Health, as this ministry - given the national challenges - has the most to gain by following the approach outlined in the Protocol. However, the implementation responsibility should ideally be placed with the line ministry responsible for infrastructure.*
* *The already functioning cost recovery principle made it possible for the government to approve the targets. Reaching political agreement would have been challenging if the costs were to be covered by the state budget, because of the large costs connected to infrastructure.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Investigate if targets actions and cost estimates can be based on reports and studies that are available and recognised as reliable.*
* *Identify methods and systems that enable the spread of costly measures over longer periods of time and over large groups of the population.*

**Case studies: Georgia, Moldova (pending)**

# Public involvement in the process of setting targets

 **Protocol text**

Article 6, paragraph 2:

[...]In doing all this, they shall make appropriate practical and/or other provisions for public participation, within a transparent and fair framework, and shall ensure that due account is taken of the outcome of the public participation. […]

**Target Setting Guidelines**

Public participation will enhance the social acceptance of the targets, contribute to a relevant and realistic outcome of the target-setting process and ensure that there are partners, such as NGOs, for the implementation of the programme of measures. The proposed targets, target dates and relevant programme of measures should be disseminated as much as possible to the broader public, relevant professional communities and other stakeholders. Consultation with the public should be organized to present and discuss the draft targets and programme of measures. The availability of resources — be they related to finances, time, capacity, social traditions, information and/or creativity — can be a limiting factor. However, limits to effective participation processes should not be an excuse for avoiding participation.

**Lessons learned**

* Public participation in the target-setting process is often achieved through the involvement of NGOs that play an important supporting role in the target setting process.
* Formal participation of NGOs as members of the inter-sectoral mechanism helps to secure their continuous involvement.
* NGOs can be responsible for organizing broad stakeholder meetings at different stages of the target setting process.
* Active involvement of professional associations may significantly contribute to the review and development of concrete suggestions for improvements.
* National authorities are vital in the participatory process to ensure ownership.

The important role of umbrella NGOs in securing broader public participation - Ukraine

***Case summary***

*The target setting process in Ukraine started in 2009 with support from the joint Ukrainian-Norwegian project on National Targets setting, and with a Project Reference Group (PRG) consisting of a broad stakeholder group with representatives from ministries, state agencies and services, NGOs, research and river basin organisations. The Draft of the National Targets consisted of 23 consolidated targets and was opened for public review. The stakeholders carried out the reviews within their organisations. The public participation process was carried out by the Ukrainian national environmental NGO MAMA-86, including over two months of decentralised public consultations and a two day public hearing meeting. The draft targets were distributed actively via e-mail, post and during events (conferences and seminars dedicated to the Protocol) to NGOs and stakeholders at sub-regional and local levels.*

*As a result of public consultations MAMA-86 collected 23 written submissions with numerous comments, which were conveyed to the targets drafting team and presented at the meeting of the Steering Committee of the National Policy Dialogue on IWRM and at two meetings of the National Working Group (NWG) on Protocol Implementation. Being a member of IWG, MAMA-86 advocated public comments that enhanced the draft targets, for example access to water and sanitation in schools, water quality and water related disease list. Finally, 15 national targets were approved.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*Ensuring a broad public participation is a challenge in a relatively large country with several geographical administrative areas and NGOs. The public consultation process cannot be solely conducted through newspapers and web pages, nor can it be organised efficiently by a state authority. With its broad network and long-standing practice as an umbrella NGO on environmental issues, MAMA-86 carried out the public consultation in a successful manner. Despite financial constraints for this task, MAMA-86 managed to facilitate the financing of the activity through its existing network with international NGOs.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The lack of understanding and acceptance of the need for public participation in the target setting process needed to be addressed to overcome the perception that participation must only be planned and organised by the responsible authorities or person/focal point. Being a member of the PRG, MAMA-86 received information about the time schedule and was able to plan the public consultation process. The ministry underwent changes and administrative reform processes during the target setting process. Therefore, it was important to maintain good communication and relations with all involved parties that remained active throughout the working period.*

*Ukraine’s substantial land size required advance planning to adequately involve the public, alongside recognising whom and how to involve them in the process.*

*MAMA-86 used its network members and branches, and was able to involve stakeholders and NGO representatives from different regions and cities/rural areas of Ukraine through the organisation of regional and local events to discuss the local – national water and health related problems and priorities related to the Protocol scope.*

*Lack of resources for public participation, and lack of understanding among decision makers with access to resources on how to organise public participation, have presented challenges. MAMA-86 enjoys long term collaborations with international NGOs - Women for Water Partnership (WfWP) and Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) - whom financially supported the work. The publication of targets was financed by the Norwegian project in 2009.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The umbrella NGOs’ experience and knowledge of public participation mechanisms and procedures, as well as the capability of organising such events.*
* *Willingness of the Project Reference Group and the Target Drafting Team to listen and accept the inputs from the public consultation process.*
* *Securing financial resources for public participation through alternative financing methods in a situation where the ministries had limited funds, in addition to the challenges due to reform processes.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Seek the involvement and support of NGOs with coordinating ability or other parties who have the capacity and competence to organise and facilitate the public participation process.*
* *Allocate dedicated and adequate resources for the public participation process. In a resource constrained situation there could be alternative financing sources that can be supportive.*
* *Recognise the need for building capacities on public participation mechanisms and take measures to develop such capacities among the authorities and NGOs.*

Stakeholder consultation at national and local levels - Romania

***Case summary***

*Several targets drafted in Romania for the Protocol overlapped with requirements in the EU Directives. The target setting period somewhat overlapped several other public consultation processes on River Basin Management Plans and related actions according to the EU WFD, strategy on sewage sludge from wastewater treatment plants, etc. Hence, it was considered possible to disseminate information to the broader public and relevant stakeholders as a parallel activity. The draft document was published on the official site of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests and at the National Administration for Water “Apele Române” and their branches. However, the advertising received a limited feedback from the public. The main reason was probably due to the limited public involvement in the preliminary consultation processes related to water, health and environment issues.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*Successful implementation of article 6 of the Protocol is achieved by ensuring collaboration and participation of all stakeholders (administration, water users, NGOs and the public) at all levels. Local and county authorities play a key role in developing projects/activities/measures in water and sanitation infrastructure that aim to improve human living conditions and human health. The public participation process allowed the public to better understand the problems and also encouraged the identification of other issues. Despite the limited feedback, the public was provided with extensive possibilities to become involved and comment through established channels.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*Creating awareness of the targets related issues among the stakeholders, including the public at a local level, was identified as a challenge. Two broad consultative processes were ongoing where the targets related issues were included: All 11 Water Basins Administrations organised 26 consultation meetings to finalise the River Basin Management Plans (which includes several targets required by the Protocol). The main objective was to inform the stakeholders about the water issues at the local and county/basin level. These meetings were followed by press conferences and newspaper articles.*

*In parallel, the National Water Administration “Apele Române” organised public meetings (focusing on specific target groups of stakeholders) at the national level to share knowledge on specific issues in water management, water resource and water quality protection through a dialogue with all stakeholders.*

*An online questionnaire was made available to collect public opinion. Only 32 answers were received and the comments were also not focused enough.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Using other ongoing consultation processes and collaborations with existing consultative bodies on water management (River Basin Committees).*
* *Early start to planning the public participation process, considering the lengthy time required.*
* *Coordination of all public authorities was required during the process, including at local and county level.*
* *Collaboration with the Romanian Water Association, representing water utilities, added value to the targets setting process and the consultation process by providing technical expertise in the field of water supply and sanitation.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Maintaining regular contact between decision-makers and key stakeholders, professional associations, NGOs and the public during the process of setting targets allows for an efficient consultation process.*
* *The number of consultative groups and participants should be adjusted to the specific problems identified at country, local and river basin levels.*
* *Meetings should be arranged to enable active and open participation of the communities concerned.*

***Facilitating the involvement of NGOs in public consultation – Armenia***

***Case summary***

*The role of the public is highlighted in Article 5(i) of the Protocol and supported by several legal instruments in Armenia: The Water Code of Armenia (adopted in 2002) includes provisions on access to information and public participation in the decision-making process; The law On Freedom of Information (adopted in 2003) ensures access to information and public awareness, among other activities, on the services provided to the public, including water supply services.*

*The NGO Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE) took initiative to coordinate the involvement of several relevant Armenian NGOs in the public consultation process on setting targets. AWWHE organised a regional workshop on “Raising awareness on the UNECE Water Convention and Protocol and strengthening of the role of the civil society organizations in their promotion and implementation” in November 2012. The workshop was carried out prior to the first Steering Committee meeting of the National Policy Dialogue on Water to increase awareness, give the public an opportunity to express their concerns and enable public authorities to register public concerns. In addition to local partners, participants from Georgia shared their views and experiences. Three follow-up stakeholder consultation meetings with NGO representatives were organised by AWHHE. These meetings gave NGOs the opportunity to propose inputs to the Steering Committee and Working Group meetings through the entrusted the representatives of the NGO AWHHE.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*Public involvement and follow-up discussions in regions focused on water and sanitation situations in rural areas, and on solutions for local problems and decentralised approaches (e.g. ECOSAN toilets, septic tanks, or other technologies). Based on local issues and priorities, concrete recommendations were made for the prioritisation of national targets.*

*When several NGOs are active on an issue, it is most efficient when one experienced NGO takes the lead in coordinating tasks and the involvement of the other NGOs.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The awareness of the Protocol and targets were quite limited among the NGOs and the general public. Organising the involvement of these stakeholders through consultative meetings was a necessary and successful activity in the target setting process. Public participation and their access to information impacted the quality of decisions and also enabled efficient dissemination of the status and decision to the public. The meetings provided the public with opportunities to express their concerns to the relevant authorities.*

*The need for financial and human resources in this process should not be underestimated. Supplementary external funds that were raised via the FinWaterWeii[[4]](#footnote-5) programme were critically important. The organised workshop and consultation meetings made it possible to increase awareness and involve a wide group of NGOs in the activities under the Protocol, enabling the public to communicate their concerns to the authorities.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The NGO consultations created a large interest in the NGO community on the Protocol and its implementation.*
* *Providing adequate opportunities to all NGOs and communities to voice their concerns and priorities and to convey their comments and suggestions to the Steering Committee is important.*
* *The coordination mechanism facilitated a coherent input of NGOs to the work of the Working Group in the target setting process.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *An NGO with experience and competence should be identified to mobilise and coordinate the involvement of other related NGOs.*
* *NGOs may be capable of raising own funds for public consultation, in addition to funds allocated by the national government and funds for the target setting process.*

Facilitation of public consultation through Aarhus and media centres – Serbia

***Case summary***

*After the ratification in 2013, the promotion of the Protocol on a local level has been seen as a useful tool to facilitate its implementation. Recognising the importance this issue, the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection signed the agreement with six Aarhus centres[[5]](#footnote-6) in Serbia (Belgrade, Nis, Novi Sad, Subotica, Kragujevac and Novi Pazar), enabling necessary stimulus, tools, information and assistance for effective raising awareness campaigns.*

*Public awareness campaigns were organised in two phases; pre-and post-ratification stages. Partnership with Aarhus centres and Regional Development Agencies led to organising workshops on a national level, where local authorities and the public were informed about their responsibilities related to the Protocol. Awareness raising campaigns with topics related to water issues, started in Aarhus centres with the participation of the media representatives and target stakeholders were invited. All activities were announced through the web site of the Ministry for Transparent Public Information. These workshops secured the support of local stakeholders in creating national targets and in building the cross sector cooperation between different institutions at the national and local level. NGO and youth representatives also recognised their roles and responsibilities in the process.*

*Parallel with the workshops/awareness raising campaigns in Aarhus centres and Regional Agencies, WHO-EURO supported the Ministries responsible for health and environment in working towards establishing a sustainable framework for inter-sectoral and multi-stakeholder cooperation to address key environment and health issues. For this purpose, three regional promotional workshops were realised in Central and East Serbia in November 2015. Small scale water supplies and WASH in schools, aligned with RPG1, were promoted during workshops.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*The use of Aarhus centres and Regional Development Agencies enabled productive public awareness campaigns through workshops at the local level. The centres enabled interactive discussions between different groups, authorities and stakeholders that led to easier development of the national targets.*

*The workshops improved the planning and implementation of actions to achieve targets due to active involvement of stakeholders. They also supported building the cross sector cooperation between different institutions at the national and local level.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The main barriers were the lack of awareness of public rights and of the local/regional authorities’ obligations, as well as the lack of national legal frameworks and cross-sectoral cooperation. This was improved to a great degree during the workshops.*

*Lack of financial resources, time and human resources as well as changes in institutions following elections were challenges. Lack of human capacity was overcome by setting up the coordination mechanism; National Working Group, consisting of representatives from different sectors that all had different roles in the process, such as designing the presentations, media campaigns etc.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Awareness of the Protocol and that a participatory approach was a prerequisite to effective participation of the public.*
* *Better acceptance of the definition and adoption of targets and measures, as well as of the implementation and evaluation of progress.*
* *NGOs were an important link between the authorities and public: Their participation in these meetings was vital to outcomes of the campaign, and the public willingness to participate in campaigns and other activities under the Protocol.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Establish Aarhus centres and actively use them in the public participation process.*
* *Sharing experiences and lessons learned through awareness raising campaigns at national and international workshops could serve as a guide and stimulus for other countries with similar institutional set ups, creating success stories in partner countries.*

# Official adoption, publication and promotion of the targets

## Formal adoption process

**Protocol text**

Article 6, paragraph 3:

Within two years of becoming a Party, each Party shall establish and publish targets referred to in paragraph 2 of this article, and target dates for achieving them.

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The final, agreed targets and target dates should be endorsed at the appropriate political level (e.g., council of ministers or Parliament, depending on the national situation).

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* Targets and target dates can be adopted as part of the national programme or strategy dealing with water and health issues.
* While the leading role in the official adoption process is usually assumed by one ministry, conducting an inter-ministerial consultation is important to reconfirm the commitment of other ministries and agencies to future implementation of targets.
* The official approval/endorsement or adoption of targets at an appropriate political level is key to securing their effective implementation. Joint order/decree by ministries of water /environment and health or a decision by the Cabinet of ministers and Parliament are successful examples of official adoption, and is recommended.

*Table 1: Examples of official adoption of targets*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Country** | **Modality of official adoption** |
| **Norway** | Decision of the Government |
| **Republic of Belarus** | Order of the Ministry of Health, signed by the Minister of Health |
| **Republic of Moldova** | Joint order of the Ministers of Health and Environment, signed by the two Ministers |
| **Ukraine**  | Order of the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources  |

***Challenges and opportunities of the involvement of local stakeholders in the process of adoption of targets - Switzerland***

***Case summary***

*In June 2007, the Swiss Parliament ratified the Protocol with a large majority. Within two years, Switzerland had to set targets for all the aspects covered by article 6, para 2, of the Protocol. The setting of targets has been mainly discussed within a core team constituted by representatives of the Federal Office of Environment and the Federal Office of Public Health. At the technical level, the baseline analysis has been performed and the needs identified. A summarised table including draft targets and action plan for the next three years was developed with corresponding responsibilities, based on the baseline analysis findings. The target approval process has since been delayed due to the Swiss requirement of all relevant stakeholders accepting an approval, even though a well detailed, structured and justified document on draft targets are available. The main challenge is to convince the implementing stakeholders about the technical feasibility, availability of financing and the legal basis of Article 6 of the Protocol at national and local levels.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*A document linking the needs, short and long term targets, actions and responsible stakeholders was produced with detailed and reasonably justified targets and related information.*

*The formal adoption process involves the stakeholders who are responsible for implementation of the targets, requiring a clear ownership.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The targets are mainly drafted by the Federal authorities of health and environment, with the needs of the Cantonal levels in mind. The approval of the drafted targets and action plan by the Federal authorities requires involvement of the decentralised Cantonal authorities that will have the implementation responsibility. The implementing authorities do not seem to fully agree with the justification for the targets and the realities of the financing, thereby challenging the legal basis of Article 6 of the Protocol at Cantonal levels. Due to the involvement of a high number of administrative stakeholders the adoption is not yet concluded.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The involvement of all stakeholders at all levels is critically important. This leads to the involvement of many stakeholders, which also leads to disagreements and delays.*
* *The target setting process becomes a tool for enhanced inter-sectoral collaboration and for raising political and administrative awareness.*
* *Development of targets linking to needs, short and long term goals and activities provide a good basis for stakeholder discussions and ownership.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Involvement of all stakeholders in both Federal and Cantonal (local) levels in the process is critically important.*
* *Secure support from various stakeholders at national and local levels.*
* *Specifics of the national decision making processes need to be considered, as they can significantly vary among countries.*

## Publication and promotion of targets

**Protocol text**

Article 10, paragraphs 1-3:

1. As a complement to the requirements of this Protocol for Parties to publish specific information or documents, each Party shall take steps within the framework of its legislation to make available to the public such information as is held by public authorities and is reasonably needed to inform public discussion of:

(a) The establishment of targets and of target dates for their achievement and the development of water-management plans in accordance with article 6;

(b) The establishment, improvement or maintenance of surveillance and early-warning systems and contingency plans in accordance with article 8;

(c) The promotion of public awareness, education, training, research, development and information in accordance with article 9.

2. Each Party shall ensure that public authorities, in response to a request for other information relevant to the implementation of this Protocol, make such information available within a reasonable time to the public, within the framework of national legislation.

3. The Parties shall ensure that information referred to in article 7, paragraph 4, and paragraph 1 of this article shall be available to the public at all reasonable times for inspection free of charge, and shall provide members of the public with reasonable facilities for obtaining from the Parties, on payment of reasonable charges, copies of such information.

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The agreed targets, target dates and programme of work must be published and brought to the attention of all stakeholders, at the national, provincial and local levels, as well as to the population. For this purpose, the Internet, relevant newspapers or television and other media should be used. Relevant local and national organizations can also play an important role in disseminating and publicizing targets, target dates and monitoring programmes.

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* Publication of targets on ministries’ websites, national bulletins, etc. should be complemented with broader and active publication of the targets through Internet, media and other available means to make them accessible to the different population groups.
* Once the targets are set they should be specifically communicated to the joint secretariat for publication on the UNECE website; an important step to ensure their availability to the Protocol’s bodies and the international community.
* Preparing a reader-friendly version of the targets set that also describe the process is useful for their promotion and sharing experiences at local, national, regional and international levels.
* Publication and information on the targets should be actively communicated within relevant institutions through different communication channels. They could also be disseminated under different steps in the target setting or implementation.
* Awareness raising campaigns can be organised with the support of NGOs.
* Establishment of dedicated clearing houses (resource centres) or using Aarhus centres can be a good promotion strategy.

**Case studies: Norway**, **Moldova (pending)**

***Involvement of state stakeholders and NGOs in promoting the Protocol – Armenia***

***Case summary***

*After developing the targets, Armenia published the report “Setting Targets and Targets Dates under the Protocol on Water and Health in the Republic of Armenia” in three languages (Armenian, English and Russian) for distribution among stakeholders. The publication consists of two parts. Part I describes the target setting process. Part II presents the current situation and issues to be dealt with under the Protocol, together with the targets, target dates and proposed measures to improve efficiency of water management, achieve safe drinking water and adequate sanitation.*

*Additional promotional materials were developed in Armenian and English for a broader circulation, both as brochures and on web pages. The Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment NGO (AWHHE) was one of the stakeholders actively involved in developing the baseline analysis, publications and brochures. These promotion materials were disseminated during the Steering Committee meetings and at various events organised at national and international levels. Moreover, the Armenian Aarhus Centres were provided with the publications to disseminate in their regions.**A set of publications with various detailing levels were produced (baseline analysis, technical reports, and brochures). They were useful in raising awareness among stakeholders such as the state authorities (ministries, agencies, institutions, and local governments), water utilities’ and sanitation facilities’ operators and the general public, and were also distributed among other partner countries to share the experience.****Overcoming challenges*** *The development of publication material required significant resources, facilitated and funded by the FinWaterWei project. While both the public and international community appreciated the publications, a wider use by the state stakeholders was limited. The materials are only published on the Protocol’s and NGO’s web pages.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *The publication and leaflets were of great interest to the local, national and international communities.*
* *The combined expertise of different stakeholders helped improve the quality of the publication and leaflets.*
* *Close cooperation was maintained with the Armenian Aarhus centres to disseminate the publication and leaflets.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Secure support from various stakeholders in developing publications that enhances quality.*
* *The involvement of both NGOs and authorities is important during the development of publications.*
* *The use of Aarhus centres, printed brochures and publications via web pages secure broader access to the materials, including international communities that look to share best practices.*

# Developing national action plans / programmes of measures to implement the targets set

**Target Setting Guidelines**

Together with the targets set, a proposed monitoring programme to attain the targets in the agreed time frame should be defined and agreed upon. This programme should contain a clear time plan and political, administrative, behavioural and infrastructural indicators, based on the target set, a clear distribution of responsibilities and a financial strategy. Existing projects, strategies and other activities should be taken into account. Implementation should start as soon as possible after the targets are agreed, and should be regularly evaluated. A programme committee can be established to this end which can meet once or twice a year to review the progress made and to adjust the monitoring programme if needed.

**Lessons learned and good practises**

* Target setting and developing actions plans or programmes of measures should be an integrated process that is beneficial to establishing a more realistic and achievable set of targets.
* It may be useful to expand the composition of the coordination committee or working group in charge of setting targets to include additional members with dedicated responsibilities to develop measures.
* Action plans should have intermediate stages or phases that would allow for progressive step-by-step financing. Indicators should also be able to follow the different stages to measure progress.
* An action plan is more focused than the targets and is a helpful instrument in prioritising. The action plan is also helpful in identifying responsibilities.
* The action plan is easier to communicate to the public (youth, water operators, local authorities, etc.).
* International obligations (such as EU Directives) may provide legal pressure and financial support also for actions to achieve the targets.
* Civil society should be involved in the preparation and the implementation of the action plan.
* The action plans should include financial and resource mobilisation strategies, including a national budget, possible contributions from donors. etc.
* The action plans should be more flexible than the targets to ensure they can adapt to changing conditions and financing (for example the yearly budget).
* Action plans should be embraced at an appropriate political level to ensure availability of resources for their implementation.
* Some targets can be met without specifically developed action plans when they are legal obligations (water safety plans, EU Directives), included in national strategic programmes (e.g. remediation of contaminated sites) or relate to information coordination and dissemination (project funds for pool registry, water quality information systems, etc).

From setting national targets to elaborating an action plan for their implementation – Moldova (pending)

***Case summary***

*Stage I: period 2016-2020 -will focus on developing the regulatory framework, reforming operational management of water and sanitation systems and empowering operators to implement infrastructure projects, capacity building of all partners involved in the achievement of target indicators strengthening capacities to monitor water quality and health protection in relation to water quality and sanitation;*

*2) Stage II: period 2021-2025 -will focus on implementing actions to achieve the set target indicators.*

*The successful implementation of achieving target indicators required the development, definition and coordination of actions to be implemented for each target, an assessment of all costs, establishment of institutions that could be involved in the implementation, progress monitoring and evaluation.*

*In this context, on 24 November 2012 UNECE, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, the Ministry of Health and Ministry of Environment signed the Memorandum for Stage II Protocol on Water and Health implementation (for the years 2016-2025).*

Developing dynamic action plan to implement the targets - Norway

*As part of the follow-up to the process of setting national targets on water and health, an action plan for achieving the targets has been developed by the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services as a responsible stakeholder.*

*The action plan is meant to be a dynamic document evaluated once a year to secure that the most efficient measures are chosen to reach the targets.*

*The measures in this plan are restricted to falls under the responsibility of the Norwegian Food Safety Authority and the Norwegian Institute of Public Health as subsidiary bodies under the Ministry, which have been delegated authority to carry out. In addition, the plan covers some optional measures to be carried out by Norwegian Water, the national association representing Norway's water industry.*

*Ministries with adjacent responsibilities were also consulted before the plan was established.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*While the Norwegian targets are set on a more general level, the action plan describes a more flexible system with small steps and shorter-term timeline towards the achievement of targets that eases the revision and evaluation of progress. The process itself is important because the participants are required to come up with specific and realistic measures. An action plan that points to the concrete responsibilities of different authorities, waterworks and other bodies leads to better commitment.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The main challenge was to make the action plan concise, specific and realistic with regards to its content and time frame. Initiating with a large scheme mentioning all tentative measures in the targets document proved to be overwhelming and made it difficult to focus on a limited number of concrete and realistic measures. The final document contains smaller implementation schemes classified under six thematic headlines: Empowerment, information, organising and competence, knowledge and research, international cooperation and documentation.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Make the plan short and simple with focus on the main challenges.*
* *Pursue good progress in the process to avoid the experience of having to start all over again.*
* *Make realistic and short deadlines – this makes progress visible.*
* *Evaluate the action plan regularly and adjust when necessary according to e.g. available funding and new knowledge of gaps.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *An action plan with shorter deadlines enables easier agreement among stakeholders and sets up a more realistic implementation.*
* *A regular monitoring of the progress and evaluation of the action plan creates dynamic and more realistic achievements of targets.*

# Reviewing and assessing progress towards the achievement of the targets, revision of the targets and reporting

## Review and revision of targets

**Protocol text**

Article 7, paragraphs 1 to 4:

1. The Parties shall each collect and evaluate data on:

(a) Their progress towards the achievement of the targets referred to in article 6, paragraph 2;

(b) Indicators that are designed to show how far that progress has contributed towards preventing, controlling or reducing water-related disease.

2. The Parties shall each publish periodically the results of this collection and evaluation of data. The frequency of such publication shall be established by the Meeting of the Parties.

3. The Parties shall each ensure that the results of water and effluent sampling carried out for the purpose of this collection of data are available to the public.

4. On the basis of this collection and evaluation of data, each Party shall review periodically the progress made in achieving the targets referred to in article 6, paragraph 2, and publish an assessment of that progress. The frequency of such reviews shall be established by the Meeting of the Parties. Without prejudice to the possibility of more frequent reviews under article 6, paragraph 2, reviews under this paragraph shall include a review of the targets referred to in article 6, paragraph 2, with a view to improving the targets in the light of scientific and technical knowledge.

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The review of progress should include a review of the targets set, with a view to improving them in light of scientific and technical knowledge. It is therefore necessary to establish feedback mechanisms linked to the evaluation of progress, involving reporting and follow-up procedures, and including informal mechanisms such as networking, which allows for the dissemination of ideas and information.

Parties should strive to present information on environment, water and health in a holistic and integrated manner rather than as a collection of single parameter indicators.

It is recommended that the coordination mechanism responsible for target setting be involved in the data collection, assessing and reporting under the Protocol. This will enable examination of the needs and possibilities to revise the targets according to recent knowledge and requirements.

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* Although the Protocol requires Parties to review progress at least every three years through preparing a national summary report, a more frequent review based on the progress in achieving the targets set is advisable. It will enable adjusting and revising targets in accordance with collected and assessed data, lessons learned and resource availability.
* Each reporting exercise is an opportunity for Parties to self-evaluate their achievements. Thus, it should serve Parties as a tool for identifying the need to revise targets and target dates.
* It is useful to revise current priorities and indicators according to the findings of the review.
* While it is important to acknowledge the achievement of targets, it is also important to focus on maintaining them.

Benefits of the annual review of progress for ownership and financial support - Moldova

***Case summary***

*Although the Protocol requires Parties to assess progress and implementation of reporting at least every three years, Moldova carried out annual reviews in target areas 1, 2, 3 and 4. The results are published in the National Annual Public Health Report.* The more frequent reviews have strengthened the ownership and awareness of responsibility among stakeholders, enabling better enforcement of implementation.

*Moldova adopted the targets in 2013 and reviewed in 2015. The revised targets were incorporated in the National Programme on Protocol on Water and Health implementation for 2016-2022. There was no significant change in the number of targets, but the indicators and deadlines were updated. Four targets were reformulated, while eight were replaced with six new targets.*

***Why it is a good practice?***

*Each progress report represents an opportunity for the country to assess their achievements. This assessment can help identify the need for a revision of targets and target dates. More frequent progress evaluation will allow the review and revision of targets in accordance with the received and processed data, obtained experience and the availability of resources. It also enables a review of current priorities and indicators. Publication of the progress report to improve public access (e.g. reliable information on water resources and data on drinking water and of treated wastewater quality) is an important argument in the implementation of the targets, but also in maintaining the trend of achieved progress.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*Insufficient trained staff at state authorities to make permanent assessment and reporting, and lack of financial resources towards reporting and implementation have proved to be challenges. However, progress in certain areas showed the realistic achievements of the measures proposed with the targets, and enabled securing further financial assistance for implementation of selected target and reporting from the Swiss Development Cooperation. Inter-sectoral collaboration was weaker than anticipated, but the renewed financing and jointly developed new targets improved the dialogue.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Review of target achievements and revision of the targets using institutional memory (continuity) were efficient and enabled continued collaboration between the two key ministries.*
* *The consultation process involved the stakeholders in the Steering committee, new stakeholders, as well as national and international experts.*
* *Involvement and active participation of the public.*
* *Continuation of the process with stakeholders and individuals involved in the initial target setting process is an advantage in recalling the discussions and agreements made with and among stakeholders.*
* *Progress reviews and revised action plans facilitate renewed financial support from donors.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *Ensure maximum continuation of the representatives of stakeholders involved in the initial target setting process to benefit from the institutional memory.*
* *Use frequent, periodic reviews and revised activities to secure engagement of stakeholders as well as support from donors.*

## Reporting under the Protocol

 **Protocol text**

Article 7, paragraphs 5 and 6:

5. Each Party shall provide to the secretariat referred to in article 17, for circulation to the other Parties, a summary report of the data collected and evaluated and the assessment of the progress achieved. Such reports shall be in accordance with guidelines established by the Meeting of the Parties.

These guidelines shall provide that the Parties can use for this purpose reports covering the relevant information produced for other international forums.

6. The Meeting of the Parties shall evaluate progress in implementing this Protocol on the basis of such summary reports

**Target Setting Guidelines**

The summary report shall be prepared in accordance with agreed guidelines and template by the Meeting of the Parties. Reports should be submitted to the Meeting of the Parties in the name of the Government of a particular Party. A broad inter-ministerial consultation process on the report is advisable, including considering the involvement of NGOs, civil society, local communities, business and the media. Reports should be submitted to the joint secretariat so as to arrive no later than 210 days before the meeting of the Parties for which they are submitted.

*Table 1. Participation of Parties and other States in periodic reporting exercises under the Protocol*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Country** | **1st reporting 2010** | **2nd reporting 2013** | **3rd reporting 2016** |
| Albania |  | X | X |
| Armenia | X | X | X |
| Azerbaijan | X | X | X |
| Belarus | X | X | X |
| Belgium |  | X |  |
| Bosnia and Herzegovina |  | X | X |
| Croatia | X | X | X |
| Cyprus | X |  |  |
| Czech Republic | X | X | X |
| Estonia | X | X | X |
| Finland | X | X | X |
| France | X | X | X |
| Georgia | X | X | X |
| Germany | X | X | X |
| Hungary | X | X | X |
| Israel |  |  | X |
| Latvia | X | X | X |
| Lithuania | X | X | X |
| Luxembourg |  | X | X |
| Malta |  |  | X |
| Moldova | X | X | X |
| Netherlands | X | X | X |
| Norway | X | X | X |
| Portugal | X |  |  |
| Romania | X | X | X |
| Russia | X | X | X |
| Serbia |  | X | X |
| Slovakia | X | X | X |
| Slovenia |  |  | X |
| Spain |  | X | X |
| Switzerland | X | X | X |
| Tajikistan |  | X |  |
| Ukraine | X | X | X |
| Uzbekistan | X |  |  |

**Lessons learned and good practices**

* Reporting process on targets and their progress proved to be a tool for enhancing inter-sectoral cooperation, including with the public, and political awareness about the Protocol at the national level.
* Public participation during the reporting process is highly recommended.
* Collection of data adequate for reporting is a time and resource consuming task. It must be planned well-ahead of the submission deadlines.
* Data for periodic reports might originate from various sources. They could also be extracted from statistical databases, reports to GLAAS, MICS, JMP, other reports to WHO and EU. Therefore, it is necessary to secure the quality of data included in the baseline report.
* Inclusion of NGOs and relevant institutions at local levels in data collection mechanism for reporting may be particularly useful in obtaining data unavailable at the national level.
* It is recommended to publish the reporting results to the public (e.g. water and effluent quality data).

Reporting as a tool to raise awareness about the Protocol - Switzerland

***Case summary***

*The national reporting process in Switzerland is coordinated by the Federal Office of Food Safety and Veterinary Affairs, which is the focal point of the Protocol. The Federal Office of Environment manages many areas stipulated in Article 6 of the Protocol, such as groundwater protection that influences the prevention of water related diseases. Consequently, the report is drafted by these two federal authorities, followed by a broad consultation conducted with other relevant stakeholders. At the federal level, the Federal Office of Agriculture or the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) were also important stakeholders that participated in the reporting process.*

*Switzerland has a decentralised administrative system where the participation of the local enforcement authorities is vital because they have the indicator data relevant to reporting progress. Other stakeholders, such as the drinking water association and the waste water association, are also interested to profile their activities and show their initiatives.*

***Why is it a good practice?***

*A broad participatory process provided information to an accurate and updated report on the target setting progress. Coordinating and consulting with the stakeholders also renewed their commitments to participate in the reporting exercise, alongside receiving their valuable input and feedback.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*The main challenge is to collect the necessary data for all the aspects that are being reported. These data belong to different stakeholders and are important to each party in proving the assumption that water management is efficient throughout the country. There is a certain reluctance to share data that is not published. The surveillance authorities set their priorities for control based on risk management, rather than conducting regular monitoring. Hence, data may not be representative and subject to interpretation. Knowing that the national report will be broadly published, including at the international level, the concerned stakeholders want to ensure that the evaluations and conclusions avoid giving a wrong and imbalanced impression of the status-quo. Consequently, it is important to involve all relevant stakeholders when gathering and interpreting the data.*

***Success factors and lessons learned***

* *Reporting on targets and progress in their achievement proved to be a tool for enhancing inter-sectoral cooperation (including with the public), alongside raising political awareness of the Protocol at the national level.*
* *Compiling data required for reporting on the achieved progress is a demanding and time-consuming process. It requires cooperation between different stakeholders, both horizontally and vertically.
It is recommended to start the process of report preparation at least six months before the reporting deadline to secure timely completion.*
* *Involving water distributor organisations at the local level in the data collection mechanism for reporting may be particularly useful in obtaining data that remains unavailable at the national level*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *The reporting process should be planned well ahead of the submission deadline. Mobilisation of the Steering committee, securing support from relevant stakeholders for the provision of data, data collection timelines, organisation of reporting chapters and content, review and consultation, translation and signature and publication requires at least six months.*
* *It is valuable to register the comments received by the stakeholders during the data collection and review process.*
* *A dedicated person(s), sufficient time and resources are recommended to secure adequate progress.*
* *Based on the previous reporting exercises, a detailed planning of the necessary steps (data gathering, consultations, etc.) is a key factor in the successful preparation of a representative national report*.
* *The data collection, review process and publications can be used to increase the awareness of the Protocol and its focal areas at operational, administrative and political levels both at Federal and Cantonal levels.*

# Raising political awareness, communication and promotion

**Target Setting Guidelines**

Parties should ensure that data on their progress towards the achievement of targets will not only be commonly available but also presented in readable, user-friendly and easily transferable formats. Practical arrangements for making the information accessible should be made. These can include:

(a)Publicly accessible websites;

(b)Publicly accessible lists, registers or files available at no charge;

(c)Active information and support to the public in seeking information (e.g., via newspapers or radio);

(d)Provision of points of contact (e.g. via newspapers or radio);

(e)Creation of a clearinghouse on the Protocol

**Lessons learned**

* Strengthening the awareness of politicians improves the political will, which is a key to effective implementation of the Protocol.
* Wide publication of achievement and revision of targets is recommended (e.g. through government and public websites, Clearing houses, Aarhus centres, etc.)
* National summary reports under the Protocol containing success stories may lead to active interaction between the stakeholders and the public.
* Horizontal information channels within state bodies that are responsible for the implementation of the Protocol are also very important.
* Establishing a dialogue between relevant sectors and stakeholders at the local level through workshops and awareness campaigns increases support in collaborative planning and contributions to the implementation of targets.

Raising political awareness – examples of different approaches by countries

***Case summary***

*Many countries report that the responsible ministries for the Protocol often displayed limited understanding and willingness to commit to the other state stakeholders during the target setting, implementation and reporting processes. Sometimes, it has been the case even within the ministries responsible for the Protocol, and a similar lack of awareness is also observed at local and regional levels. The support, understanding and commitment from all relevant stakeholders, both horizontally among partner ministries and authorities as well as vertically among national, federal, regional, provincial and local levels etc, remain imperative to the development of the national target setting process. This type of engagement solidifies a sense of ownership that secures a commitment to the implementation of measures. Organisations who undertook the responsibility to coordinate the development of the targets seemed to be disappointed by the apparent lack of knowledge and lack of willingness to collaborate, but found ways to win the trust and support from important stakeholders during the target setting process.*

***Why it is a good practice?***

*It is impossible to address broad target areas as proposed in the Protocol through one or two ministries alone, due to the hierarchies that currently govern in political and administrative organisations. Development strategies and visions of various line ministries need to be coordinated and focused towards the overlapping and interrelated targets, alongside considerations for resources required in the implementation process. Hence, the best and only alternative is to obtain complete support from all stakeholders, and the countries have reported various approaches to securing the necessary support.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*In several cases, several of the stakeholders were not aware of the commitments made by a state when ratifying the Protocol. When a state undertakes the responsibilities and commitments under the Protocol the state organisations responsible for the subjects in question are naturally expected to collaborate and contribute to the fulfilment of these requirements. In several EU states, state stakeholders would question the justification, and sometimes the legal relevance, for developing targets when they were considered well covered by the already addressed EU Directives. Dissemination workshops, incorporation in to the Steering groups and target drafting groups, sharing of experience from other countries and insight provided by the UNECE and publication materials gradually built up the stakeholders’ trust and willingness to collaborate and contribute.*

***Lessons learned and good practices***

* *Involvement of all stakeholders in the target setting process is important. While operational level resource persons can efficiently contribute in this process, they should also be encouraged to communicate and raise awareness within their organisations.*
* *Sharing of publications documenting the needs (baselines analysis, periodic reports) and the records of progress achieved have gained increased political attention.*
* *Documenting needs and establishing targets also create additional financing possibilities; both national and international sources have attracted political awareness from other stakeholders.*
* *Constructive dialogues took place between the general public and NGOs with state stakeholders also generating increased political awareness and commitments.*
* *Some EU countries were also successful in securing financing for the implementation of targets.*

***How to replicate this practice?***

* *As many stakeholders as possible must be included in the steering groups. If the establishment of a steering group is difficult, it is possible to start with a working group.*
* *EU member states may use the Protocol as a tool for phasing deadlines and realising obligations along certain EU Directives.*
* *Set financially realistic or politically supported targets in resource intensive target areas, while using other tools to meet targets in other areas without earmarked funds.*
* *Use existing structures like Aarhus centres, Clearing houses, GLAAS reporting and National Policy Dialogue on Water to increase the political awareness of the Protocol.*
1. United Nations sales publication, No. Sales No. E. 10.II.E.12. Available from http://www.unece.org/index.php?id=11644. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. A mechanism to provide human and financial resources for target setting processes in Eurasian countries. The mechanism does not exist anymore. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. *The UN-Water Global Analysis and Assessment of Sanitation and Drinking-Water (GLAAS)* [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. FinWaterWei is the program for Finland’s water sector support to the EECCA countries under the Wider Europe Initiative. The FinWaterWEI programme is managed on behalf of the Finnish Ministry for Foreign Affairs by SYKE ( <http://www.environment.fi/default.asp?contentid=405313&lan=EN>) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The Aarhus Convention establishes a number of rights of the public with regard to the environment: access to environmental information, public participation in environmental decision-making and public participation in environmental decision-making [↑](#footnote-ref-6)