



Lessons learned from the reporting process, and proposals for the way forward

Sarah Tiefenauer-Linardon, UNECE and Aurélien Dumont, UNESCO

Technical meeting on the template for reporting on SDG Indicator 6.5.2 and under the Water Convention, Budapest, Hungary, 16-17 January 2018

Recalling the process



- Indicator methodology tested in 5 countries under GEMI Integrated Monitoring Initiative: confirmed simplicity and data availability.
- UNECE and UNESCO initiated data and information collection through a questionnaire addressed to Ministers responsible for transboundary waters in early 2017
 - Deadline for reporting initially 5/6 months later
- Countries supported by a set of measures
 - methodological guidance, helpdesk, capacity building, including webinars and face-to-face sessions in UNECE and UNESCO events, notably the Convention's Working Group on Integrated Water Resources Management
 - After the submission of the Reports UNECE and UNESCO reviewed and analysed the reports and supported countries to improve the quality of the reports to validate them
- 105 country responses end of 2017 (out of 154)
 - 71 validated for surface water by UNECE
 - 40 validated out of 73 reports including aquifers for groundwater by UNESCO

Lessons learned and good practices from the process for reporting



- **Supporting member state in identifying appropriate national focal point for transboundary water issues and mobilizing networks at national level**
 - Able to build upon existing knowledge and relationships
 - Water Convention and IHP national focal points
 - Dynamic nature requires periodic review
- **Some reports were prepared through extensive coordination**
 - Different approaches to gather, collect and report information
 - Countries created national committee, organized national workshops, designated experts responsible for the coordination of the process
 - Good opportunity to support national coordination, cooperation and data-sharing between national institutions
 - At national or transboundary level (with neighbours or within joint bodies)
 - The reporting process also improved synergies between national institutions
 - Reporting already had an impact in terms of increased visibility and awareness of the problems at national and transboundary levels

Lessons learned and good practices from the process for reporting



- **Some difficulties in completing the reporting template and validating the reports**
 - Inconsistencies between SDG calculation and section II
 - Supporting measures assisted, but more could be done to promote and utilise measures
 - More extensive work with countries through validation process is needed
 - Reporting template will be clarified and revised for next cycle
- **Information reported**
 - Reports include a wealth of data never reported before, many reports very transparent on the existing challenges
 - Groundwater data a particular challenge, but many countries made efforts to reports aquifers
 - Long-term process to make best use of international sources, e.g. UNESCO's ISARM database



How to enhance the reporting process

- **Timeliness of report submission**
 - Reports submitted well after deadline after several reminders
 - limits the time available to review and analyse the reports
- **Guidance tools and capacity building to prepare for the next round to limit gaps and improve the quality of the information reported**
 - In addition to the available tools, share good practices on national coordination, organise global or regional hands on training to fill in the template,
 - Incentives for countries to organise national workshops, involve more cooperation partners (e.g. basin commissions)
 - UNESCO IHP will work with Member States from now to improve groundwater information, based on the gaps identified in the first reporting round.
 - Mobilizing networks at regional and international level (Regional organizations and Basin organizations; IHP network of Regional Offices and Centres and Chairs
 - Refine the step-by-step methodology (session 2) and Proposition to develop a Guide for reporting under the Water Convention / Sections II to IV



Guide for reporting under the Water Convention / Sections II to IV

- number of questions are not clear and are prone to different interpretations
- many questions of clarification or difficulties in completing the template might be addressed by providing additional guidance
- **Objectives:** assist countries in completing the reporting template
 - limit the time taken to complete, review and revise the reports
 - improve the quality of reporting
 - allow for greater comparability across country reports
- **Possible content:**
 - explain key terminology, possibility to include a glossary
 - simplify the template by taking out definitions and long explanations from the template
 - explanatory notes not needed anymore
 - explain the purpose for asking certain questions, e.g. link the questions to key provisions of the Convention;
 - provide examples of how certain answers might be completed
 - structure: general explanations (equivalent of explanatory notes), glossary of main terms, explanations for each questions when needed



Plenary discussion on timeline for reporting, the process of submission of the reports and other related procedural aspects

- During the first reporting cycle Invitations were sent out in January/February 2017 for a reporting deadline of May/June 2017?
Is a 5-month timeline for submitting reports appropriate?
FRE: Un délai de cinq mois pour la soumission des rapports est-il approprié?
- During the first reporting cycle a significant number of reports were received after the reporting deadline. A major challenge in receiving reports after the deadline is that it limits the time available to review and analyse the reports.
What might be done to improve the number of countries reporting by the deadline?
FRE: Que pourrait-on faire pour améliorer le nombre de pays ayant soumis leur rapport avant la date limite?
- Custodian agencies worked for a significant amount of time with countries to address gaps and misunderstandings in the reports submitted. Some gaps and misunderstandings may be addressed through the proposals to develop a guide for reporting under the Water Convention (Sections II to IV of the template), refine the step-by-step methodology, and by improving the clarity of the reporting template.
Are there other measures that might be put in place to facilitate the filling of the template and improve the quality of the reports?
FRE: Y a-t-il d'autres mesures qui pourraient être mises en place pour faciliter le remplissage du gabarit et améliorer la qualité des rapports?
- **What other opportunities exist to improve the procedural aspects of reporting?**
FRE: Quelles autres possibilités existe-t-il pour améliorer les aspects procéduraux des rapports?



Thanks for listening!