



# **Implementation of the Astana Water Action – fostering progress towards improved water management**

Sonja Koeppel

UNECE Water Convention secretariat

# Astana Water Action (2011-2015)

- Endorsed at the seventh EfE conference, and part of programme of work of the Water Convention for 2013-2015
- Initiative based on doc. ECE/ASTANA.CONF/2011/5, prepared by the Chair of the Bureau of the UNECE Water Convention with a small group of experts
- Collection of possible actions for improving the status of water and water-related ecosystems through their more sustainable management:
  - General actions
  - Sustainable management of water and water-related ecosystems
  - Sustainable management of water and greening the economy

# Astana Water Action -

- 78 actions from 21 countries and 4 organisations



# Mid-term review of the Astana Conference outcomes

- Request from the CEP 18 (Geneva, April 2012), template developed by secretariat
  - Progress
  - Challenges and lessons learned
  - Usefulness of Astana Water Action
  - Future of Astana Water Action
- Responses by 14 countries and 4 organisations (80%)
- Late responses from 2 countries not included in report
- Report by secretariat on AWA implementation:  
Of 62 actions reported: 47 in progress, 15 completed  
Overall, significant progress in water management

## Progress achieved - Sustainable management of water and water-related ecosystems

- Developed river basin management plans (e.g. Serbia, Croatia)
- Implemented/designed institutional reforms (e.g. Georgia)
- Steps to harmonize legislation with EU directives (e.g. Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia(now EU), Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Serbia)
- Actions on monitoring, information management, assessment, research (e.g. Czech Republic, Hungary, Italy, Romania, Switzerland)
- Actions on protecting water-related ecosystems (e.g. Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Italy, Republic of Moldova, Switzerland)
- Actions on human health issues (e.g. Austria, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Republic of Moldova, Romania, EAP TF, ECE)

## **Progress achieved - Sustainable management of water and water-related ecosystems**

- Actions to improve water quality (e.g. Hungary, Romania, Switzerland, Portugal) for better human health
- Actions in adapting to extreme events and climate change (e.g. Czech Republic, Georgia, Germany, Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, USA)
- Actions to support transboundary cooperation (Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, USA, ECE, Eco-Tiras, INBO)

## **Progress achieved - Sustainable management of water and greening the economy**



## Challenges

- Human resources (insufficient personnel, capacity)
- Availability of reliable data, problems with data exchange
- Limited financial resources
- Lengthy approval procedures for project type actions
- Coordination between sectoral authorities
- Need to improve communication and involve population
- Governance issues
- Challenges with regard to emerging issues
- Challenges with regard to transboundary cooperation

## Usefulness of Astana Water Action

- Around half of AWA stakeholders considered AWA useful to strengthen political support to sustainable water management. Some felt political support to water was available without AWA, but AWA had symbolic character
- AWA was considered important for:
  - Fostering exchange of experiences in both national and transboundary water management and supporting IWRM
  - Bringing together various sectoral ministries & stakeholders
  - Complying with international obligations (Conventions, EU legislation)



## Future of the Astana Water Action

- Many showed interest to continue to submit and monitor new actions, some did not want to submit new commitments.
- Proposals to raise awareness about the initiative
- No duplication with existing reporting-type actions
- Important joint platform of EfE process and Water Convention
- Meeting of AWA stakeholders held on 25 September at Water Convention's Working Group on IWRM
  - Final reporting on AWA implementation in 2015/16
  - Publicize the initiative better

## Questions for discussion:

- (a) What is the added value of the Astana Water Action? Has the Astana Water Action contributed to sustainable water management and transboundary water cooperation?
- (b) What are the positive and negative lessons of the Astana Water Action?
- (c) What are the main challenges in implementing the Astana Water Action? How can they be overcome?
- (d) How could the impact of the Astana Water Action be increased and the experience-sharing between stakeholders intensified? Does the Astana Water Action have enough visibility?
- (e) How could the progress and results of the Astana Water Action be reported to the next “Environment for Europe” conference? Should the Astana Water Action framework be extended? If so, how?