

Guidance material for reporting

Professor Alistair Rieu-Clarke

Northumbria University, Newcastle, UK

UNECE Consultant



For all States: report on SDG 6.5.2

For Parties to the Water Convention: official report under the Convention
For all States: additional information to explain, substantiate and complement SDG indicator data

Section I Calculation of SDG indicator 6.5.2

Calculation of SDG indicator 6.5.2 value for a) transboundary rivers and lake basins (table 1); and b) transboundary aquifers (table 2).

States can elaborate on transboundary river, lake and aquifers, and their operational arrangements, in section II

Section II Transboundary rivers, lakes and aquifers

Questions to be completed for each arrangement covering a particular river or lake basin, or aquifer system, as well as sub-basins, parts of a basin or groups of basins, where appropriate

Consider replies to question 1, 2, 3, 4 and 6 to verify the rivers, lakes and aquifers covered by operational arrangements - based on "operationality criteria" in SDG indicator 6.5.2 methodology

Section III National Water Management

Questions relate to governance arrangements in place at the national level that concern transboundary waters

Section IV Final Questions

Policy-focused summary and questions on how template was completed

Guidance on completing this section is contained in the Revised Step-by-Step methodology

Guidance on completing these sections contained in this *Guide to Reporting*



UNECE

Revised step-by-Step methodology

- Step-by-step methodology developed for the for first reporting exercise - <https://www.unwater.org/publications/step-step-methodology-monitoring-transboundary-cooperation-6-5-2/>.
- Currently being revised in light of lessons learned from the first reporting exercise
 - Main change – improve ‘user friendliness’!
- Includes definitions of key terminology (aligned to guide to reporting)
- Addresses data sources and collection
- Provides five key steps for calculating SDG indicator 6.5.2 at a national level
- Will be available for second reporting cycle (December 2019)

Guide to reporting under the Water Convention and as a contribution to SDG indicator 6.5.2

- Developed by a drafting group comprising over 40 countries from different regions/ contexts
- Two meetings held in May and September 2019
- To be finalised by December 2019

Content of the Guide

- Introduction

- Why reporting on transboundary water cooperation?
- Why the need for a guide?
- Process of developing the guide
- Rationale for layout of the guide
- Linkages between Water Convention and SDG reporting
- Organisation of reporting process
- How to make the most out of the reporting process

Content of the Guide

- Questions by question guidance on template for reporting
- Sections II to IV covered
- Provides definitions of key terminology
- Illustrates how certain questions might be approached
- Offers county-/ basin-specific examples

Sample content

4. Have joint objectives, a common strategy, a joint or coordinated management plan or action plan been agreed for the basin, sub-basin, part of a basin or group of basins? [58] [59]

Yes /No

If yes, please provide further details: [fill in] [60]

[58] This question should be considered alongside the calculation of SDG indicator 6.5.2, including the criteria for operability (section I, *revised step-by-step methodology* ECE and UNESCO, 2019).

[59] For States that have an agreement or arrangement, as well as a joint body or mechanism, in place this question seeks to determine whether the States in question have cemented their cooperation through subsequent activities. **The joint objectives, strategy or plans should therefore *not be contained within the agreement or arrangement itself, but adopted after the agreement or arrangement is in force through, for example, a decision of a joint body or mechanism.***

A range of post-agreement or arrangement instruments may be considered. For example, the Water Convention, obliges riparian Parties to, ‘develop harmonised *policies, programmes and strategies* covering the relevant catchment areas, or parts thereof, which should aim to prevent, control and reduce transboundary impact and protect the ecosystems of those transboundary waters’ (Art. 2(6)). In addition, the Convention requires its Parties to set water quality *objectives and criteria* for the purposes of preventing, controlling and reducing transboundary impact (Art. 3(3)). Other instruments, such as a joint vision, declaration or principles, might be included. These instruments may cover a variety of topics, including gender mainstreaming, basin management, climate change adaptation, environmental protection, flood risk management, hydropower, navigation, sedimentation management, sustainable development, and early warning and alarm systems.

For States that do not have an agreement or arrangement in place, any cooperative efforts between the States, such as the development of a joint vision, might be included here.

Sample content

Master Plan for the Development and Management of the Senegal River

Within the framework of the Organisation for the Senegal River (OMVS), the riparian States have developed a Master Plan for the development and management of the river. The Master Plan is a result of an extensive consultation process with stakeholders, which was carried out between 2009 and 2011. The plan sets out a concrete action to achieve sustainable development within the basin by 2025, whilst protecting the river basin's ecosystems. The integration of various sectors, including hydropower, navigation, drinking water and sanitation, transport, rural development, the environment, mining and industry is central to the plan. A key priority of the plan is to avoid the over exploitation of water within the basin, through effective, equitable and sustainable water management. The plan can also be seen as tool by which to reduce the risk of conflict related to the availability or accessibility of water resources within the basin, and it therefore contributes to peace and stability in the sub-region.

For further information see <http://www.omvs.org/>.

The Sava River Basin Management Plan

The Framework Agreement on the Sava River Basin (FASRB) defines two main goals of cooperation in the field of water management: i) the establishment of sustainable water management; and ii) the undertaking of measures to prevent or limit hazards, and reduce and eliminate adverse consequences, including those from floods, ice hazards, droughts and incidents involving substances hazardous to water.

According to the FASRB, Parties (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Serbia and Slovenia) shall cooperate on the basis of, and in accordance with, the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD), and develop joint or co-ordinated plans on the management of the water resources of the Sava River Basin – a sub-basin of the Danube River Basin. The implementation body of the FASRB is International Sava River Basin Commission (ISRBC).

Pursuant to these obligations, the ISRBC has coordinated the development of a joint Sava River Basin Management Plan (Sava RBMP). The first milestone of the Sava RBMP was the Sava River Basin Analysis Report that was the culmination of a comprehensive analysis of the Sava River Basin, including the characterisation of transboundary surface and groundwater bodies, the identification of their significant anthropogenic pressures and impacts, as well as aspects related to water quantity, water use, flood management and navigation. As a follow-up, the Sava RBMP has been developed which addressed the Sava river and its tributaries larger than 1000 km² and rivers of basin wide importance and transboundary and national groundwater bodies which are important to the size (>1000 km²) or due to various other criteria.

The 1st Sava RBMP was adopted by the Parties in December 2014 and since then the process towards the development of 2nd Sava RBMP takes place resulting in finalization of 2nd Sava River Basin Analysis and Interim Overview for the Significant Management Issues with the report of the implementation of measures defined in the 1st Plan. With the 2nd Sava RBMP the Parties follow the provisions of the WFD regarding the 6 years cycle of the revision of the plans (available at: <http://www.savacommission.org/srbmp/>).

Thanks for listening

Alistair.rieu-clarke@Northumbria.ac.uk

