

# How countries reported on common indicators in the first reporting exercise? Lessons and guidance for the second reporting cycle

Thor Axel Stenström

Invited expert

**WORKSHOP ON REPORTING UNDER THE PROTOCOL ON WATER AND HEALTH**  
Geneva, 12–13 February 2013





## Aim of indicators

- The indicators are designed to show how the progress has contributed towards preventing, controlling or reducing water-related disease
- In this they relate to the collection and evaluation of existing data
- These data further relate to the set targets and priorities of actions as well as the actions needed to enhance implementation

# Indicators



- 1. Statistical background: (percent coverage) and where it applies (urban; rural; specific areas)
- 2. Quality information: (frequencies of compliance and relationship with standards/guidelines): Bacteriological quality indicators and chemical quality indicators (mandatory and additionally selected)
- 3. Disease incidence and number of outbreaks: Selected pathogens (epidemiology; route of exposure)
- 4. Access data: Drinking water and Sanitation coverage (urban and rural)

# Indicators (cont.) Water Resources and Quality



- 5. Quality classification of surface waters (EU and non-EU including number of sources and volume)
- 6. Quality of groundwater sources (including number of sources and volume)
- 7. Water use (exploitation index): Agriculture, industry and domestic

# Reporting



- ECE/MP.WH/2010/2–EUDHP/1003944/4.2/1/8
- **Regional report on the status of implementation of the Protocol**
- **Second session of the Meeting of the Parties**
  - Bucharest, 23–25 November 2010; Item 6 (a) of the provisional agenda
- **Procedure and mechanisms facilitating the implementation of the Protocol: national summary reports on implementation**
- The report summarizes information from 23 national summary reports submitted during the first pilot reporting exercise. The document aims to assist the Parties in assessing implementation of the Protocol and in facilitating preparation and adoption by the Meeting of the Parties of a number of decisions, in particular the programme of work for 2011-2013.

# Indicators –general considerations



- Many countries focused on the procedural and formal part of the reporting, often omitting the analysis and conclusions that would have been most relevant, also for others
- A clear link between the information of indicators and the target setting and management assessment was sometimes partly missing



- Data provision on indicators were mainly on a national level, without clear indications of "hot spots" or problem areas and the connecting attributes
- The common indicators aimed to gather similar information from all countries, but in reality report deviated in this context and the information is not comparable due to differences in methodology
- Supporting information for contextual relationships were generally missing. This hampered comparative analysis of the data between countries.
- In order to allow an analysis of trends for all Parties under the Protocol, it was requested to use wherever possible 2005 — the year of entry into force of the Protocol — as the baseline year. This was not possible in all cases.

# Indicators - Statistical background



- The coverage figures provided a general background with overall higher figures in urban than in rural areas
- The sub-national variations are just addressed by some countries. Sites with higher vulnerability to pollution are not addressed or only partly, which limit the possibilities to relate to specific target settings or risk situations.



# Indicators - Quality information



- The percentages of samples that failed to meet the national standard for *E. coli* and *Enterococci* reported mostly show a decrease in microbial non-compliance; however, the number of samples and the coverage are often poorly defined.
- Information on regional variations are most often lacking.
- The numeric data reported is highly difficult to interpret and compare.
- Many countries, especially countries in Eastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia did not report data on *Enterococci* as they often lacked a national standard for this parameter.
- Information on small water supplies was generally not provided.

# Indicators - Quality information



- Many countries did not report on all the suggested parameters for chemical quality .
- The explanations accompanying the data provided were generally vague or lacking and did not allow for an interpretation.
- Some of these parameters, like Arsenic, Fluoride or Lead are localised problems.
- A clear differentiation for centralized and decentralized/rural systems are most often missing and the statistical base for the parameters is not given.
- Additional health-relevant chemical parameters of national or local concern were usually identified, but why the parameters were selected was seldom stated, nor was the number of samples that the compliance was based on specified. Many were generally stated as zero or non-detected!
- Both for bacteriological and chemical quality, there was no corresponding target set in the area of quality of drinking water supplied when a problem was highlighted.

# Indicators -Disease incidence and number of outbreaks



- Information is heavily depend on the accuracy and reliability of the national surveillance system. Values do not reflect a “healthy” situation and data are not comparable between countries.
- Outbreaks are generally absent according to the reporting, which may be a reflection of the selected indicators (for example EHEC) and the reporting system.
- General information on other etiological agents are sometimes, but not generally given.
- In the reporting no information is provided for other exposure routes such as recreational water or irrigation.
- A misunderstanding sometimes occur between general occurrence within the country and where a link to environmental transmission has been established.



## *Indicators - Access data*

- Access data for water and sanitation mainly reflect a difference between Western and Eastern countries (and urban versus rural)
- Some countries highlighted issues related to small-scale water supplies including lack of responsibilities and management issues, but no country gave information related to seasonal used houses

# Indicators - Quality classification of surface- and ground waters



- Reporting on classification and the effectiveness of management, protection and use of freshwater resources varies due to the Framework Directive and/or national standards.
- A lack of national classification and of monitoring of groundwater is reported by some non-EU countries.
- The main impacting factors are nutrients from point and diffuse pollution sources, hazardous substances, as well as hydromorphological alterations. *Few reports mention microbiological pollution.*

## *Indicators - Water use* (exploitation index)



- Many countries reported on water use but sometimes with different metrics. Some used the water exploitation index while others reported through percentage of abstraction by sectors