



## Collection of good practices and lessons learned on target setting and reporting

Draft

### Table of Contents

0	Foreword.....	2
0	Preface .....	2
0	Acknowledgements.....	2
0	Contents.....	2
0	List of figures and tables .....	2
0	List of boxes .....	2
0	List of acronyms and abbreviations .....	2
0	Summary .....	2
1	Introduction .....	2
1.1	Cross-cutting lessons and common challenges .....	2
2	Institutional arrangements for setting and implementing targets .....	2
3	Development of baseline analysis and prioritisation of issues.....	8
4	Definition of draft targets .....	10
4.1	Examples of targets in the target areas required under the Protocol.....	12
5	Financial and economic matters related to the setting of targets (including cost-benefit analysis) .	18
6	Public involvement in the process of setting targets.....	21
7	Official adoption, publication and promotion of the targets .....	27
7.1	Formal adoption process .....	27
7.2	Publication and promotion of targets.....	29
8	Developing national action plans / programs of measures to implement the targets set.....	31
9	Reviewing and assessing progress towards the achievement of the targets.....	33
9.1	Review and revision of targets.....	33
9.2	Reporting.....	34
10	Raising political awareness, communication and promotion.....	36

- 0 Foreword
- 0 Preface
- 0 Acknowledgements
- 0 Contents
- 0 List of figures and tables
- 0 List of boxes
- 0 List of acronyms and abbreviations
- 0 Summary

1 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 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 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 from Parties to the Protocol and other States that highlight some good and bad practices that may be of use to other countries.



Figure 1. Logical framework for the process of setting targets.

1.1 Cross-cutting lessons and common challenges

*Text to be developed*

2 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

- Involvement of leading competent authorities and other stakeholders, including a shared buy-in by key ministries and sub-national authorities dealing with environment, water and health is a great advantage in securing support during the target setting and implementation process.
- The formalization of the inter-ministerial cooperation (e.g. through a cabinet decision or a joint order/decision by the two leading ministries) is recommended to ensure continuity and effectiveness of cooperation. Involvement of other relevant ministries in the process is an advantage.
- Use of the existing national coordination mechanism, such as the Steering Committees under the National Policy Dialogues or national water councils, is recommended to ensure formal, accountable and continued cooperation.
- Involvement of high management in ministries and departments at the technical level (e.g. at the level of head of department), in addition to the political leadership in ministries, proves valuable when coping with political changes.
- Involvement of nongovernmental organizations is highly recommended to drive and promote the process of setting and implementing targets, as well as pointing out specific challenges.
- Involvement of dedicated members with personal commitment and leadership (i.e. national focal points) in the inter-sectoral mechanisms is valuable.
- Allocation of dedicated financial and human resources for the implementation of the Protocol is strongly suggested since most organizations do not have reserve resources.

- **Potential case studies: Germany, Hungary (how the Expert committee continued to work on voluntary basis during an unstable period)**

#### Case study-Norway

**Case summary**

*In Norway an approach of establishing two groups at different governmental levels was chosen to establish the institutional arrangements needed to develop the drafts for the Norwegian targets.*

*A new group at the ministerial level was formed with representatives of Ministry of Health and Care Services (leader of the group), Ministry of Climate and Environment, Ministry of Local Government and Modernization, Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Ministry of Trade, Industry and Fisheries and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The task of this group was to oversee the work and the progress made in the second group. This ministerial group was intended to be a forum for discussion of questions related to drinking water in general and not only matters solely connected to the Protocol on Water and Health.*

*In order to carry out the work of drafting the national targets, the Ministry of Health and Care Services in consultation with the Ministry of Environment, appointed the Norwegian Food Safety Authority (NFSA) to coordinate the drafting of targets in cooperation with the relevant governmental bodies such as the Norwegian Institute of Public Health and the Norwegian Environment Agency. Contact was also made with Norwegian Water, the national association representing Norway's water industry, to get their input on the targets.*

*The targets proposed by the drafting group were then presented to the ministerial group, before the government in 2014 finalized the targets.*

**Why is it a good practice?**

*The organization was considered good because it secured the involvement of all relevant ministries at this level, while at the same time drawing from the experiences and knowledge of the directorates primarily in charge of drinking water, wastewater and disease control. In other words, the proposals for the targets were made by the officials who were the closest to know the real problems and able to suggest how to improve the situation. Links to the waterworks association secured that the government and the local level shared the description of where the problems are.*

**Overcoming challenges**

*Initially, the main challenges at the governmental level were the lack of understanding of why it was necessary to set national targets under the Protocol. Often, it was said that the different EU-regulations and directives were sufficient as tools to deal with the problems. Other difficulties came from the common understanding that water and water supply is a concern for the municipalities to deal with, and not a problem for the state level to engage. Finally, the problems in the sector were generally thought to be very small.*

*To change the common perception amongst government politicians that problems were small, all routes of information were used to inform them about the challenges and that the Protocol represented a good tool to deal with them. In all relevant budget documents, white papers in the field of public health and proposals for new legislation, the need of taking action was mentioned. Over the period of some years, both the parliament and the (changing) governments received the message.*

*A factor that probably helped significantly in securing that the targets were set, is that the key personnel working with the development of the targets both at ministerial and directorate level stayed the same during the whole process.*

*Another element working in favour of getting recognition of the targets, was probably that other sources of information such as an independent report made by the national engineers association repeatedly pointed at water and sanitation as areas where the standards were sinking.*

**Success factors and lessons learned**

*Stability in the group of personnel dealing with the preparation and development of the targets and the target setting process has been helpful.*

*Working on establishing the same perception of what your challenges are and what to do with them at all administrative levels including operators take time – more than the two years foreseen by the Protocol text.*

*Setting targets is not an easy and self-fulfilling task – it takes a lot of time and effort to get acceptance for the necessity of setting them since the Protocol is not yet very well-known in the mind of politicians.*

***How to replicate this practice***

*If it doesn't already exist, create a platform where the different authorities can meet and discuss challenges.*

*See if this can be done at several levels of administration – it is vital that the challenges are recognized in all relevant sectors and levels.*

**Case study - Hungary**

***Case summary***

Hungary was among the first countries to ratify the Protocol, and consequently was early to proceed to target setting. Targets were set in 2008 and revised in 2010. 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 intersectorial body, the Special Committee on Water and Health was established under the Public Health Interministerial Committee and mandated to coordinate implementation at the operational level.

The Special Committee involved various governmental bodies and institutions responsible for environment, water management, health, water utility regulation, public health and epidemiology. Non-governmental organizations were also represented, mainly by professional associations of water utility and pool operators and environment protection NGOs. Target setting was the first task of the Special Committee. Priority areas were identified by the members of the committee. Relevance and feasibility (e.g. availability of resources) of the targets were assessed. Not all target areas were covered in the target setting process. The targets were published.

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 the 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.

Reporting under the Protocol is also coordinated by the Special Committee. Primary responsibility of reporting lies with the Ministry of Human Resources, but all involved stakeholders provide data.

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

Target areas cover many areas of expertise, some of which are outside of the scope of the responsible institutions. A mandated intersectorial body is therefore a key element of the successful implementation. Each stakeholder can propose targets in their respective work areas. The target

proposals are assessed by the entire intersectoral body, prioritized and accepted. The completeness of reporting is also facilitated by multi-stakeholder involvement.

### ***Overcoming challenges***

The target setting process in Hungary started very early, well before the publication of the Guidelines for Target Setting and Reporting. It was thus 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 problem was tackled during the revision of the targets when the rationale of indicators was better understood.

Five years after the ratification of the Protocol, major governmental reorganization resulted in the abolition of the “mother organization” Public Health Interministerial Committee, thus terminating the formalized mandate of the Special Committee on Water and Health. 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 the more formalized 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.

The Special Committee - by bringing together various expertise in connections with water and health, also served as a platform of information exchange on other related areas outside the direct scope of the Protocol.

### ***Success factors and lessons learned***

- A mandated, formalized intersectoral body is essential for the successful implementation.
- Availability of funding should be taken into account to set realistic and achievable targets.
- Less resource intensive targets (such as data acquisition or dissemination)
- The completeness of reporting is facilitated by multi-stakeholder involvement.

### ***How to replicate this practice***

Countries should aim at establishing a formalized intersectoral 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. Preferably the body should have an allocated budget for its activities.

Both target setting and reporting should be coordinated by the panel of experts in the intersectoral body. This extends the scale of expertise and thus the panel can summarize potential targets, discuss their relevance and jointly set priorities. An intersectoral coordinating body also enables consistent and reliable reporting. Targets should be in line with the financial realities, in target areas, where resources are not available, cost-efficient



## **Case study- Ukraine**

### **Case summary**

Ukraine has been a Party to the Protocol on Water and Health since 2003, when the Protocol was ratified by Law of Ukraine №1066-IV on 09.07.2003.

According to the order of the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine dated 06.10.2003 № 46963 "On implementation of the Action Plan for implementation of the Law on Ratification of Protocol", the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine is the central executive body responsible for controlling the implementation of the Action Plan and serving as focal point for communicating with the Protocol Secretariat.

The Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine established an Interdepartmental Working Group on Protocol implementation. Understanding the complexity of requirements of the Protocol's target setting format and procedures, the Ministry Ukraine in May 2008 requested the Project Facilitation Mechanism of the Protocol to provide international assistance to Ukraine for the National targets setting process. In March, an agreement was signed between the parties at the 5th World Water Forum. The Ukrainian Ministry of Environment nominated national consultants to the project, while the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs appointed the Norwegian Institute for Water Research (NIVA) as international consultants.

The stakeholder group was established as the Project Working Group to develop and review the national targets for Ukraine. A baseline analysis along 14 target areas of the Protocol was carried out under the project in 2009.

The Project Working Group reviewed the data and analyzed the challenges related to the Protocol scope in Ukraine, and identified and discussed priorities during a series of meetings. As a result, the first draft of the National Targets, consisting of 80 indicators, was developed.

These targets were reviewed, prioritized and later consolidated in the final version of 15 National Targets.

Overall, 15 National Targets were approved. These correspond to Article 6 of the Protocol, paragraphs 2 (a), 2 (b), 2 (c), 2 (d), 2 (e), 2 (h), 2 (g), 2 (i) 2 (m) and 2 (n).

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

A large number of interested parties have been involved in the process of working on the development and establishment of the targets, working as a team and achieving good results within a short term. A broad stakeholder group consisting of ministries and state committees, NGOs, research organizations and river basin organization was appointed by the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine.

### **Overcoming challenges**

Unfortunately, not enough attention was paid to the systematic analysis of common problems in Ukraine in the sphere of the Protocol, in accordance with Article 6; particularly on risk assessment and economic analysis of the cost of measures to achieve the NCP. Allocation of priorities were done by each office subscribing process on the basis of its studies, common criteria were not worked out on a methodological basis.

During the development of the NCP no attempt was made to formulate a draft program on measures needed to achieve the NCP, due to the peculiarities of national practices and the lack of long-term planning of national cost-benefit analysis techniques. In establishing indicators, the agency that is responsible for the task formulated the indicators based on the existing activities, which were carried out at that time under the relevant state programs.

### **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.*

### 3 Development of baseline analysis and prioritization 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 describing prevailing conditions as well as expert judgements.

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

#### Lessons learned and good practices

- The development of the baseline analysis is recommended to start as soon as possible after ratification, to enable the successful establishment and publishing of targets within two years after ratification. This process is suggested to start in parallel with the establishment of the inter-ministerial working groups for the implementation of the Protocol.
- The scope of the baseline analysis should be defined at the outset of the process. It should be developed by the experts concerned so that the focus and investigation remains on the most important issues while substantiating existing problems. *A vision on possible future targets will effectively direct the baseline analysis.*
- In some cases, highly aggregated data 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 from 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 judgement can also provide initial direction. Moreover, filling specific data gaps and/or strengthening national monitoring capacity can indeed become the focus of a target.
- Developing a comprehensive baseline analysis in the 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 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.
- The baseline analysis is an important tool for the further discussions on targets and should therefore be widely disseminated to reach out to all stakeholders. Therefore, its publication, for example through posting on the national Protocol website, and its broad distribution are good practices.



- 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 which 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*.

- **Potential case studies: Germany, Hungary**

### **Case study - Serbia**

#### **Case summary**

*The Republic of Serbia became a Party to the Protocol in April 2013. Soon after, the target setting process was 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), led by the Ministry of Health. The NWG conducted 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. This analysis was essential for the setting of priority issues and implementation actions under the Protocol. Moreover, Serbia's participation in the GLAAS reporting cycle for 2014 and the data gathered through the GLAAS process contributed and complemented baseline analysis. The baseline analysis was published as an electronic publication in order to disseminate and communicate its results to the public. The baseline analysis paved the way for drafting national targets and target dates, presented at the national workshop held in December 2014 in Belgrade supported by UNECE and WHO/Europe. The targets and target dates were agreed after additional cross-sectoral consultations with a wider range of experts and representatives from relevant ministries and institutions responsible for education, sanitary inspection, infrastructure, public health and natural resources, including involvement of higher management in the Ministry of Health. The targets were approved in April 2015 through the process of official validation by the ministries responsible for health and environmental protection, as the joint signatories to the inter-ministerial agreement. We learned that good intersectoral collaboration was the most important aspect in ensuring a timely setting of the national targets and target dates in Serbia. Dedicated work by the national team members became an additional successful factor.*

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

*This case study shows that implementing and undertaking all of the essential steps, such as the establishment of good and efficient coordination mechanism, intersectoral collaboration, the development of the baseline analysis followed by identification of priority issues, public involvement and official validation of the proposed targets, led to a timely and successful fulfilment of the obligations under article 6 of the Protocol. Furthermore, commencing the process soon after ratification of the Protocol and effective time management resulted in setting the national targets and target dates on time.*

*The development of the baseline analysis has shown 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, that becomes necessary when deciding and prioritization areas that should be addressed as targets. Development of the baseline analysis was initiated promptly after ratification of the Protocol in order to meet the deadline. Throughout the GLAAS process, which was simultaneously ongoing with the development of the baseline analysis, NWG learned to identify drivers and bottlenecks, knowledge gaps, strengths, weaknesses and challenges, as well as priorities and successes.*

### **Overcoming the challenges**

*Several barriers and challenges were identified throughout the target setting process in Serbia: data gaps and their poor quality in the baseline analysis, lack of awareness and involvement of higher management in ministries in the process, and lack of financial resources.*

*Barriers were overcome by identifying them at the regular meetings at the Working Group (NWG), minimizing their impact or avoiding them altogether.*

*Data gaps were identified and addressed by setting the targets such as rapid assessment of drinking water quality in rural areas, assessment water, sanitation and hygiene in schools, and improvement of data collection methodology for WASH in schools.*

*Lack of awareness and involvement of higher management in ministries was overcome through the workshop held in Belgrade, supported by UNECE and WHO/Europe. This workshop gathered high level officials from both ministries, where the participants realized their important role in the implementation process, accepted their duties and tasks and supported the promotional process at the local level to ensure better cooperation with local agencies, institutions and NGO's.*

*Financial challenges still remain as unsolved, since there is not a continuous financing model which could encourage efficient joint action.*

### **Success factors and lessons learned**

*Efficient coordination mechanism for target setting and the baseline analysis led by the Ministry of Health commenced soon after 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 with clear and concrete tasks assigned to each team member responsible for a relevant area of work, within specified time frame and deadlines.*

*Effective time management in a way that kept process on time.*

*Data collected through the GLAAS process complemented and facilitated the development of the baseline analysis.*

*Publication of the baseline analysis ensured outreach to the relevant stakeholders and the public.*

*Dedicated work by the NWG members.*

### **How to replicate this practice**

*Use the same model and follow similar steps in successful intersectoral cooperation by establishing the joint working group that could provide efficient collection of data, define priorities and coordinate responsible institutions and experts for setting targets and target dates.*

*Share experience and lessons learned on the target setting process and implementation of the Protocol at the national and international workshops. It could serve as a guide and stimulus for other countries with similar institutional set up in order to follow related procedures for replicating success stories in their countries.*

*Overview and advocacy of good practice with lessons learned gathered through the national plan of experience exchange could be of great support to countries with similar conditions and challenges, possibly neighbouring countries.*

## **4 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 ensure compliance with its provisions.
- The *2030 Sustainable Development Agenda* is the new global framework to achieve sustainable development by 2030. There are strong synergies between the targets related to water, environment and health targets in the *Sustainable Development Goals* (SDGs) and the Protocol, thus setting targets in all areas will support the achievement of the SDGs. The implementation of the *2030 Agenda* should therefore reinforce the implementation of the Protocol, and vice-versa.
- Prioritization of issues is successfully carried out by setting short, medium and long-term target dates following an incremental approach taking into account capacity and resources available.
- 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).

## Potential case studies: Czech Republic, Germany, Netherlands, Slovakia, Ukraine

### 4.1 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.

### I. QUALITY OF THE DRINKING WATER SUPPLIED (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (a))

#### Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:

- Reduction of non-compliance of drinking water quality according to national standards by xx% by 20xx.
- To improve collection and publication of drinking water quality monitoring data through development of an electronic information system
- Develop water safety plans for settlements by 20xx – in x major cities; ii - by 20xx – in xx rural communities.
- To develop plan for the improvement of microbiological and chemical quality of drinking water in rural areas
- To develop and establish a National program for improving quality of drinking water by 20xx.

## **II. REDUCTION OF THE SCALE OF OUTBREAKS AND INCIDENTS OF WATER-RELATED DISEASE (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (b))**

### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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
- To improve methodology for epidemiological investigation and assessment of water borne outbreaks
- Providing the latest equipment necessary laboratories for testing safety and quality of drinking water
- Regularly publish (once every five years) an overview of detected water-related epidemics, including identified causes etc.

## **III. ACCESS TO DRINKING WATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (c))**

### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- To improve the access to drinking water in urban areas to 97% in rural areas to 74% by 2020.
- Increase the access of children in schools and pre-school institutions to improve water supply sources
- Upgrade private water supply systems with unclear ownership/unsatisfactory water quality and security, or connect to existing water supply systems

## **IV. ACCESS TO SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (d))**

### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- To increase % of connections to centralized sewerage systems in rural areas
- Improve sanitation in educational facilities by construction of new sanitation systems including Ecosan toilets; xx by 20xx; a further xx by 20xx
- Complete construction of waste water treatment plants and sewers for public use according to EU Directives
- To raise awareness of teachers, school staff and pupils on hygiene of the sanitation facilities in school
- Ensure by 20xx the development and implementation of technical regulations governing the construction and operation of improved treatment facilities, including small sanitation systems.

## **V. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE OF COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS AND OTHER SYSTEMS FOR WATER SUPPLY (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (e))**

### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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
- Leakages from the water distribution network shall be reduced to less than xx% by 20xx
- Non-planned interruptions in the water supply should be less than 0.5 hours on average per inhabitant per year

## **VI. LEVELS OF PERFORMANCE OF COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS AND OTHER SYSTEMS FOR SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (e) (continued))**



**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Efficient collective sanitation systems in place
- 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
- Wastewater treatment levels as stated in the permits issued by the water boards

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))****Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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
- To increase the number of water utilities with Technical Safety Management confirmation and ensure compliance with the technical standards.
- To develop legislation for the implementation of Water Safety Plan in all water supply systems
- Regional associations of enterprises for collective and other systems of water supply and sanitation are established and operational
- To improve WASH survey in schools introducing new methodologies

**VIII. APPLICATION OF RECOGNIZED GOOD PRACTICES TO THE MANAGEMENT OF SANITATION (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (f) (cont.))****Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Complete construction of waste water treatment plants and sewers for public use
- 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.
- Reduce nutrient inputs causing eutrophication, reduce the risks arising from harmful substances and protect groundwater

**IX. OCCURRENCE OF DISCHARGES OF UNTREATED WASTEWATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (g) (i))****Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Decrease of discharge of pollutants into water bodies (compared to 20xx): persistent organic pollutants - xx%; nitrogen – xx%; Phosphorus – x%
- 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
- Revitalization and completion of the wastewater treatment plants (WWTP) and construction of new prioritized WWTPs
- Ensure that leaks and discharges from overflows do not come into conflict with user interests such as drinking water, agricultural irrigation and bathing

**X. 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))**

**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Support the neutralization of stormwater overflows by direct harmless infiltration or runoff via settling ponds
- 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
- To the extent that is financially viable, surface water should not be directed to the wastewater sewerage network

**XI. QUALITY OF DISCHARGES OF WASTEWATER FROM WASTEWATER TREATMENT INSTALLATIONS TO WATERS WITHIN THE SCOPE OF THE PROTOCOL (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (h))**

**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Develop and establish standards for the quality of effluents from treatment plants discharged into open water bodies, and related procedures by 20xx
- Reduction in the discharges of untreated wastewater in xx city; at least xx% by 20xx; by xx% by 20xx (compared to 20xx)
- Discharges from the municipal sewerage sector shall be in accordance with the requirements set in the Pollution Regulations or individual permits
- 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

**XII. DISPOSAL OR REUSE OF SEWAGE SLUDGE FROM COLLECTIVE SYSTEMS OF SANITATION OR OTHER SANITATION INSTALLATIONS (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (i), first part)**

**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Harmonization of the national legislation with EU Water Framework Directive
- To update the national Sewage Sludge Ordinance
- 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

**XIII. QUALITY OF WASTEWATER USED FOR IRRIGATION PURPOSES (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (i), second part)**

**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- A mechanism for the reuse of sludge from treatment plants and the dry ECOSAN toilets in agriculture and landscape management in place
- Organic waste products shall be used as fertilizer or soil conditioner as long as it is agronomically, environmentally and medically justifiable

**XIV. QUALITY OF WATERS WHICH ARE USED AS SOURCES FOR DRINKING WATER (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), first part)**

**Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Meet the requirements for achieving "good status" for all waters as set out in the EU Directive
- Enforce the delimitation of the first-level sanitary zones to protect drinking water sources; xx% by 20xx; at least xx% by 20xx
- By 20xx, develop National strategy for the protection of water resources
- A GIS (Geographical Information System) that provides information on the quality of the sources of drinking water in place

#### **XV. QUALITY OF WATERS USED FOR BATHING (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), second part)**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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
- Draw up Bathing water profiles, according to EC directive
- To improve collection of bathing water quality monitoring data through development of an electronic information system.

#### **XVI. QUALITY OF WATERS USED FOR AQUACULTURE OR FOR THE PRODUCTION OR HARVESTING OF SHELLFISH (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (j), third part)**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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
- Decrease the percentage of non-compliance with physical, chemical and biological standards of water samples from ponds used for aquaculture
- Achieve compliance with EU WFD protection measure targets on fisheries. Initiate investigation on surface waters. Implement protection plans by 20xx

#### **XVII. APPLICATION OF RECOGNIZED GOOD PRACTICE TO THE MANAGEMENT OF ENCLOSED WATERS GENERALLY AVAILABLE FOR BATHING (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (k))**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Draw up and issue a handbook of manmade bathing waters good operational practice
- 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))**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- 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

- To identify and establish Registry of contaminated sites which adversely affect waters within the scope of this Protocol
- Contaminated sites that threaten bodies of water covered by the protocol shall be risk assessed and treated/improved if necessary

#### **XIX. EFFECTIVENESS OF SYSTEMS FOR THE MANAGEMENT, DEVELOPMENT, PROTECTION AND USE OF WATER RESOURCES (ART. 6, PARA. 2 (m))**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- River Basin Management Plans in place
- Develop a strategy for managing the quality of water resources by 2016
- Implementation of targets relating to effectiveness of water system management plants etc are governed by Act on the Organization of Water Management
- 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

#### **XX. 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))**

##### **Examples of targets chosen by the Parties:**

- Publish regular reports and consumer information on drinking water quality
- 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
- 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

##### *Case studies for examples of targets:*

- *Why was the target chosen (for inspirational targets)?*
- *How is the target measured?*
- *What are the recommendations / advice / lessons for countries that would set a similar target?*
- *For each target area different approaches are used by countries: best examples and elaborated examples for the target areas from the programme of work*

*To be further developed*

#### **5 Financial and economic matters related to the setting of targets (including cost-benefit analysis)**

##### **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 achieving the targets enables to reveal the resource requirements, which 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 defining targets, it will certainly be a hurdle in implementation of the targets. Proposing financing of actions, where possible, is therefore valuable.
- Many partners have neglected 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 set with the strategies with dedicated budget proves efficient for achieving progress toward the targets set. However, lack of secure funding should not be a limiting factor in target setting as the targets can also be a tool for attracting additional funding at national and international level.

### Case study – financial and economic matters

#### Case summary

*From the very beginning it was very clear to the Food Safety Authority and the Norwegian Environment Agency who were given the task of elaboration of the Norwegian targets under the Protocol, that the biggest challenge in economic terms was the costs related to renewal of old infrastructure, in particular pipes, for both drinking water and sewage.*

*In Norway a survey related to the status of public infrastructure is published with several years interval by RIF – Association of Consulting Engineers, Norway. RIF is the organisation for approved consulting companies in Norway and the Norwegian member association of the global consulting association FIDIC. In several cases, RIF has pointed to water and sanitation as two areas where standards are poor due to aging pipes and the trends show worsening conditions over time.*

Another association, Norwegian Water (in Norwegian: Norsk Vann) which is a national association 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, and another 300 billion NOK in new infrastructure.

When suggesting the national targets, the reports from these associations, with the addition of results from inspection data from the Norwegian food safety authority, was chosen as baseline data regarding the need and the costs of targets related to maintenance. The data and the recommendations from these sources were found solid enough to be trusted and hence no new cost-benefit analysis was needed.

In Norway all costs and all investments for such infrastructure are paid by the consumer through the municipal taxes or directly to private companies. 90 % of the population get their water from companies that are owned by the municipality. For all public systems the law sets a "full cost recovery" principle meaning that the consumer cannot be charged more than the costs of running the service.

As a result of this system only comparatively small sums of new money have been granted to the follow up of the Norwegian targets. And these are earmarked for the activities of the governmental bodies like the National Institute of Public health.

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

Building on estimates and suggestions made by non-governmental organisations in reports well known by the public seems to have made a more general acceptance of the nature of the challenges identified and the price tag of the measures that needs to be taken to deal with them. The costs referred to in the Norwegian national targets are in fact the costs estimated by the sector itself.

By building on estimates already at hand the government saved time and money in deciding the targets. A separate report investigating the costs would have taken a long time and delayed the formulation of the targets, probably by years.

#### **Overcoming challenges**

##### **What were the main barriers/challenges?**

- The main challenge was that some ministries, like the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation, feared that the economic burden on municipalities as owners of water and sanitation infrastructure, especially the smaller municipalities, would be too big for their economic capacity.
- As a result of this it was agreed in the government decision setting the targets that the action plan for carrying out the targets should be consulted with the other relevant ministries involved before setting it. Such a consultation was held in autumn 2015 and the action plan and agreement was reached.
- Another challenge is that the Ministry of Climate and Environment has chosen not be part of the action plan for reaching targets. The reasoning was that some initiatives were already taken connected to the work done on implementing EU-directives such as the Water Framework directive, and that this was sufficient. This remains to be seen.



- *Small municipalities represent a challenge in many areas in Norway, not only water and sanitation. The present conservative government has as their policy to support the merging of smaller municipalities to make them more robust. This may help to make a change.*

#### **Success factors and lessons learned**

- *It has probably been a success factor that the Protocol was placed within the Ministry of Health because this is the ministry that -given the national challenges - has the most to gain by following the approach given by the Protocol.*
- *The cost recovery principle probably made it possible for the government to pass the targets. If the costs were to be covered by state budget it would have been very difficult reaching any political agreement because of the immense costs connected to infrastructure.*

#### **How to replicate this practice**

- *See if targets and target measures can be based on reports and studies that are available and recognized as solid and reliable.*
- *A good advice is probably to find ways and systems that enable you to spread the costs of costly measures over longer periods of time and over as large groups of the population as possible in your county.*

#### **Potential case studies: Moldova, Georgia**

### 6 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.
- Role of national authorities is also vital in the participatory process to ensure ownership.

## Case studies

**Potential case studies: Finland, Norway (electronic means), Hungary: involvement of professional associations**

### **Case summary-Ukraine**

*The target setting process in Ukraine started in 2009 with support from the joint Ukrainian-Norwegian project on National Targets setting. A broad stakeholder group consisting of representatives of ministries, state agencies and services, NGOs, research and river basin organization was appointed by the Ministry of Ecology and Natural Resources of Ukraine as the Project Working Group to develop and review the national targets for Ukraine. This Project Working Group reviewed the data, analysed the challenges and identified priorities during a series of meetings. The Draft of the National Targets consisting of consolidated 23 targets was opened for public review. The stakeholders carried out the reviews within their organizations, while the public participation in this process was carried out by the Ukrainian National Environmental NGO MAMA-86 and included 2 months of public consultations (5 September - 10th November 2010) and public hearings (on 20-21 October 2010). The draft targets were distributed actively by e-mail and by post and during events (conferences and seminars dedicated to the Protocol) for NGOs and stakeholders at sub-regional and local levels. These awareness raising events were organized by "MAMA-86".*

*As a result of public consultations "MAMA-86" collected 23 written submissions with numerous comments, which were put into the table and delivered to the Ukrainian-Norwegian project team and presented at the meeting of the Steering Committee of the National Policy Dialogue on IWRM and at 2 meetings of the Intergovernmental Working Group (IWG) on Protocol Implementation in November 2010-March 2011. Being a member of IWG MAMA-86 advocated the public comments and some of the public comments were taken into account in the Targets (access to W&S in schools, water quality and WRD list).*

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

*The Protocol principles and approaches (Art.5 i) were implemented, stakeholders, public awareness on the Protocol tasks and ways of implementation were raised. The public participation mechanisms and procedures were developed for the Protocol implementation, public opinion and comments were collected and presented to the decision makers. The key points of the public comments were taken into*

account in the final decision. National Targets reflected the main local and regional priorities due to public participation and received a support for implementation at local level. Some NGOs, including MAMA-86, focused its activity on improvement of access to WASH to achieve the national targets set under the Protocol in Ukraine.

### **Overcoming challenges**

Lack of common understanding that public participation has to be a part of the target setting process and that it can be planned and organized by the responsible authorities or person/focal point.

Ukraine is a large country and to involve the public the process has to be planned and organized well in advance recognizing how and whom to be involved into the public participation process.

Lack of resources for public participation and understanding how to organize them by the decision makers also became a challenge.

### **How were they overcome**

NGO took an initiative to organize the public participation process and representatives of the NGOs were involved as members of the Interdepartmental WG- Protocol implementation coordination mechanism. Being a member of the Interdepartmental Working group (ID WG) NGOs received the information about the timetable and deadlines of the TS process and were able to plan the public participation process. Communication and working relations with the Ministry of Ecology and natural resources – responsible for Protocol implementation - were developed and kept updated ( due to on-going administrative reforms and changes in the Ministry).

The national NGO, by using its network members and branches, was able to involve stakeholders and NGO representatives from different regions and cities /rural areas of Ukraine via organization of regional and local events to discuss the local – national water and health related problems and priorities related to the Protocol scope.

Fund raising for public participation in target setting was organized by NGO – initiator of the public consultation – and looked at different categories of challenges such as: institutional, capacity – human and financial, Information, others.

Financial support for public participation was provided by the Women for Water Partnership (WfWP) and Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC) due to fundraising of MAMA-86. For NTs promotion at national –local levels the publication was done with support from NIVA – the Norwegian partners of the international support project.

### **Success factors and lessons learned**

Experience and knowledge of public participation mechanisms and procedures, the proactive position of the NGO leading the process of public participation, readiness of the authorities and NIVA experts from the UN Project to provide access to information at all drafting and target setting process and to cooperate in the public hearings of the Draft, involvement of NGOs into the ID WG on Protocol implementation all benefitted the process.

### **How to replicate this practice**

Build capacities on public participation mechanisms, procedures and Protocol principles, planning methodology and ways to implement them through training and knowledge exchange among the authorities and NGOs. Involve and support NGOs or other actors who have capacity to organize and facilitate the public participation process for targets setting – revision, reporting and others Protocol implementation actions. The resources for public participation have to be allocated by the state or donors, then possibilities for fund raising for public participation can be established and included into the Protocol planning process.

## **Case study - Romania**

### **Case summary**

Romania participated in the 2010 and 2013 reporting exercises according to article 6 and article 7 of the Protocol on Water and Health. The process of setting targets and the implementation of the Protocol is completed, in most of the cases, through the implementation of the EU Directives in the water field, which contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the Protocol.

Therefore the majority of targets, including the targets dates, as required by the Protocol overlapped with those required by the relevant EU Directives dealing with drinking water, sanitation, water management, bathing water and urban wastewater treatment. The transition periods required by Romania for the implementation of the EU Directives are also taken into consideration for the setting of the targets data under the Protocol. Also, all targets under the Protocol are established at the national level.

In this context public involvement, including dissemination of information, in the process of setting targets under the Protocol is seen as:

- A process built/based on other consultation processes and their results (such as: public consultation on River Basin Management Plans according to the EU WFD, including the Programmes of Measures took place at national and local level; public consultation according to art. 6 of Law no. 52/2003 on decisional transparency in public administration regarding the draft of Governmental Decision for approval of Strategy on sewage sludge from wastewater treatment plants). Information is disseminated to the broader public and relevant stakeholders, with the main purpose to receive their comments and suggestions on those documents.

- A process according to which the targets and targets dates established under the Protocol are subject to public consultation. The document was published on the official site of the Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forests and of the National Administration "Apele Române" and their branches. A limited feedback from the public was received. The main reason for this could be the public involvement in other consultation processes related to water/health/environment issues.

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

Successful implementation of the Protocol, respectively of article 6, is achieved by ensuring collaboration and participation of all parties (stakeholders, water users, NGOs, public) involved at all levels. Local and county authorities play a key role in developing of projects/activities/measures in water and sanitation infrastructure aiming to improve human living conditions as well human health.

### **Overcoming challenges**

The public participation process allowed the public to understand the problems better and encourage identification of others. Quality of the process itself can depend of the human and financial resources allocated to the process, of the number of participants to the process, and of the inputs received from participants.

In Romania, in order to finalize the River Basin Management Plans (that include most of the targets required by the Protocol) all 11 Water Basins Administrations organized 26 consultation meetings. Main stakeholders, water users, public health authorities, local and county public administrations, environmental agencies, NGOs, professional associations attended these meetings. The main objective was to inform them about the water issues on the local and county/basin level, to consult them on the proposed measures, with the aim to take water management decisions in a transparent manner and in full awareness of all stakeholders. These meetings were followed by press conferences and newspaper articles.

*In the meantime, the National Administration “Apele Române” organized public meeting (focusing on specific target groups of stakeholders) at the national level in order to share knowledge on specific issues in water management, water resource and water quality protection through a dialogue with all stakeholders involved in using water resources. As a result of the meetings with stakeholders, the programs of measures to reach the main objectives were improved and finally established. The program of measures includes the timetable for implementation of the measures while at the same time, the ways to identify funding sources. Information material such as leaflets, brochures, and questionnaires were disseminated to all participants. An on-line system was carried out and all interested were able to complete the questionnaire directly and to express their opinion. Only 32 interested people used this electronic*

*tool to communicate their comments (and the comments were not very focused).*

*It is clear that the national authority has worked hard to involve the public, but it seems that the initiatives are not always effective in getting feedback from stakeholders, despite the fact that the public and stakeholders was involved from the early stages of process.*

*Participation of public/stakeholders in this process could be the reason why the majority of the public did not actively participate, respectively contribute to the consultation process on setting targets under the Protocol.*

*Collaboration with the Romanian Water Association, professional association, added value to the targets setting process as well as the consultation process by providing technical expertise in the field of the water supply and sanitation.*

***The public consultation procedure attained its clear purpose and proved once more the necessity of public participation to the decision making in the field of water management.***

#### ***Success factors and lessons learned***

*Use the outcomes/results of others consultation processes on water/environment/health issues.*

*Rely on existing consultative body on water management during the consultation process (River Basin Committees).*

*Specific training regarding how to conduct activities on public participation properly are needed for public authorities/institutions.*

*Appropriate management of the process of public participation is needed (a timetable for the public consultation process and the preparation of this process should be established in advance of the deadline for submitting the National Report to the joint secretariat of the Protocol.*

*The process should be developed based on the products/publications developed under the Protocol (Guidelines on the setting of targets, evaluation of progress and reporting under the Protocol on Water and Health and Guide to Public Participation under the Protocol on Water and Health). A good coordination of all public authorities is required during the process, including at local and county level.*

#### ***How to replicate this practice***

*Maintaining regular contacts between decision-makers and key stakeholders, professional association, NGOs and public during the process of setting targets will allow authorities to conduct a proper consultation process.*

*Public participation process should increase the number of interested groups in accordance with the specific problems at the local/county/water basin level. Organization of meetings with local communities should take place in order to respond to communities concerns in a clear and transparent way.*

*Use of non-technical language when addressing the public, sharing information and keeping communication channels open to public should lead to the improvement of the process to the next reporting exercise.*



## **Case study -Armenia**

### **Case summary**

*The civil society played a vital role in the development, implementation and support of the Protocol on Water and Health. The public role is recognized in the Article 5(i) of the Protocol that: "Access to information and public participation in decision-making concerning water and health are needed, inter alia, in order to enhance the quality and the implementation of the decisions, to build public awareness of issues, to give the public the opportunity to express its concerns and to enable public authorities to take due account of such concerns".*

*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 things, on the services provided to the public, including water supply services.*

*In the frame of the UNECE-WEFC project, the NGO Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment (AWHHE) organized a regional workshop on "Raising awareness about the UNECE Water Convention and its Protocol on Water and Health and strengthening the role of the civil society organizations in their promotion and implementation" in Yerevan in November 2012 prior to the first Steering Committee meeting of the National Policy Dialogue. The workshop aimed to increase awareness and involve a wide group of NGOs in the activities under the Water Convention and the Protocol with the view to giving public the opportunity to express its concerns and enabling public authorities to take due account of public concerns. Among the participants of the workshop were 30 representatives from different organizations, ministries and programs from Armenia and Georgia. Georgian partners shared their experience about the setting of targets process in Georgia.*

*Within the framework of the target setting project in Armenia (2013-2014) three stakeholder consultation meetings of NGO representatives were organized under the leadership of NGO AWHHE in Gyumri (North Armenia), Gavar (Central Armenia) and Yerevan. These meetings gave NGOs the opportunity to comprehensively prepare themselves for the Steering Committee and Working Group meetings and entrusted the representatives of the NGO AWHHE to speak on their behalf at these meetings.*

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

*Public involvement and following discussions in regions were focused on situation on water and sanitation in rural areas, and solutions for local problems and decentralized approaches (e.g. ECOSAN toilets, septic tanks, or other technologies). Concrete recommendations were made for prioritization of national targets taking into consideration local issues and priorities. Outcomes of the first two meetings and the draft targets were in the focus of discussions of the last meeting held in the capital. Thus, the public was involved at two levels: rural and urban and recommendations were developed.*

### **Overcoming challenges**

*Access to information and public participation in the process of decision making on water and health issues are essential elements of the overall strategy to improve the situation with water and sanitation in any country, as it is also recognized in the provisions of the Protocol on Water and Health. Access to information and public participation improve the quality of decisions taken by informing the public about the most pressing issues. They also provide the public with opportunities to express their concerns to the competent authorities so that they are properly considered.*

*To improve the situation in the water and sanitation sector reforms financial and human resources and time are needed.*



*The organization of the consultation meetings were possible to implement through UNECE-FinWaterWe<sup>1</sup> project “Protocol on Water and Health – Improving health in Armenia through target setting to ensure sustainable water management, access to safe water and adequate sanitation”.*

*The number of civil society organizations which contributed to the implementation of the Protocol was rather limited.*

*The organized workshop and consultation meetings made it possible to increase awareness and involve a wide group of NGOs in the activities under the Protocol with the view to give the public the opportunity to express its concerns and enable public authorities to take due account of public concerns.*

### **Success factors and lessons learned**

*The NGO consultations showed a large interest of the NGO community in the Protocol and its implementation.*

*The organized events provided an opportunity to NGOs and communities to voice their concerns and priorities and to convey their comments and suggestions to the Steering Committee. In addition, this mechanism facilitated a coherent input of NGOs to the work of the Working Group in target setting.*

## **7 Official adoption, publication and promotion of the targets**

### **7.1 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**

- Targets and target dates can be adopted as part of the national program 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 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/decrees by ministries of water /environment and

<sup>1</sup> 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>)

health or a decision by the Cabinet of ministers and Parliament are successful examples of official adoption, and is recommended. (see table)

*To be further developed*

### **Case studies**

**Potential case studies: Romania, Ukraine**

#### **Case study - Switzerland**

##### **Case summary**

*In June 2007, the Swiss Parliament ratified the Protocol on Water and Health with a large majority. Within two years, Switzerland had to set Targets for all the aspects covered by the 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 lack identified. Out of these statements, a summarized table including targets proposal with the foreseen program of work for the next three years was described with the corresponding responsibilities. The difficulties were linked with the approval of this detailed table, knowing that the implementation of the targets regularly do not concern the federal authorities, but the decentralized cantonal authorities. At this level, the question of the technical feasibility and the financial support was regularly raised. The legal basis for the implementation of article 6 at national and local level was also questioned.*

*The high number of stakeholders at the different levels is a major issue for managing a consequent agreement of the targets proposed.*

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

*It is essential to convince all the stakeholders concerned by the implementation of the targets to be able to show the progresses based on agreed indicators.*

##### **Overcoming challenges**

*The challenge is linked to the elaboration and the agreement of an action plan for the next 3 years in line with the targets proposed. All stakeholders have to participate in setting of targets, as they will have to support the consequences. Even if the participants of the target setting process are convinced, they have to take into account all the consequences and bring credible answers to the stakeholders concerned.*

##### **Success factors and lessons learned**

*Targets and target dates can be adopted as part of the national program 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 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.*

##### **How to replicate this practice**

*At the international level, it could be useful to provide more details on the necessary steps to agree on the proposed targets set at the national level.*

*It is also important to identify who has the responsibility for officially publishing the agreed targets: the minister of health? The leading person for Health and Environment issues?...or the focal point?*

## 7.2 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

- 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 organized with the support of NGOs.
- Establishment of dedicated clearing houses (resource centres) or using Aarhus centres can be a good promotion strategy.

## Case studies

**Potential case studies: Norway, Serbia, Moldova, Armenia**

### Case study - Armenia

#### Case summary

*By June 2014, the main outputs, including publications under the UNECE-FinWaterWei<sup>2</sup> project "Protocol on Water and Health – Improving health in Armenia through target setting to ensure sustainable water management, access to safe water and adequate sanitation" were completed. A technical report was finalized in Armenian and English languages based on the baseline analysis and adopted at the 10<sup>th</sup> EUWI NPD Steering Committee meeting held on 26 September 2013.*

*The baseline analysis was the first substantive technical step under the target setting process and included an analysis of the existing legal framework (national and international) and the environmental and health situation in Armenia with relevance to all twenty areas of target-setting under the Protocol.*

*Based on the baseline analysis, the publication entitled "Setting Targets and Targets Dates under the Protocol on Water and Health in the Republic of Armenia" was developed in three languages (Armenian, English and Russian). The publication consists of two parts. Part I of this publication describes the target setting process and Part II presents the current situation and issues to be dealt with under the Protocol on Water and Health together with the targets, target dates and proposed measures to improve efficiency of water management, and achieve safe drinking water and adequate sanitation.*

*Additionally, "Promotion materials" were developed in two languages (Armenian and English). One of the two leaflets provided information on the UNECE-FinWaterWei project and the other one was about the draft targets and targets dates. The electronic versions of the publication and leaflets were posted on the AWHHE's website (<http://awhhe.am/target-setting-process-under-the-protocol-on-water-and-health-in-armenia-4/>).*

<sup>2</sup> FinWaterWei is the programme 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>)

*The Armenian Women for Health and Healthy Environment NGO (AWHHE) was one of the stakeholders who were actively involved in developing the baseline analysis, the publication and leaflets. These promotion materials were disseminated during the Steering Committee meetings and at different events organized at the national and international levels. Moreover, the Armenian Aarhus Centres were provided with the publications to disseminate in their regions.*

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

*The publication and promotion materials were primarily developed as resources for the state authorities (ministries, agencies, institutions, and local governments), water utilities' and sanitation facilities' operators and the general public for raising awareness about the UNECE-FinWaterWei project and target setting process in Armenia.*

***Overcoming challenges***

*No challenges were encountered during the development of information materials.*

***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 Centers to disseminate the publication and leaflets.*

## 8 Developing national action plans / programs 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

- Target setting and developing actions plans or programs of measures should be an integrated process that is beneficial for establishing a more realistic and achievable set of targets. It may be useful to expand the composition of the coordination committee to include additional members with dedicated responsibilities to develop measures.
- The action plans or programmes of measures should include financial and resource mobilization strategy, including national budget, possible contributions from donors. etc.

- Action plans and programs of measures should be adopted at an appropriate political level to ensure availability of resources for their implementation.

## Case studies

### Potential case studies: Moldova

#### Case study - Norway

##### Case summary

*As part of the follow up of the National Targets for Water and Health, an action plan has been made for the targets where the Norwegian Ministry of Health and Care Services is responsible.*

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

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

*Ministries with adjacent responsibility were consulted before the plan was set.*

*We are planning to have evaluation processes once a year.*

##### Why is it a good practice?

*Targets without a plan describing measures to reach the targets will have little effect.*

*While the Norwegian targets are set on a more general level, the action plan describes a more flexible system with small steps with shorter time limits towards the targets. This makes it easier to see and evaluate progress.*

*The process itself is important because the participants are forced to come up with specific and realistic measures.*

*An action plan that points to the authorities, waterworks and other bodies who are responsible for carrying out action, leads to better commitment.*

##### Overcoming challenges

*The main challenge was to make it restricted, specific and realistic – regarding content and time frame.*

*We started out with a big scheme with all tentative measures mentioned in the targets document. It became too overwhelming and made it difficult to focus on a few realistic measures to start with. During the process, we ended with a document containing smaller schemes classified under six thematic headlines: empowerment, information, organizing and competence, knowledge and research, international cooperation and documentation.*

##### Success factors and lessons learned

*Make the plan short and simple with focus on what are thought to be the main challenges.*

*Pursue good progress in the process to avoid the experience of having to start all over again.*

*Make realistic and short time limits – this makes progress visible.*

*Evaluate and adjust the action plan when necessary according to, for example, funding available and new knowledge of where the gaps are.*

*Avoid starting with financial discussions if possible – they may become never ending.*

##### How to replicate this practice

*Consider if your national targets would benefit from having a sub level in the form of an action plan that could be more flexible than the targets themselves and take into account new knowledge, available funding and emerging problems.*

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

### 9.1 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



- Although the Protocol requires Parties to review progress at least every three years in the summary report, a more frequent review based on targets and progress achieved 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 evaluate the achievements themselves. Thus, it should serve Parties in identifying the need to revise targets and target dates.
- It may be useful to revise current priorities and indicators according to the findings of the review.
- Establishing appropriate caution plans to rectify any delays or to achieve revised targets is useful.
- It is recommended to publish the reporting results to the public (e.g. water and effluent quality data).
- While it is important to appreciate the achievement of targets, it is also important to focus on maintaining them.

### Case studies

**Potential case studies: Czech Republic, Slovakia**

## 9.2 Reporting

### 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.

### Lessons learned

- Adequate reporting on targets and progress proved to be a tool for enhancing inter-sectoral and NGO cooperation and political awareness about the Protocol at the national level.
- Public participation during the reporting process is recommended.

- Compiling data required for reporting and preparing report on the progress achieved is a demanding and time-consuming process. It requires cooperation between different stakeholders, both horizontally and vertically.
- It is advisable to hold a yearly meeting on progress evaluation of targets to facilitate the process of 3-yearly reporting.
- It is recommended to start the process of report preparation at least 6 months before of the deadline for submitting the report to the joint secretariat, to ensure obtaining adequate contributions.
- 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.

## Case studies

### Potential case studies: Hungary

#### **Case study - Switzerland**

##### **Case summary**

*The national reporting has to be coordinated by the Federal Office of Food Safety and Veterinary Affairs, knowing that this institution is the focal point for Switzerland. In doing so, it is essential to mention that the Federal Office of Environment manages many aspects described in article 6 of the Protocol. This national authority leads several projects, like the groundwater protection, that have an influence on the prevention of water related diseases.*

*Consequently, the key elements for the reporting have to be prepared by these two federal authorities and then a broad consultation is proposed to the other actors. At the federal level, the Federal Office of Agriculture or the Swiss Development and Cooperation Agency are also important players.*

*In such a decentralized system, it is also important to stress the participation of the local enforcement authorities, due to the fact that they have the data collected in line with the indicators foreseen. The other stakeholders, like the drinking water association or the waste water association, are also interested to profile their activities and show their initiatives.*

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

*It is necessary to organize a broad participation for the collection of information in order to be able to deliver a realistic picture of the situation.*

*It is of importance to plan the consultation of the interested partners, in order to get their commitments to participate and receive valuable comments.*

##### **Overcoming challenges**

*The main challenge is to collect the necessary data for all the aspects to be reported. These data belong to different stakeholders and are important to prove the assumption that water management is efficient throughout the country.*

*There is a certain reluctance to publishing data which is not well established. The surveillance authorities set their priorities for controlling based on risk management. They do not manage a proper monitoring, which is the reason why their data are not representative and subject to interpretation.*

*Knowing that the national report will be broadly published, also at international level, the concerned stakeholders want to be sure that the evaluations made will not give a wrong perception of the reality. Consequently, it is important to involve these stakeholders when gathering the data, and later also for the interpretations of their data.*

### **Success factors and lessons learned**

*Adequate reporting on targets and progress proved to be a tool for enhancing inter-sectoral and NGO cooperation and political awareness about the Protocol at the national level.*

*Compiling data required for reporting and preparing report on the progress achieved 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 6 months before of the deadline for submitting the report to the joint secretariat, to ensure obtaining adequate contributions.*

*Inclusion of water distributor organizations at local levels in data collection mechanism for reporting may be particularly useful in obtaining data unavailable at the national level*

### **How to replicate this practice**

*Based on the previous reporting exercises, a detailed planning of the necessary steps (data gathering, consultations, etc.) for the setting of a representative national report is a key factor of success.*

## 10 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**

- Political awareness should be strengthened as it may improve the political will, which is a key for effective implementation of the Protocol.
- Wide publication of achievement of targets is recommended (e.g. websites, Clearing houses, Aarhus centres, etc.)
- Horizontal information channels within state bodies that are responsible for the implementation of the Protocol are also very important.
- Establishing a dialog between relevant sectors and stakeholders at the local level through workshops and campaigns increase support in collaborative planning and contributions to the implementation of targets.
- National status reports containing success stories may lead to active interaction of the stakeholders and the public.

- The general public, i.e. final beneficiaries of the Protocol's implementation, should be informed on the progress with implementing the Protocol. Potential dissemination channels for this purpose are listed in the guidelines (refer back)

#### **Case studies**

**Potential case studies: Moldova (on the Clearing House)**

Unedited draft