



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MENA REGIONAL WATER GOVERNANCE BENCHMARKING PROJECT

FIELDWORK PROTOCOL

June 2010

This report was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). It was prepared by International Resources Group (IRG) in association with International Water Management Institute, Institute of Water and Watersheds at Oregon State University, Computer Assisted Development Incorporated, Nile Consultants, and ECO Consult.

MENA REGIONAL WATER GOVERNANCE BENCHMARKING PROJECT FIELDWORK PROTOCOL

DISCLAIMER

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	V
FOREWORD	VI
1. INTRODUCTION	7
1.1. Purpose	7
1.2. Structure.....	7
1.3. Logistics.....	8
1.4. Staffing	8
1.5. Participant Selection.....	9
2. PREPARATORY WORK	11
3. WORKSHOP.....	12
3.1. Overview	12
3.2. Organizations and Functions Matrix	14
4. RATING SESSION	15
4.1. Overview	15
4.2. Decision Making Features Questionnaire.....	17
4.3. Outcomes Effectiveness Questionnaire	18
5. REPORTING	19
APPENDIX 1: STRATA FOR SELECTING PARTICIPANTS.....	20
APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS LIST	21
APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE REGISTRATION FORM.....	22
APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE O&F MATRIX.....	23
APPENDIX 5: WATER GOVERNANCE STANDARD FUNCTIONS	24
APPENDIX 6: DECISION-MAKING FEATURES QUESTIONNAIRE	25
APPENDIX 7: FUNCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE	34
APPENDIX 8: SAMPLE OF WORKSHOP AND RATING SESSION REPORT	36

ACRONYMS

CADI	Computer Assisted Development Incorporated
ECO	ECO Consult
IRG	International Resources Group
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWW/OSU	Institute for Water and Watersheds/ Oregon State University
MENA	Middle East North Africa
OSU	Oregon State University
ReWaB	MENA Regional Water Governance Benchmarking Project
TL	Team Leader
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

FOREWORD

A primary purpose of this project was to develop a field methodology that would support assessments of national water governance. This Protocol represents a distillation of the process that has emerged into a form that can guide others in applying it. Because changes, adaptations, and improvements to it should and, it is hoped, will occur, it also serves to document the present “state of play” and to serve as a foundation for those improvements.

The protocol was drafted by Dr. Lucia DeStefano of IRG and Dr. Jonathan Lautze of the International Water Management Institute (IWMI). In addition, the development of the process described benefitted from a great many other inputs – from other project team members, national collaborators, and workshop and rating session participants themselves.

Mark Svendsen, Ph.D.
International Resources Group
Team Leader
Regional Water Governance Benchmarking Project

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. PURPOSE

The purpose of this protocol is to document the Regional Water Governance Benchmarking (ReWaB) Project's approach to preparing and implementing field activities. These field activities, in turn, provide perception-based information on the performance of water governance decision-making in the target country¹. This information can be used, together with other data, to characterize and document the country's water governance regime. The protocol describes session logistics, participant selection, and the implementation of activities and reporting.

1.2. STRUCTURE

The fieldwork is designed to be implemented during two one-day sessions – one called the Workshop and the other the Rating Session. These sessions can be held separately or back-to-back (preferred).

The purpose of the Workshop is to (a) introduce the ReWaB project to participants, (b) discuss and share concepts and examples of water governance and water governance assessment, and (c) complete the Organizations and Functions (O&F) Matrix. This is accomplished through presentations, discussion, and participant completion of exercises. This Workshop is held before the Rating Session, in order to strengthen participants' understanding of water governance concepts and the project approach and help them make well-informed choices during the rating exercises.

The purpose of the Rating Session is to collect water governance assessments from a range of knowledgeable people with differing perspectives on water resources governance in the country. This is accomplished through participant completion of the Decision-Making Features Questionnaire and the Outcomes Effectiveness Questionnaire. At the end of the Rating Session, participants discuss, first in groups and then in the plenary, strong and weak points of water governance in their country, and then formulate recommendation to tackle water governance short-comings.

¹ A description of the project and background material is available at the project website www.rewab.net.

1.3. LOGISTICS

The Workshop and the Rating Session are held at a hotel or conference facility in a central location in each country, usually the capital city. One coffee break and lunch are provided for each session. Optionally, and depending on local norms, an additional coffee break can open the day. The core activities of the Workshop and Rating Session generally take about 5 hours each. Written materials (three exercises and the session agendas) are translated into the local language and provided to participants approximately two weeks in advance of the event via email.

Preparing for the two sessions requires local administrative support for the following activities.

- Arranging for the conference facilities, including lunches and coffee breaks
- Collecting and checking the contact details for the participants to be invited
- Preparing and sending out invitations
- Following up on invitations, including receiving attendance confirmations, making follow-up phone calls, and answering queries on session logistics
- Printing out the agenda and work materials and assembling participants folders
- Preparing the participant sign-in list
- Preparing name tags for the participants
- Preparing table name tags for the official opening of the event
- Preparing and printing out group lists
- Preparing expense reimbursement forms (if needed)
- Preparing a list of participants that actually attended the event, including updated contact details
- Insuring that the meeting room set-up is correct and complete
- Being available during the event to solve any logistical problems that arise

All the activity and logistic materials should be ready no later than the day before of the event and the meeting room should be prearranged in tables for 5-8 people each and a head table for the official opening. The room should be equipped with a projector and screen for powerpoint presentations.

1.4. STAFFING

In general, 3 to 5 project staff members are needed to conduct each session. These include at least one person (ideally two) very familiar with the benchmarking methodology and the activities to be conducted, a least one local facilitator/water expert (ideally two), and a person to carry out secretariat tasks (see

section 1.3). The support of local facilitators is particularly important to help the participants frame the project content and objectives within the local context. Moreover, if the other project staff members are not proficient in the local language, the local facilitators can help understand and guide the discussion in groups and in the plenary sessions, and can summarize the presentations and instructions in the local language.

If the lead facilitator has not conducted the process before, he/she should participate in at least one pair of sessions with an experienced facilitator to fully understand the activities and the type of dynamics that he/she could encounter. Local facilitators should be briefed in advance of the event to ensure that they are familiar with the session objectives and content and with the materials to be used. This briefing is particularly important because (a) local facilitators may suggest changes in the agenda to adapt it to the specific needs and expectations of the country, and (b) local facilitators must work in an integrated way with the external facilitators in guiding the participants during the event. It is important, therefore, that their questions and comments relative to the event activities are addressed before the start of the session.

1.5. PARTICIPANT SELECTION

The integrity and reliability of the information produced by the Workshop and Rating Session depend strongly on obtaining input from a carefully structured and balanced set of participants. Participants are selected to represent five standard strata of water professionals in each country: (a) water resources, (b) irrigation, (c) other water using sectors, (d) national policy-makers and (e) advisors (see Appendix 1 for sub-categories under each strata). Roughly equal numbers of participants should represent each strata. Some of the strata – national policy makers, for example – may be harder to populate than others, and special efforts may be required to obtain adequate representation from this group.

The invitation list is drawn up by identifying a set of organizations, or particular departments of organizations, that fit into each of the above-mentioned strata. For each organization or department identified, the organizers will determine how many persons should be invited to attend the two sessions and, if possible, identify names of individual participants to represent the organization or department. Local partners will apply their judgment in recommending organizations and specialists who understand water governance generally and are knowledgeable about national water resources issues. Wherever possible, invitations should be addressed to individuals within organizations who fit both the stratification criteria and the individual criteria mentioned above. This is usually feasible in the case of universities, NGOs, water users associations, and private companies. In the case of government bodies,

the invitation, sometimes though not always, may need to be sent to the head of the relevant department or agency, explaining the experience and perspective required and requesting him/her to designate a specified number of staff members to participate in the two sessions. The local partner should guide the choice of approach. If invitations are sent to a department or agency, the local partner may be able to suggest informally to the agency names of individuals who might be appropriate for selection. In any event, the invitation should be targeted on specific departments based on the stratification plan, and not on the agency at large. The table shown in Appendix 2 can aid the process of identifying and keeping a record of potential participants.

The organizers should target an actual attendance of at least 25 participants at each session. Since experience shows that 20-25% of the invited participants will not show up on the day of the session, the organizers should invite 32-35 people, with 6-7 people invited from each strata. It is very important that the same people attend both sessions to take advantage of the understanding of issues and concepts developed during the Workshop. Ideally, the Workshop and Rating Session will be held back-to-back, making this continuity easier to obtain. If this is not possible, it may be advisable to invite a still larger number of people to the Workshop (say 35 to 40) so that at least 25 people from this group are available for the subsequent Rating Session.

Once the final list of attendees is complete, heterogeneous groups of 5 to 7 people each are created by selecting participants so that each strata is represented in each group. Participants will sit and work in those heterogeneous groups, called table groups, throughout both the Workshop and the Rating Session.

2. PREPARATORY WORK

When initiating fieldwork activity in a country, the benchmarking team undertakes the following preparatory steps.

1. Identify a consulting firm or partner organization that knows well the water sector and how to deal with the public administration. The local partner should have the capacity to conduct secretariat tasks and also have access to one or two knowledgeable persons who can act as facilitators in the local language during the Workshop and Rating Session.
2. Make contact, ideally through personal meetings, with senior officials in the dominant water-related public agency in the country to explain the water governance assessment process and its benefits, secure their involvement, and obtain their advice on how to proceed.
3. Send a formal letter to the senior representative of the above-mentioned organization signed by the assessment leader informing him/her about the initiative (objectives, sponsor, partners, expected outcomes), explaining why the country was chosen and the benefits to the country, and asking for his/her support. Subsequent follow-up through both formal and informal channels will likely be needed, and the local partner can play a key role in this.
4. Once an official response is received, identify, with the local partner, organizations and individual participants to be invited, using the five strata as a framework and following the approach outlined above.
5. Arrange translation of the O&F Matrix and the two scoring exercises into the local language, ideally by a person familiar with the project. If it is necessary to use an outside translator, the local partner should check the translation very carefully.
6. Select dates for the two sessions (ideally at least 4 weeks in advance), taking into account local holidays and major water-related events occurring in the country and availability of appropriate meeting facilities.
7. Undertake an agreement with the selected hotel, reserving meeting rooms and equipment and arranging for food and beverage service.
8. Send out invitation letters by email or fax and follow up with phone calls as needed. In some countries, email may not be an effective way to communicate and fax communication is more appropriate. In some cases also, the norm is that a participant answers only if he/she is not attending. The local consulting partner is critical in understanding and following local norms in this regard.
9. Send the translated activity materials to the confirmed participants.
10. Allow one full workday prior to the event for the external facilitators to interact with the local partner to insure that arrangements are in place and to brief the local facilitators on the tasks to be performed.

3. WORKSHOP

3.1. OVERVIEW

The Workshop is designed to acquaint the participants with the concepts of water governance and the framework being employed in the assessment and to develop a picture of the organizations active in the nation's water sector and the roles they perform. This familiarization is achieved through (a) presentations about the project and discussions of water governance concepts, (b) presentation of examples of water governance in the hosting country by a local expert, and (c) completion of the O&F Matrix.

After signing in (Sample Registration Form in Appendix 3) and receiving a folder with the Workshop materials (name tag, agenda of the day, blank O&F Matrix, and list of Standard Functions and Sub-functions), participants are invited to sit at the table to which they have been assigned by the project staff.

After an official opening – ideally highlighted by a representative of an organization with a central role in the country's water sector – project staff give an overview of the project (objectives, territorial scope, and project team), present definitions for “water governance”, “benchmarking” and other key terms, and outline the project methodology. The purpose of this presentation is twofold. First, it familiarizes participants with the project and its concepts and terminology, and second, it helps them understand the purpose of the three forms they are asked to complete during the Workshop and Rating Session.

The introduction to the project is followed by a presentation giving specific examples of water governance drawn from the country itself. This presentation is usually made by a local facilitator or resource person, but a project staff member should work closely with the local facilitator in preparing this presentation to insure that it is consistent with the concepts and definitions used by the project. The purpose of this presentation is to link the theoretical concepts of the project with country reality, to trigger questions, and awaken participants' interest in water governance issues. After that, the floor is opened for questions and discussion. All these activities will take place in plenary, though participants will be already seated with other members of their mixed group at an assigned table.

Once participants are familiar with the project, they are guided through the completion of the O&F Matrix. This matrix is designed to elicit and document the distribution of roles among the various water-related organizations in the country. The project staff give instructions for completing the O&F Matrix and some examples. Participants then work in table groups to complete the matrix. Each group should reach consensus among its members and produce only one matrix per table. Project staff will (a) ask the group to identify a group member to summarize their discussion and report their results to the plenary, (b) stress that all of the sub-functions should be kept in mind during the exercise, not only the main Standard Function names that appear in the matrix, (c) stress that they should rate actual practice and not “on-paper” responsibilities, and (d) give an approximate timeframe to complete the matrix (about 1:15 hours).

The facilitators monitor the groups discussions and processes to answer questions, spur discussion if needed, and help overcome any bottlenecks in the group discussion. At the end of the exercise, one rapporteur for each group presents the results of the discussion to the plenary. An open discussion follows. The project staff then wrap up and close the day.

Project staff and local consultants will work jointly to present and facilitate the activities, in English and in the most appropriate local language. The time allotted to each activity and the sequence is shown below (to be adapted to the country's needs and norms in cooperation with the local facilitators).

Tentative Agenda (about 5 working hours)

30 min	Registration and coffee/tea (coffee/tea optional)
20 min	Official opening
30 min	Introduction to the project and explanation of basic concepts
30 min	Presentation on important local water governance issues by local expert
30 min	Q&A and discussion
1 h 15 min	O&F Matrix
1 h	Feedback and discussion
15 min	Feedback on the workshop process and methodology

Note: lunch and breaks should be placed in the agenda according to country norms.

3.2. ORGANIZATIONS AND FUNCTIONS MATRIX

This exercise generates information on the distribution of roles among important water-related organizations in the country. Since there is no “ideal” role distribution, the results cannot be used for assessing or ranking countries. However, it can give an idea of the number of actors involved in the various functions, and where there are gaps. In addition, completing the matrix helps participants become familiar with the concept of water resource Standard Functions – a concept that is also used in the Rating Session.

INFLUENCE SCORING	
1	No Influence
2	Minimal influence
3	Moderate influence
4	High influence
5	Very high influence
NA	No answer/don't know

The matrix (see Appendix 4) has on its vertical axis the name of the water-relevant organizations in the countries (identified prior of the exercise with the local partner) and on its horizontal axis the names of the five Standard Functions in a water resource sector (see Appendix 5).

During the exercise, participants will be asked to:

1. Check the list of organizations and add any missing organizations the group feels are essential. This should be done only for significant omissions. When the facilitators agree that an organization should be added to the matrix, then they should inform all of the groups and ask them to add the organization to their matrix as well.
2. Assign a value assessing the level of influence each organization has over decision making related to each of the five Standard Functions, using the scale in the box at the right. Facilitators make very clear that it is the actual level of influence and not the nominal or ‘on paper’ degree of influence that should be rated.

In this exercise, “influence” means that the organization “has an impact on the decisions that are made relative to this Function.”

As mentioned above, participants discuss the matrix in groups and complete it in groups. This means that the members of each group produce only one matrix per group, after reaching a consensus on the scores they wish to assign.

4. RATING SESSION

4.1. OVERVIEW

The purpose of the Rating Session is to collect assessments from a range of knowledgeable perspectives on water resource decision-making processes and water resource outcomes in the country. This is accomplished by having participants complete the decision-making features and the outcomes effectiveness questionnaires.

Three major activities are undertaken: (1) assessment of five features of decision-making related to water resources (Decision-Making Features Questionnaire, Appendix 6), (2) assessment of the effectiveness in performing five water resources Standard Functions (Outcomes Effectiveness Questionnaire, Appendix 7), and (3) discussion of strong and weak points of water governance in the country and formulation of recommendations to enhance it.

The day starts with participant sign-in and delivery of Rating Session material (name tag, agenda of the day, Decision-Making Features Questionnaire, Outcomes Effectiveness Questionnaire, and a consolidated O&F Matrix from the preceding Workshop). Participants are invited to sit at a pre-assigned table with 5 or 6 participants from other water sub-sectors.

Since the Rating Session will have been preceded by the Workshop, and since the large majority of participants will have participated in the Workshop, there is generally no need for an opening ceremony or project overview. Instructions for completing the exercises are provided in the opening plenary session, while the specific exercises are undertaken in mixed table-based groups. Participants are asked first to discuss the questions and issues in the exercise in a group, and then to complete each questionnaire individually.

The first activity is completing the Decision-Making Features Questionnaire rating the degree to which five features of decision-making (transparency, participation, integrity/accountability, rule of law, responsiveness) are typically at work when the country formulates its responses to a set of five common water resources challenges. Participants assess on a 1 to 4 scale the degree to which each of these

decision making characteristics is at play in the different challenges. The second activity assesses the country's level of effectiveness in performing the five water resource Standard Functions.

The day concludes with a feedback session where participants are asked to work in groups to identify the strong and weak points of water governance in their country, and to formulate recommendations on concrete actions that could be taken to improve water governance. Groups are asked to take into account ideas and issues raised during the O&F Matrix exercise as well as the two rating exercises. In case they wish to refer to the project material, they are provided with a summary O&F Matrix created in advance from the data generated during the Workshop and they will keep the two questionnaires they just completed until the end of the Session. Groups are asked to record the conclusions of their group discussion on a flip chart and to appoint a rapporteur to present them to the plenary. The groups' debriefings to the plenary are followed by open discussion. The project team will use the groups' flipcharts and the oral debriefing to capture the content of the discussion and include them in the Workshop/Rating Session report. At the end, project staff wrap up and close the event

As at the Workshop, project staff and local facilitators work jointly to present and facilitate activities in English and in the most appropriate local language. The time allotted to each activity and the sequence is shown below (to be adapted to the country's needs and norms in cooperation with the local facilitators).

Tentative Agenda (about 4½ to 5½ working hours)

If the Workshop and the Rating Session are held back to back:

10 min	Participant sign-in and delivery of working material
20 min	Introduction to the Rating Session
75 min	Decision Making Features Assessment (instruction and scoring)
45 min	Functional Effectiveness Assessment (instructions and scoring)
45 min	Discussion in groups on water governance (strong and weak points)
60 min	Reporting and discussion
15 min	Feedback on the workshop process and methodology

If the Workshop and the Rating Section are held more than one week apart:

30 min	Registration and coffee/tea (coffee/tea optional)
20 min	Official opening (optional)
40 min	Introduction to the project and to the Rating Session
75 min	Decision Making Features Assessment (instruction and scoring)
45 min	Functional Effectiveness Assessment (instructions and scoring)
45 min	Discussion in groups on water governance (strong and weak points)
60 min	Reporting and discussion
15 min	Feedback on the workshop process and methodology

Note: lunch and breaks should be placed in the agenda according to the country's norms.

4.2. DECISION MAKING FEATURES QUESTIONNAIRE

This exercise (Appendix 6) assesses the application of five characteristics of governance decision-making when facing five key water challenges. Typical country performance is assessed against the highest conceivable level of each of the five features.

The five water-related challenges that are used in the assessment are common to all country assessments, i.e. the same challenges are used in each country in which the assessment is conducted. These challenges were designed to (a) be relevant to the five studied countries and (b) cover most of the five water resources Standard Functions. Key Challenges used are the following.

1. Increasing demand for drinking water (function 2)
2. Decreasing groundwater levels (function 2)
3. Strategic planning for a national water policy (function 1)
4. Regulating water quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways (function 5)
5. Matching supply and demand in agriculture (function 4)

For each challenge, participants are asked to use a four-point scale shown in the box at the right to score 2-5 statements related to the five decision-making features -- participation, transparency,

DECISION MAKING PROCESS SCORING

- 4 Yes, in all or almost all cases
- 3 Generally yes, but not in all cases
- 2 Only in some cases
- 1 No, in all or almost all cases
- NA No answer/don't know

integrity and accountability, rule of law, and responsiveness. Participants are requested to discuss the scoring in groups and then complete the questionnaire individually.

4.3. OUTCOMES EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire (Appendix 7) is designed to assess the overall level of national effectiveness in performing the five water resources Standard Functions. The results are used to assess the functional performance of the water sector. The questions included in the questionnaire refer to the five Standard Functions as follows.

- F1: Questions 1 to 7
- F2: Questions 8 to 10
- F3: Questions 11 to 13
- F4: Questions 14 to 16
- F5: Questions 17 to 20

Participants are asked to complete the questionnaire using the same rating scale used in the Decision-Making Features Questionnaire. Participants discuss the scoring in groups and then complete the questionnaire individually.

5. REPORTING

Following the conclusion of the Rating Session, a Workshop and Rating Session Report is prepared, documenting the two sessions and summarizing the primary results of the activity². This report includes the main descriptive characteristics of the Workshop (venue; date; facilitators; number; organizations, names and contact details of participants; agenda; and activities undertaken) as well as the data collected during the participant exercises. It will not include data analysis or interpretation, since its purpose is to document the Workshop and to produce quickly a write-up that can be circulated to sponsors, senior officials and others who have expressed interested in the sessions. An example of a report is provided in Appendix 8.

Project staff also produce a confidential internal note describing any problems encountered, lessons learned, feedback from participants on the Workshop and Rating Session processes, and suggestions for improving future sessions. The project team should also keep for future reference a list of participants' contact information (which is not included in the Workshop and Rating Sessions Report) and the presentations used.

The data gathered through the three exercises is transcribed in a data spreadsheet, accompanied by a metafile explaining the data structure within the spreadsheet which can then used in subsequent analysis.

² If the two sessions are separated in time, a draft Workshop report is prepared after the Workshop and then updated following the Rating Session.

APPENDIX 1: STRATA FOR SELECTING PARTICIPANTS

1. Water resources
 - a. Government water planning department
 - b. Water resource data collectors and keepers
 - c. Ground water department
 - d. Basin planning and management organizations
 - e. Environmental agencies
2. Irrigation
 - a. Irrigation department/ministry
 - b. Water Users Association representatives
 - c. Agricultural department/ministry
3. Other water using sectors
 - a. Municipal water utilities or departments
 - b. Regulators for water utilities
 - c. Industrial users
 - d. Hydropower/fisheries/navigation/recreation
 - e. Environmental regulators for wetlands and instream uses
4. National policy makers
 - a. Planning ministry
 - b. Finance ministry
 - c. Legislature
 - d. Office of the nation's chief executive (king, PM, or president)
 - e. Judiciary
5. Advisors
 - a. Academics
 - b. Consultants
 - c. Environmental NGOs
 - d. Donors

APPENDIX 2: SAMPLE PARTICIPANTS LIST

Strata	Organization	Sub-unit	Sub-unit description	No. of invited participants	Names of invited participants	Participant contact information	Contact person (if different from participant)
Strata 1: Water Resources	Ministry of Water Resources	Directorate for Water Infrastructure	Directorate in charge of water resources development	3	1. 2. 3.	Address, Email, Phone, Fax	Name, Address, Email, Phone, Fax
	Ministry of Water Resources	National Groundwater Agency	Agency in charge of groundwater management	1			
	National Fed. of Water User Associations	-	National Fed. of Water User Associations	2	1. 2.		
	National Environmental Protection Agency	Water Protection Department	Dept. for water protection	1			
<i>Total strata 1</i>				7			
Strata 2: Irrigation (and so on)							
<i>Total strata 2</i>							

APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE REGISTRATION FORM

Attendance List

Date and Venue:

Name	Organization	Phone	Email	Signature Day 1	Signature Day 2

APPENDIX 4: SAMPLE O&F MATRIX

	Organizing & Building Capacity in the Water Sector	Planning Strategically	Allocating Water	Developing & Managing Water Resources	Regulating Water Resources and Services
Water Department					
Environment Department					
River Basin Authorities					
Ministry of Agriculture					
H. Council for Water & Climate					
Planning Department					
Industry Department					
Dept. for Land Management					
Tourism Department					
Health Department					
Economy Department					
Justice Department					
Legislative bodies					
Nat. Ag. for D. Water & Sanit.					
National Agency for Electricity					
Reg. Agencies for Agr. Dev.					
Water and Forest Department					
Private Sector					
Universities					
NGOs					
Water Users Associations					

APPENDIX 5: WATER GOVERNANCE STANDARD FUNCTIONS

- 1. Organizing and building capacity in the water sector**
 - 1.1 Creating and modifying an organizational structure
 - 1.2 Assigning roles and responsibilities
 - 1.3 Setting national water policy
 - 1.4 Coordinating and integrating among sub-sectors, levels, and national sub-regions
 - 1.5 Establishing linkages with neighboring riparian countries
 - 1.6 Building public and political awareness of water sector issues
 - 1.7 Securing and allocating funding for the sector
 - 1.8 Developing and utilizing well-trained water sector professionals
- 2. Planning strategically**
 - 2.1 Collecting, managing, storing and utilizing water-relevant data
 - 2.2 Projecting future supply and demand for water
 - 2.3 Designing strategies for matching expected long-term water supply and demand and dealing with shortfalls (including drought mitigation strategies)
 - 2.4 Developing planning and management tools to support decision making
- 3. Allocating water**
 - 3.1 Awarding and recording water rights and corollary responsibilities
 - 3.2 Establishing water and water rights transfer mechanisms
 - 3.3 Adjudicating disputes
 - 3.4 Assessing and managing third party impacts of water and water rights transactions
- 4. Developing and managing water resources**
 - 4.1 Constructing public infrastructure and authorizing private infrastructure development
 - 4.2 Forecasting seasonal supply and demand and matching the two
 - 4.3 Operating and maintaining public infrastructure according to established plans and strategic priorities
 - 4.4 Applying incentives and sanctions to achieve long and short term supply/demand matching (including water pricing)
 - 4.5 Forecasting and managing floods and flood impacts
- 5. Regulating water resources and services**
 - 5.1 Issuing and monitoring operating concessions to water service providers
 - 5.2 Enforcing withdrawal limits associated with water rights
 - 5.3 Regulating water quality in waterways, water bodies, and aquifers (including enforcement)
 - 5.4 Protecting aquatic ecosystems
 - 5.5 Monitoring and enforcing water service standards

APPENDIX 6: DECISION- MAKING FEATURES QUESTIONNAIRE

Key Challenge 1: Increasing demand for drinking water

To satisfy increased drinking water demand, there are options to increase overall use of surface water, groundwater and desalinated water and to re-allocate water from existing uses. There are also options to increase efficiency of water use. Key decisions must be made in selecting the appropriate mix of these and other options.

Please consider the process for selecting the best mix of options to satisfy increased demand for drinking water and assess the following statements using the scale below.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Yes, in all or almost all cases | 1 | No, in all or almost all cases |
| 3 | Generally yes, but not in all cases | | NA No Answer/I do not know |
| 2 | Only in some cases | | |

How participative is the process?

There are opportunities for public input to pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the public input	
There are opportunities for the input of organized stakeholders into pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the input of organized stakeholders	
Explanation:	

How transparent is the process?

Information on decisions faced is made available to the general public	
Data are easily available on decisions faced	
Criteria to be used in deciding are clearly stated	
Decision making processes are clearly defined	
Cost-Benefit Analyses of planned projects are easily available	
Explanation:	

How much integrity and accountability is evident in the process?

Decision-makers are held responsible for their decisions	
Water users pay “un-official” payments for water services	
Contracting processes are standardized and free from illicit payments	
Explanation:	

Is the process consistent with the rule of law?

Decisions are made according to established rules, laws and procedures	
Decisions are made impartially—irrespective of who is involved	
Explanation:	

How responsive is the process to changes in demand and circumstances?

The government reviews policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
The government adjusts policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
Explanation:	

Key Challenge 2: Decreasing groundwater levels

To reduce groundwater water table decrease, there are several options. For example, you can recharge the aquifer by adding surface water, you can reduce withdrawal per hectare, and you can reduce withdrawal per hectare and cease irrigation extension. Selecting the appropriate balance of these and other measures requires that key decisions be made.

Please consider the process for selecting strategies to reduce groundwater table decline and assess the following statements using the scale below.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Yes, in all or almost all cases | 1 | No, in all or almost all cases |
| 3 | Generally yes, but not in all cases | | NA No Answer/I do not know |
| 2 | Only in some cases | | |

How participative is the process?

There are opportunities for public input to pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the public input	
There are opportunities for the input of organized stakeholders into pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the input of organized stakeholders	
Explanation:	

How transparent is the process?

Information on decisions faced is made available to the general public	
Data are easily available on decisions faced	
Criteria to be used in deciding are clearly stated	
Decision making processes are clearly defined	
Cost-Benefit Analyses of planned projects are easily available	
Explanation:	

How much integrity and accountability is evident in the process?

Decision-makers are held responsible for their decisions	
Water users pay “un-official” payments for water services	
Contracting processes are standardized and free from illicit payments	
Explanation:	

Is the process consistent with the rule of law?

Decisions are made according to established rules, laws and procedures	
Decisions are made impartially—irrespective of who is involved	
Explanation:	

How responsive is the process to changes in demand and circumstances?

The government reviews policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
The government adjusts policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
Explanation:	

Key Challenge 3: Strategic planning for a national water policy

Generally, governments define and develop their national water-related priorities in national water policy documents and mid- to long-term water resources plans. Different approaches can nonetheless be utilized to in the process of identifying and ordering the priorities, goals and objectives contained in national water policies and long-term water resource plans. Please consider the process of developing water policies and plans and assess the following statements using the scale below.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Yes, in all or almost all cases | 1 | No, in all or almost all cases |
| 3 | Generally yes, but not in all cases | | NA No Answer/I do not know |
| 2 | Only in some cases | | |

How participative is the process?

There are opportunities for public input to pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the public input	
There are opportunities for the input of organized stakeholders into pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the input of organized stakeholders	
Explanation:	

How transparent is the process?

Information on decisions faced is made available to the general public	
Data are easily available on decisions faced	
Criteria to be used in deciding are clearly stated	
Decision making processes are clearly defined	
Cost-Benefit Analyses of planned projects are easily available	
Explanation:	

How much integrity and accountability is evident in the process?

Decision-makers are held responsible for their decisions	
Water users pay "un-official" payments for water services	
Contracting processes are standardized and free from illicit payments	
Explanation:	

Is the process consistent with the rule of law?

Decisions are made according to established rules, laws and procedures	
Decisions are made impartially—irrespective of who is involved	
Explanation:	

How responsive is the process to changes in demand and circumstances?

The government reviews policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
The government adjusts policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
Explanation:	

Key Challenge 4: Regulating water quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways

Ensuring water quality is important to minimize adverse health effects, to ensure the quality of agricultural production and to sustain healthy aquatic ecosystems. Decision-making related to regulation of water quality includes the definition of quality standards, the formulation and application of rules to meet those standards (e.g. the establishment of pollutants emission permits), the implementation of projects to reduce pollution and the enforcement of the laws to limit pollution.

Please consider the process of regulating pollutant discharges (i.e. deciding who can emit pollutants and how) and assess the following statements using the scale below.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Yes, in all or almost all cases | 1 | No, in all or almost all cases |
| 3 | Generally yes, but not in all cases | | NA No Answer/I do not know |
| 2 | Only in some cases | | |

How participative is the process?

There are opportunities for public input to pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the public input	
There are opportunities for the input of organized stakeholders into pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the input of organized stakeholders	
Explanation:	

How transparent is the process?

Information on decisions faced is made available to the general public	
Data are easily available on decisions faced	
Criteria to be used in deciding are clearly stated	
Decision making processes are clearly defined	
Cost-Benefit Analyses of planned projects are easily available	
Explanation:	

How much integrity and accountability is evident in the process?

Decision-makers are held responsible for their decisions	
Water users pay "un-official" payments for water services	
Contracting processes are standardized and free from illicit payments	
Explanation:	

Is the process consistent with the rule of law?

Decisions are made according to established rules, laws and procedures	
Decisions are made impartially—irrespective of who is involved	
Explanation:	

How responsive is the process to changes in demand and circumstances?

The government reviews policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
The government adjusts policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
Explanation:	

Key Challenge 5: Matching Supply and Demand in Agriculture

The agricultural sector withdraws and consumes the vast majority of water in most countries. At the beginning of the irrigation season decisions need to be made about how to share the available water among existing agricultural water users (private small and large farms, irrigation districts or government irrigation projects). These decisions are a major challenge since demand often exceeds supply.

Please consider the process of allocating water to the different agricultural water users within the constraints of the annual availability of water resources and assess the following statements using the scale below.

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| 4 | Yes, in all or almost all cases | 1 | No, in all or almost all cases |
| 3 | Generally yes, but not in all cases | | NA No Answer/I do not know |
| 2 | Only in some cases | | |

How participative is the process?

There are opportunities for public input to pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the public input	
There are opportunities for the input of organized stakeholders into pending decisions	
Decisions are made taking into account the input of organized stakeholders	
Explanation:	

How transparent is the process?

Information on decisions faced is made available to the general public	
Data are easily available on decisions faced	
Criteria to be used in deciding are clearly stated	
Decision making processes are clearly defined	
Cost-Benefit Analyses of planned projects are easily available	
Explanation:	

How much integrity and accountability is evident in the process?

Decision-makers are held responsible for their decisions	
Water users pay "un-official" payments for water services	
Contracting processes are standardized and free from illicit payments	
Explanation:	

Is the process consistent with the rule of law?

Decisions are made according to established rules, laws and procedures	
Decisions are made impartially—irrespective of who is involved	
Explanation:	

How responsive is the process to changes in demand and circumstances?

The government reviews policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
The government adjusts policies, laws, rules and procedures to accommodate changing conditions	
Explanation:	

APPENDIX 7: FUNCTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

Thinking broadly about the ministries and departments involved in managing water resources in your country, please consider how well the following list of key water resources functions are performed. Please consider also how well the functions were performed currently as well as how well they were performed at one point in the past (year that is particularly significant for water issues in your country, e.g. year of entrance into force of a new water law).

Please use the following rating scale and place a number in each of the boxes in the matrix shown below. As you can see, a higher score reflects a higher level of performance.

- 4 Yes, in all or almost all cases
- 3 Generally yes, but not in all cases
- 2 Only in some cases
- 1 No, in all or almost all cases
- NA No answer/I do not know

	Past Rate	Present Rate
Roles and responsibilities of each department or agency are clearly defined		
Policy goals for the water sector are clearly defined		
The water sector is provided with sufficient funds to function properly		
National governmental agencies consult each other when <u>taking decisions</u> that impact multiple sectors		
National governmental agencies cooperate <u>in the implementation</u> of their policies where appropriate		
Regional governmental agencies are consulted when decisions that affect their region are taken		
Governmental agencies are staffed with sufficient and trained personnel to perform the assigned tasks		

Future water supply and demand forecasts are based on good quality data		
Water resources data are collected regularly, continuously throughout the country		
Current strategies for long-term matching of supply and demand have been effective at matching supply and demand		
Rules and procedures for assigning and recording water rights are clearly defined and functioning		
Rules and procedures for transferring water rights are clearly defined and functioning		
Disputes among water users are resolved effectively		
Government agencies are effective at forecasting seasonal supply and demand and matching the two		
Government agencies effectively operate public water infrastructure		
Government agencies effectively maintain public water infrastructure		
Current incentives and sanctions (including water pricing) are effective at achieving long and short term supply/demand matching		
Government agencies are effective at enforcing withdrawal limits that are established		
Official water quality standards in waterways are met		
Aquatic ecosystems are protected to the level specified by the government		

APPENDIX 8: SAMPLE OF WORKSHOP AND RATING SESSION REPORT

Morocco Water Governance Workshop Preliminary Results

A two-day workshop to assess national water governance capacity and performance was held on 22-23 February 2010 in Rabat as part of the Regional Water Governance Benchmarking (ReWaB) project. Twenty people participated and provided responses to the exercise throughout the workshop. One international ReWaB project member (Lucia De Stefano) and one local facilitator (Dr. Mohamed Aboufirras) were present. Dr. Ahmed Fikri provided support in the preparation and development of the workshop and Mrs. Ghizlane Jaabari took care of logistical issues. The workshop was hosted by Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II, which provided logistic support under the coordination of Mrs. Ouïam Lahlou.

Overall Approach

Participants from 17 water-related organizations attended the workshop (the list of participants in Annex 1):

- Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de l'Eau et de l'Environnement/Département de l'eau/Direction de la recherche et de la planification d'eau.
- Secrétariat d'Etat chargé de l'Eau et de l' Environnement / Département de l' Environnement/Direction de la coopération.
- Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forêts et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification.
- Ministère de l'Habitat, de l'Urbanisme et de l'Aménagement de l'Espace/Direction de l'Aménagement du Territoire.
- Ministère du commerce et de l'Industrie/Direction de la Production Industrielle.
- Haut Commissariat au Plan/Direction de la planification.
- Ministère de la Justice/Direction des études, de la coopération et de la modernisation.
- Office National de l'Eau Potable (ONEP)/ Direction de la Planification.
- Ministère du Tourisme / Société Marocaine d'Ingénierie Touristique.
- Office de Mise en valeur Agricole Doukkala.
- Office de Mise en valeur Agricole Moulouya.
- Association des Usagers de l'Eau Agricole (AUEA) Doukkala.
- Association des Usagers de l'Eau Agricole (AUEA) Moulouya.

- Université Hassan II.
- Office National de l'Electricité (ONE).
- Ecole Hassania des Travaux Publics.
- Institut Agronomique et Vétérinaire Hassan II.

The distribution of participants according to the ReWaB strata is shown below.

Strata	Number of Participants
Water resources	3
Irrigation	4
Other water using sectors	7
National policy makers	3
Advisors	3

The workshop and Rating Session followed the agenda provided below.

Day 1 - February 22, 2010

9:00 - 9:30	Registration
9:30-10:00	Opening and Welcome
10:00 -10:30	Introduction to the project approach (project objectives, water governance, features of water governance) and Q&A (L. De Stefano)
10:30 – 11:00	An example of water governance in Morocco (M. Aboufirras)
11:00-11:20	Coffee break
11:20-11:45	Benchmarking components: organizations, processes & effectiveness and Q&A (L. De Stefano)
11:45-1:00	Participant Exercise: Organizations & Functions Matrix for Morocco
13:00-13:30	Debriefing from the groups and discussion
13:30	Lunch

Day 2 - February 23, 2010

9:00-9:15	Introduction to the second day activities and Q&A (L. De Stefano)
9:15-11:00	Participant exercise: Governance Process Features
11:00-11:20	Coffee break
11:20-12:00	Participants exercise: Functional Effectiveness
12:00-12:45	Discussion in groups on water governance and the project methodology
12:45-13:30	Feedback and recommendations from the groups
13:30	Lunch

The workshop and Rating Session consisted of six parts: (1) an introduction to the project and the concepts of water governance supported by a Moroccan real case, and explanation of project components, (2) completion of an exercise that describes the extent to which organizations influence core water resources functions and (3) rating of key features of water governance decision-making, (4) rating of the effectiveness with which key water resources functions are carried out, and (5)

discussion on strengths and weakness of water governance in Morocco and (6) the collection of feedback from the participants on the project and the approach.

Preliminary Results

The following text and tables show very preliminary results of exercises from the workshop and Rating Session. More detailed analysis of the results and a comparative assessment across countries will be undertaken in the coming weeks.

Organizations and Functions Matrix

The organizations and functions matrix examines the extent to which major organizations in Morocco influence water resources functions. The major functions are organizing and building capacity in the water sector (Organizing), planning strategically (Planning), allocating water (Allocating), developing and managing water resources (Developing), regulating water resources and services (Regulating). In each of these five functions, participants assigned a score assessing the degree to which an organization influences decisions on a particular function. The scale ranged from 1 through 5, with 1 being the lowest level of influence and 5 being the highest. 3 groups completed this exercise. Shown below are the averages for all 3 groups.

	Organizing	Planning	Allocating	Developing	Regulating	Average	
Département de l'eau	5.00	5.00	4.33	5.00	4.67	4.80	<i>Water Department</i>
Département de l'environnement	3.67	2.33	1.33	2.67	4.33	2.87	<i>Environment Department</i>
Agences de bassins	4.00	5.00	5.00	4.33	4.33	4.53	<i>River Basin Authorities</i>
Ministère de l'agriculture	4.33	5.00	5.00	4.00	3.67	4.40	<i>Ministry of Agriculture</i>
Conseil supérieur de l'eau et du climat	4.00	2.50	2.00	2.50	1.50	2.50	<i>Higher Council for Water and Climate</i>
Département de planification	1.67	2.33	1.33	1.33	1.33	1.60	<i>Planning Department</i>
Département de l'industrie	1.67	1.33	1.00	1.33	2.00	1.47	<i>Industry Department</i>
Département de l'aménagement de territoire	1.67	2.67	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.53	<i>Department for Land Management</i>
Département du tourisme	1.33	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.13	<i>Tourism Department</i>
Département de santé	1.33	1.33	1.00	1.00	2.33	1.40	<i>Health Department</i>
Département de l'économie	2.33	2.33	1.00	4.00	1.67	2.27	<i>Economy Department</i>
Département de la justice	1.33	1.00	1.67	1.00	1.00	1.20	<i>Justice Department</i>
Instances législatives	3.33	1.00	1.33	1.33	2.00	1.80	<i>Legislative bodies</i>
ONEP	4.33	4.67	3.67	3.67	4.33	4.13	<i>National Agency for Drinking Water and Sanitation</i>
ONE	1.67	2.67	1.33	2.67	1.67	2.00	<i>National Agency for Electricity</i>
ORMVA	3.00	4.33	4.00	4.00	3.33	3.73	<i>Regional Agencies for Agricultural Development</i>
Eaux et forêts	2.33	2.67	1.33	2.00	3.00	2.27	<i>Water and Forest Department</i>
Secteur privé	2.00	1.33	1.00	1.67	1.33	1.47	<i>Private Sector</i>
Universités	2.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.67	1.40	<i>Universities</i>
ONG	1.67	1.00	1.33	1.00	1.00	1.20	<i>NGOs</i>
Associations des usagers de l'eau	1.67	2.00	1.67	1.33	1.33	1.60	<i>Water Users Associations</i>
Ministère de l'Intérieur	3.33	3.00	2.00	2.00	2.33	2.53	<i>Ministry of Domestic Affairs</i>
Régies	2.00	3.50	2.00	3.00	3.50	2.80	<i>Local Water Agencies</i>

Water Governance Decision-making Challenges

The first rating exercise focused on assessment of selected features of decision-making in Morocco in the context of five generic water sector challenges: (1) increasing demand for drinking water, (2) declining groundwater levels, (3) strategic planning for a national water policy, (4) regulating water quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways, and (5) matching supply and demand in agriculture (see Annex 2).

The decision-making features that were assessed were

- Participation
- Transparency
- Integrity
- Rule of law
- Responsiveness

A set of between 2 and 5 questions were used to elicit a characterization of each feature for a particular challenge. Shown below are the aggregate scores for each feature in each challenge. Also shown are the averages by challenge and by feature. The scale ranged from 1 to 4, with 1 being the lowest level of the feature and 4 being the highest level. Participants completed this exercise individually after discussion in groups.

	Participation	Transparency	Integrity	Rule of Law	Responsiveness	Average
Challenge1: Drinking Water	2.63	2.43	1.99	3.33	3.00	2.68
Challenge2: Ground Water	3.39	3.14	2.12	3.40	3.25	3.06
Challenge3: Planning	3.44	2.71	2.39	3.56	3.53	3.13
Challenge4: Water Quality	1.91	2.23	2.29	3.13	3.19	2.55
Challenge5: Matching supply- demand	3.23	3.28	2.25	3.38	3.28	3.08
Average	2.92	2.76	2.21	3.36	3.25	

Decision-Making Features Questionnaire

Functional effectiveness questions were used to assess how effectively key water resources functions were carried out in practice (see Anne). Participants were asked to assign a score for the present (today) as well as one reference point in the past (year 1995, when the Water Act entered into force).

A four-point scale (1 through 4) was used, where 4 indicates high effectiveness and 1 indicates low effectiveness. Participants completed this exercise individually after discussion in groups.

Question	1995	Today
Roles and responsibilities of each department or agency are clearly defined	2.87	3.60
Policy goals for the water sector are clearly defined	2.47	3.20
The water sector is provided with sufficient funds to function properly	3.00	3.00
National governmental agencies consult each other when <u>taking decisions</u> that impact multiple sectors	2.80	3.33
National governmental agencies cooperate <u>in the implementation</u> of their policies where appropriate	2.47	3.00
Regional governmental agencies are consulted when decisions that affect their region are taken	2.87	3.53
Governmental agencies are staffed with sufficient and trained personnel to perform the assigned tasks	2.73	2.13
Future water supply and demand forecasts are based on good quality data	2.73	3.20
Water resources data are collected regularly, continuously throughout the country	3.00	3.33
Current strategies for long-term matching of supply and demand have been effective at <u>matching supply and demand</u>	2.33	3.07
Rules and procedures for assigning and recording water rights are clearly defined and functioning	1.64	3.00
Rules and procedures for transferring water rights are clearly defined and functioning	2.78	3.27
Disputes among water users are resolved effectively	2.29	3.07
Government agencies are effective at forecasting seasonal supply and demand and matching the two	3.07	3.47
Government agencies effectively operate public water infrastructure	2.73	3.07
Government agencies effectively maintain public water infrastructure	2.53	2.33
Current incentives and sanctions (including water pricing) are effective at achieving long and short term supply/demand matching	1.93	2.33
Government agencies are effective at enforcing withdrawal limits that are established	1.33	1.73
Official water quality standards in waterways are met	1.60	2.20
Aquatic ecosystems are protected to the level specified by the government	1.20	1.47
Average	2.42	2.87

Annex 1 - List of Participants

Participant name	Organization
M. Souliman Kaichouh	SEEE/Dept eau
Mme. Ouiam Lahlou	IAV Hassan II
Mme Mouna Sekkat	SEEE/Dept Environnement
M. El Ouahidi My Hassan	SEEE/Dept Environnement
M. Fekri Ahmed	Faculte des Sciences Ben Msik
M. El Bouazzaoui Rachid	MICNT
M. Omerani Abdesslam	Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets
M. Kassimi Abdessamad	ORMVA Moulouya
M. Lazaar El Bekkay	AUEA Milli Haute
Mme. Abani Naima	HCP
M. Mohamed Sinan	EHTP
M. Anwar Limouri	SMIT
M. El Kodia Mostafa	ONEP
Mme. Bouchra En-nia	Ministere de la Justice
M. El Issami Abdslam	ONEP
M. Alaoui Lamrani Abdelmalek	Direction de l'Amenagement du Territoite
Mlle. Nisrine El Azher	Direction de l'Amenagement du Territoite
M. Hajji Hamadi	ONE
M. Nassiri Hamid	ORMVA Doukkala
M. Jaouad Bahaji	USAID
M. Andrew Watson	USAID
M. Ahmed Eddehbi	AUEA Nour
M. Aziz El Jami	Ministere de la Justice

Annex 2 – Key Water Challenges

Key Challenge 1: Increasing demand for drinking water

To satisfy increased drinking water demand, there are options to increase overall use of surface water, groundwater and desalinated water and to re-allocate water from existing uses. There are also options to increase efficiency of water use. Key decisions must be made in selecting the appropriate mix of these and other options.

Key Challenge 2: Declining groundwater levels

To reduce groundwater water table decline, there are several options. For example, you can recharge the aquifer by adding surface water, you can reduce withdrawal per hectare, and you can reduce withdrawal per hectare and cease irrigation extension. Selecting the appropriate balance of these and other measures requires that key decisions be made.

Key Challenge 3: Strategic planning for a national water policy

Generally, governments define and develop their national water-related priorities in national water policy documents and mid- to long-term water resources plans. Different approaches can nonetheless be utilized to in *the process of identifying and ordering the priorities, goals and objectives* contained in national water policies and long-term water resource plans. Please consider the process of developing water policies and plans.

Key Challenge 4: Regulating water quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways

Ensuring water quality is important to minimize adverse health effects, to ensure the quality of agricultural production and to sustain healthy aquatic ecosystems. Decision-making related to regulation of water quality includes the definition of quality standards, the formulation and

application of rules to meet those standards (e.g. the establishment of pollutants emission permits), the implementation of projects to reduce pollution and the enforcement of the laws to limit pollution.

Key Challenge 5: Matching Supply and Demand in Agriculture

The agricultural sector withdraws and consumes the vast majority of water in most countries. At the beginning of the irrigation season decisions need to be made about how to share the available water among existing agricultural water users (private small and large farms, irrigation districts or government irrigation projects). These decisions are a major challenge since demand often exceeds supply.

Please consider the process of allocating water to the different agricultural water users within the constraints of the annual availability of water resources.

Annex 3 - Functional Effectiveness Assessment

Thinking broadly about the ministries and departments involved in managing water resources in your country, please consider how well the following list of key water resources functions are performed. Please consider also how well the functions were performed currently as well as how well they were performed at one point in the past (year 2000).

Please use the following rating scale and place a number in each of the boxes in the matrix shown below. As you can see, a higher score reflects a higher level of performance.

4 Yes, in all or almost all cases

3 Generally yes, but not in all cases

2 Only in some cases

1 No, in all or almost all cases

NA No answer/I do not know

U.S. Agency for International Development
1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20523
Tel: (202) 712-0000
Fax: (202) 216-3524
www.usaid.gov