

# Global Water Leadership Programme Country Briefs

Malawi, Tanzania, Central African Republic, Rwanda,  
Uganda, Nepal, Palestine

**GWL Closeout Workshop**

**Lilongwe, Malawi**



March 14-15, 2024

# Malawi

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Malawi mainly depends on groundwater, especially in rural areas, where about 80 per cent of Malawi's population lives. Source protection challenges, soil erosion and deteriorating water quality pose a significant risk to water resources, amplified by increased seasonal variability and lower water tables that aggravate water insecurity. Water-related climate shock impacts heavily on Malawi's delivery of water, sanitation and hygiene services. For instance, it is estimated that in 2019 Cyclone Idai destroyed WASH infrastructure worth \$3.8 million according to the World Bank. The sector funding falls short of the anticipated budget to meet agreed deliverables, for instance, the overall Water Sanitation and Hygiene budget at mid-year of the 2022/2023 fiscal year increased from MK49.9 billion to MK131.3 billion representing a 163% increase in nominal terms and about 97% in real terms as a result of an increase in donor-funded projects. However, despite the increase the budget remains MK76 billion (37%) less than the MK207 billion minimum threshold as per the 2019 UNICEF Sustainable Goals costing tool. This agrees with the findings of the AIP programme which aims at closing the water investment gap in Africa. Delivery of water investments across Africa remains below the target required to meet the water needs of the below target least USD30 billion/year is required to achieve SDG 6 by 2030. Only \$10-\$19 billion/year is invested in water security.

### What are the major barriers that were identified, and strategies highlighted in the response strategy that would help address the challenges?

Three main barriers were identified in Malawi, and these are:

1. Inadequate water investments and climate financing
2. Weak coordination and regulatory framework
3. Lack of political will and leadership

### Strategies in the response strategy include the following:

**1<sup>st</sup> barrier:** Develop eleven (11) legal texts guiding the implementation of the Water Code; seek government intervention to harmonize hydrology-related activities between the Hydraulics and Transport departments.

**2<sup>nd</sup> barrier:** Implementation of a resource mobilization strategy for the acquisition, maintenance, and renewal of monitoring tools.

**3<sup>rd</sup> barrier:** Define and implement a capacity-building program for human resources managers at the Ministry of Energy Development and Water Resources.

**4<sup>th</sup> barrier:** Set up an internal monitoring committee for the mobilization of internal resources and the execution of public expenditure.

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups? How was the Root Cause Analysis undertaken?

To align the GWL work to existing structures, the formation of the working groups that were responsible for developing the response strategies was endorsed by a Sector Working Group meeting overseen by the Ministry of Water and Sanitation. The exercise was in line with requirements of the guidelines for Malawi 2063 Pillar and Enabler Coordination Groups for delegation of authority under TORs of Technical Working Group which states that "*with permission from the Pillar, TWGs may form or delegate authority to a specialized working group such as Task Force or subcommittees to undertake specific activities within a*

*limited period. These Task Forces will be dissolved once they deliver on the allocated assignments.” One task force for each of the 3 barriers was formed namely: Investment and Climate Financing for Barrier 1, Coordination for Barrier 2 and Advocacy. For barrier 3. The 3 task forces were given a mandate to work over 1 year after which they will be dissolved.*

The root cause analysis of each barrier was conducted by the task forces which discussed in-depth the barriers and their causes in two task force meetings, as had been deliberated during a national stakeholder consultation. The Ministry of Water and Sanitation provided a frame through which the root cause analyses were to be conducted. Over 50 participants from academia, NGOs, government line ministries, private sector and water utilities provided their knowledge and expertise during the root cause analysis.

### **How does the Malawi government intend to see the Response Strategies**

**implemented?** *The three response strategies are expected to feed into the One WASH Programme that Malawi intends to develop and implement. The One WASH concept is being borrowed from Ethiopia with the sole purpose of harmonizing or aligning the WASH programme within the sector. This also includes having a consolidated account where donors put in their funding.*

### **How has the GWL working group process – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

For the first time, Malawi used the dual-phased approach that ensured regional input and participation. Stakeholders at the local, regional, and community levels were consulted, and results were taken to the national level stakeholders for discussions and voting on 3 top barriers. The 3 Task Forces comprising senior government officials among other stakeholders met regularly and actively participated in crafting strategic documents, marking a significant milestone. There was a focal point person within the Ministry of Water and sanitation who oversaw the smooth running of the program and was responsible for sending out invitation letters which were signed by the PS, compiling all documents, and working hand in hand with GWP to make sure meetings take place. This approach has ushered in a positive transformation in coordination, underscoring the effectiveness of communication from lower to upper levels and government-led communication to the sector in developmental processes.

### **Has GWL promoted any additional activities not exclusively linked to the response strategies?**

The programme supported the Ministry in the Reporting system for AMCOW- Africa Water and Sanitation Sector Monitoring and Reporting System (WASSMO) and the AIP Scorecard. The programme supported the Ministry of Water and Sanitation, which is still a relatively new Ministry, in developing its Strategic Plan. It additionally contributed to the development of the Minister of Water’s keynote address for the UN Water Conference 2023. Finally, the GWL team also participated alongside WASH stakeholders who engaged the Malawi Parliament on the need to allocate more resources to the sector to address some challenges that the sector faces.

# Tanzania

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Tanzania is water-rich, compared with almost all its semi-arid neighbours. It sits on Africa's three largest lakes: Lake Tanganyika, Lake Nyasa and Lake Victoria, and has high rainfall. Less than 10 percent of surface water is abstracted, and 85 percent of water resources have good ambient quality. Of the water that is abstracted, close to 90 percent is used for agriculture, forestry, and fisheries; 9 percent is used for services such as potable water; and less than 1 percent goes to industry. Nonetheless, increased dams and abstraction of surface water for flood irrigation and hydropower in the Pangani and Rufiji Basins have disrupted river flows and threatened biodiversity, while agricultural and mining run-off, untreated municipal and industrial wastewater, and inadequate sanitation compromise surface and groundwater quality. Population growth and increased urbanization, combined with a steady reduction in government expenditure on water, is a growing concern. Financial allocations for water declined from 3.8 percent to 2.4 percent between 2014 and 2018, while recent analysis of the Ministry of Water's budget shows that between FY 2016/17 to 2022/23 only 6-7% of the Ministry's budget has been allocated for water resources sub-sector.

### What are the major barriers that were identified, and strategies highlighted in the response strategy that would help address the challenges?

Identified barriers in Tanzania included:

1. Inadequate funds to implement resilient water resources.
2. Inefficient irrigation water uses and practices a case of Ruvu Sub Basin
3. Overlapping legal and regulatory mandates impacting inter Sectoral coordination.

### Strategies in the response strategy include the following:

**1<sup>st</sup> barrier:** Capacity building to Directorate of Water Resources and Basin Water Boards in resources mobilization, program design, execution, and overall planning; Enhancing adaptation to impacts of Climate Change through innovative financing mechanisms and efficient resource allocation for sustainable management.

**2<sup>nd</sup> barrier:** Strengthening the extension services; Incentivizing the adoption of water-efficient irrigation technologies; Rehabilitation of inefficient irrigation schemes and piloting modern irrigation practices and technology-driven methods; and building capacity among farmers for optimized water usage and climate resilience.

**3<sup>rd</sup> barrier:** Policy harmonization and systems strengthening; Fostering dialogue and inter-sectoral collaboration; Integrate water resource management efforts through policy harmonization and joint project implementation.

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups? How was the Root Cause Analysis undertaken?

The original structure of the National Multistakeholder Forum (NMSF) did not provide clear pathways for all stakeholders to equally contribute, have their voices heard and eventually bring about change into the Water Sector at large. Through GWL support, the NMSF revitalized itself from a mostly dormant body to one prepped for action. Working groups had always been planned, and GWL successfully advocated that the broad

categories of the working groups should align with the key barriers they had jointly been identified. These working groups are permanent. However, smaller GWL taskforces within each working group were formed to work on the Response Strategy. The GWL Task Force leadership in Tanzania, consisting of a chairperson, vice chairperson, champion, and secretary, played a crucial role in ensuring the success of the GWL's taskforce activities. They were responsible for leading task force meetings and overseeing the progress of each of the stages of development of the Response Strategies to barriers, taking corrective actions when necessary. The Ministry of Water Secretariat were the general overseer for all the taskforce related activities. The GWL taskforce chairpersons and vice chairpersons were elected by the respective working group members. The GWL taskforce teams Chairpersons and vice chairpersons served also as the NMSF permanent working Groups' leaders, they will serve a three-year term before being re-elected, whereas champions' tenure may vary based on availability and requirements.

Taskforce teams with diverse and relevant stakeholders, subject matter experts, and individuals with different perspectives were involved in the exercise of root-cause analysis to gain a comprehensive understanding of the issues. Due to the different complexity and nature of the three bottlenecks each of the task force teams selected a desired Root Cause Analysis approach. *Barrier #1* analysed secondary information from sector literature, specifically WRM in Tanzania. *Barrier #2* adopted the '5 Why' method of root cause analysis. This framework is widely used to investigate problems that do not need quantitative analysis coupled with field visits where key informants' interviews with Basin Board and Irrigation commission staff, and Irrigation Water User Groups leadership were carried out. *Barrier #3* used a questionnaire to conduct interviews and through literature review.

#### ***How does the Tanzania government intend to see the Response Strategies***

***implemented?*** *The Response Strategy will be implemented using existing government structures of the water sector lead ministries. The National Multi-Sectoral Forum (NMSF) in Tanzania serves as a crucial framework for coordinating collaborative endeavours aimed at implementing the response plan that addresses obstacles to investing in water resources in a climate-resilient manner. With the Ministry of Water leading both the NMSF and other agencies within the larger frameworks of the Tanzania Water Investment Programme (TanWIP) and the Water Sector Development Programme (WSDP), the NMSF assumes a key position in this regard.*

#### **How has the GWL working group process – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

The working group process, through its engagement of diverse stakeholders in a year-long series of meetings to develop comprehensive response strategies, has significantly enhanced cohesion within the water sector and across represented ministries and agencies and other stakeholders. This collaborative effort not only fostered consortiums that are now actively pursuing climate change adaptation funding together, but also built participants' comfort and willingness to engage in the financial aspects of water sector planning. The involved stakeholders now reflexively refer to the three critical barriers and the response strategies when they approach funding opportunities. Meanwhile, the Ministry of Water has recognized the value of off-site, in-person meetings, such as those employed for the response strategy development process, for fostering new cross-sectoral collaborations. During the 6th NMSF, in her closing remarks, the Deputy Permanent Secretary insisted on different represented ministries and agencies to continue the efforts by GWL Program including coming together to develop necessary document and prepare proposals for mobilizing resources to implement the response strategy. This shift towards more collaborative and open communication and coordination practices marks a significant evolution in how the water sector operates within the country.



# Central African Republic

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

While CAR has considerable renewable water resources, barely 30% of the population has access to drinking water: rates range from 36.5 percent in Bangui, the capital, to 27 percent in rural areas. The population has increased rapidly from about 1.5 million people in 1960 to 4.8 million in 2020, 40 percent of which is urban. Access to critical water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) services is additionally complicated by the prolonged period of political instability that resulted in one-seventh of the population-658,000 people being internally displaced. In all, 2.8 million people in CAR (roughly half of the population) need humanitarian assistance, including WASH services.

### What are the major barriers that were identified, and strategies highlighted in the response strategy that would help address the challenges?

Four main barriers were identified in the Central African Republic. These are:

1. Poor implementation of existing texts and documents governing the water and climate sector.
2. Lack of an optimized water resources monitoring system
3. Poor distribution of human resources
4. Inadequate national budget allocation vis-à-vis the problems to be solved.

### Strategies in the response strategy include the following:

**1<sup>st</sup> barrier:** Develop eleven (11) legal texts guiding the implementation of the Water Code; seek government intervention to harmonize hydrology-related activities between the Hydraulics and Transport departments.

**2<sup>nd</sup> barrier:** Implementation of a resource mobilization strategy for the acquisition, maintenance, and renewal of monitoring tools.

**3<sup>rd</sup> barrier:** Define and implement a capacity-building program for human resources managers at the Ministry of Energy Development and Water Resources.

**4<sup>th</sup> barrier:** Set up an internal monitoring committee for the mobilization of internal resources and the execution of public expenditure.

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups? How was the Root Cause Analysis undertaken?

The working groups were institutionalised by a ministerial memo signed by the Ministry of Energy Development and Water Resources. Each group (led by two chairs and two rapporteurs) developed working methods to achieve set objectives. In addition to monthly meetings, the group chairs and the project coordination unit met to prepare group meetings.

Each group met three times during the root cause analysis phase. During these meetings, study analyses were presented to the group members to improve their understanding of the barrier they were working on to facilitate the identification of root causes.

### ***How does the CAR government intend to see the Response Strategies implemented?***

*Some proposed solutions in the response strategy will be integrated into the new National Development Plan. In addition, the Ministry will organize a roundtable to mobilize key technical and financial partners, to advocate for ownership and commitment towards the implementation of the response strategy. It should be emphasized that the response strategy is aligned with and will be integrated into the 3-year budget program framework of the Ministry of Energy Development and Water Resources.*

### **How has the GWL working group process – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

In the Central African Republic, this is the first-time stakeholders oversaw the identification of obstacles in the water sector and provided tentative solutions. This model has influenced a positive shift in coordination, proving that lower-level to upper-level communication is effective in development processes. The GWL working group process received positive feedback in the country, with related sectors expressing the desire to replicate the working group model.

### **Has GWL promoted any additional activities not exclusively linked to the response strategies?**

The root cause analysis process inspired GWL to organize a workshop dedicated to re-reading the environmental code. The workshop helped identify inconsistencies between the water and environment sectors and formulated recommendations to ensure that the revised Environment code addresses these inconsistencies to promote the simultaneous development of both sectors.



**Response Strategy External Validation Workshop in Bangui, CAR**

# Uganda

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Although at first glance Uganda seems well watered with extremely low abstraction of water (particularly for irrigation), the effects of climate change, wetland degradation and the inability to match investment in water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH) with population growth present a challenging situation that will worsen if major reforms are not undertaken. The reduction of government expenditure on water from 5 to 3 % of the national budget is an indication of the fragility that the water sector faces.

### What are the major barriers that were identified, and strategies highlighted in the response strategy that would help address the challenges?

These barriers were prioritised following extensive consultations:

1. Weak policy, legal and institutional frameworks for IWRM/WASH.
2. Limited finance for IWRM/WASH.

### Strategies in the response strategy include the following:

- Review and update policy, legal and institutional frameworks.
- Improve institutional and stakeholder collaborations, partnerships and linkages through technical and high-level political dialogues and operationalization of the inter-ministerial committees.
- Strengthen the political economy and governance of IWRM and WASH services in Uganda.
- Mainstream budget for water source protection in the Ministerial Policy Statement, and budget framework paper.
- Issue a certificate of compliance to project and program developers.
- 
- Conditional grants be allocated to Districts to strengthen climate change resilience and environmental conservation.
- Establish environmental police stations/officers at lower local units.
- Develop new innovative financing mechanisms.
- Local government should collect taxes such as pay as you earn, VAT, withholding tax, and budget for their use at the source.

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups? How was the Root Cause Analysis undertaken?

Two working groups were constituted, comprised of Government Ministries, Departments and Agencies/Authorities, Private Sectors, Civil Society Organizations, cultural and religious institutions, and partners like UNICEF. Several stakeholders were engaged from different institutions and gender was one of the considerations.

The root cause analysis of the bottlenecks started with a literature review of the available data, especially from the Government of Uganda, including the relevant policies and acts. Subsequently, the teams conducted a field study and collected data guided by questionnaires developed by the working groups. Data



was analysed by SPSS and reports were developed for respective bottlenecks to inform the findings of the study to propose the actions/solutions and recommendations.

***How does the Ugandan government intend to see the Response Strategies implemented?*** *GWL has been implemented through the Ministry of Water and Environment throughout the initiative. The Response Strategy will be presented to senior management in the Ministry of Water and Environment to further strengthen the government's ownership of the implementation of the strategy. The Response Strategy will be launched during Uganda Water and Environment Week, an annual event coinciding with World Water Day where the government (through the Ministry of Water and Environment) mobilizes water stakeholders to come together and act towards responsibly managing water resources in the country. The intent is to invite the Minister of Water and Environment to launch the Response Strategy alongside the Permanent Secretary and other high-level guests from different institutions. This approach will help generate financial commitments from various ministries within the government and additionally call upon actors to support the sector.*

## **How has the GWL working group process – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

Working groups are composed of different members from different sectors. The working group activity has enabled its members to learn about the experience of other stakeholders in other lines of work as well as topics of importance to all such as climate financing. The process of jointly identifying and getting deeper into the root causes of the water sector's challenges and proposing the best actions and recommendations to overcome challenges through a working group approach has strengthened coordination among sectors and institutions.

## **Has GWL promoted any additional activities not exclusively linked to the response strategies?**

GWL Uganda, under Output One of the programme has supported the government of Uganda in developing papers presented during the SWA SMM in Indonesia in 2022, UNWC 2023, FMM 2023, SWWW, COP28 and the 10th WWF. These papers include the Country Brief on Achieving SDG6; country commitments during the SMM in Indonesia and the Presidential Compact during the UNWC; the concept for Water for Cooperation presented during the UNWC; and the development of Uganda's NAP for WASH coordinated by UNICEF.

# Rwanda

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Rwanda benefits from abundant rainfall (average 1,200 mm/ annum) but is still characterized as water-scarce due to its high population and limited water storage infrastructures, with only 670 m<sup>3</sup> of water per capita per year. The Government of Rwanda, with other development partners, has made significant progress in enhancing access to clean drinking water. The percentage of households using improved drinking water sources increased from 79 per cent to 83 per cent between 2015 and 2020 (UN Water, 2020). Its improved sanitation levels are exceptional for Africa, particularly the high proportion in rural areas. The Water and Sanitation Sector Strategic Plan 2018–2024 (Ministry of Infrastructure, 2018) indicates that access to “basic” sanitation services is at 62 percent countrywide. Coverage stands at 57 percent for rural settings and 64 percent for urban areas.

### What are the major barriers that were identified?

Approximately 25 barriers were originally identified. A prioritization exercise surfaced four barriers as most urgent with greatest potential impact on water resilience:

1. Limited Technical Capacity: This bottleneck encompassed challenges in water demand and supply management, coupled with low renewable water resources availability per capita.
2. Inadequate Flood Risk Management: Addressing the limited capacity to manage flood risks across different sectors.
3. Insufficient Community Awareness: Tackling the limited knowledge and awareness within the community and private sector regarding issues affecting water management.
4. Siltation: Addressing the high siltation of water bodies impacting water development projects.

### Corresponding strategies to address these barriers include the following:

1. Empowering Decentralized Entities and Water Users: Equipping them with the skills necessary for effective water infrastructure management, enhancing sustainability and resilience.
2. Mainstreaming Water Resilience: Embedding water resilience into district land use plans and establishing flood forecasting systems for critical flood-prone areas to enhance flood risk management.
3. Disseminating Knowledge: Focused on sustainable water management practices, reinforcing the link between water quality, agricultural productivity, and conservation efforts.
4. Soil Conservation Measures: Implementation in the upstream areas of water supply sources for key cities to mitigate siltation, ensuring sustainable water resources for economic growth.

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups?

Members of working groups were coming from diverse backgrounds from the following institutions:

- i. Government institutions like:
  - Rwanda Water Resources Board (RWB)
  - Water and Sanitation Corporation (WASAC)
  - Rwanda Energy Group (REG)
  - Rwanda Agricultural and Animal Resources Development Board (RAB)
  - National Land Authority (NLA)
- ii. Academia

- University of Rwanda
- iii. Development Partners
  - WaterAid-Rwanda
- iv. Non-Governmental Organisation
  - Young Water Professionals
  - Global Water Partnership-Rwanda
  - International Water and Sanitation Center
- v. Private sector
  - Owners of water related companies.

## How was the root cause analysis undertaken?

A consultation workshop united diverse stakeholders from government, development sectors, academia, and civil society, including youth, to address and prioritize Rwanda's water resilience challenges. Hence four IWRM bottlenecks were prioritized.

Following identifying key bottlenecks, four working groups were established to investigate the underlying causes through a mixed-method approach of desk research and fieldwork. The first and third groups conducted their studies in Eastern Rwanda, focusing on technical capacity and water resources. The second and fourth groups, dealing with flood risk and siltation, worked in the North-Western region. Their fieldwork included engaging directly with local stakeholders through surveys, interviews, and observations to understand the factors behind each challenge thoroughly.

***How does the government of Rwanda intend to see the Response Strategies implemented?*** *The Government of Rwanda, through the Rwanda Water Resources Board, has appreciated how this response strategy was developed. This Response Strategy will enable the Government to achieve different programs at the National level such as Rwanda's Vision 2050; Rwanda's National Strategy for Transformation (NST1); as well as Rwanda Water Resources Board Strategic Plan (2021-2030). In addition, this Response Strategy will enable the Government to achieve the international treaties and programs ratified by the Government such as the African Union Agenda 2063 for environmentally sustainable and climate-resilient economies and Sustainable Development Goal 6 (SDG6) for water and sanitation among others.*

## How has the GWL working group process itself – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?

The approach helped in enhancing communication among stakeholders within the sector. They discussed the challenges of IWRM and WASH and shared ideas and perspectives which will enable them to convey a holistic message for sustainable management of natural resources in their respective communities and surroundings. The working group members also benefited a lot from the training they received on developing finance plans and resource mobilisation skills in general.

# Nepal

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Progress in the WASH sector accelerated following the National Sanitation and Hygiene Master Plan in 2011. To achieve SDG 6 by 2030, the government formulated a 15-year national strategy in 2015, directing each municipality to formulate its own 5- to 10-year WASH plan. The current national five-year Plan aims to increase access to safe drinking water from 88% to 99 %. Between 2000 and 2020, while the population with access to improved water sources increased from 50% to 90%, access to safely managed water has fallen from about 27% to 18%, from a combination of the 2015 earthquake and a huge backlog of facilities needing rehabilitation. Three per cent of GoN's total budget is allocated for WASH, doubling from US\$249 to \$431 million between 2015 and 2020.

Despite Nepal being declared Open Defecation Free in 2019, with 95% of households using improved sanitation, that year's Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, found 75% of water sources and 85% of household drinking water showed faecal contamination.

### What are the major barriers that were identified?

The main barriers identified and prioritised in Nepal were the following:

1. Weak policy implementation
2. Weak Institutional coordination
3. Lack of data and capacity building

### What was the institutional setup of the working groups?

The Water and Energy Commission Secretariat (WECS) in collaboration with the Ministry of Water Supply (MoWS) formed three working groups (WGs) for the three prioritised barriers. Membership for the WGs included representation from government and non-governmental organisations, associations of the local governments and water users, academia, inter-governmental organisations, UNICEF, and the private sector working on water resources, WASH, and climate change. Participants selected two coordinators (representing the Ministry of Energy, Water Resources, and Irrigation, WECS, Nepal Electricity Authority, Department of Water Supply and Sewerage Management, and National Statistics Office) for each WG to continue group work in the absence of one coordinator.

Each WG met three times to identify and prioritise the root causes for each barrier. The first meeting was held in August 2022 and further two meetings identified and prioritised the root causes of the barriers. The joint meeting of three WGs helped to map institutions and compile issues before entering root cause analysis, and advance coordination and linkages with other WGs. Several joint meetings of the WGs were organised to minimise duplications of root causes, solutions, and strategies, and ensure timely sharing of group activities.

**How does the government of Nepal intend to see the Response Strategies implemented?** *The Response Strategy was developed under the leadership, guidance, and facilitation of the government. In Nepal, WECS led this Global Water Leadership (GWL) Programme and GWP Nepal/JVS simply supported the strategy formulation process. Secretaries of the Government of Nepal leading the WECS, and the Ministry of Energy, Water Resources and Irrigation, and Joint-Secretaries of WECS and the Ministry of Water Supply have attended the*

*WG's presentations in the multi-stakeholder consultative processes - the workshop or joint-meeting and provided guidance. WECS has since provided inputs to the National Planning Commission to integrate key strategies in the 16th Plan (2024/25-2028/29) which will be finalised soon. Hence, ownership lies with the government and is expected to internalise its implementation through planning and budgeting processes. Under the implementation arrangement, the strategy has specified the role of government, existing inter-agency committees, public participation & private sector, and NGO federations. A National Water Resources Coordination Committee will be established under the chair of the Secretary of WECS with representation mostly from water, climate and data-related institutions, the private sector, associations of local governments and NGOs. The Water Resources Division (WRD) of WECS will function as its secretariat and will generate, package and repackage knowledge from strategy implementation and share it using appropriate channels.*

## **How has the GWL working group process itself – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

In Nepal, a 'learning-by-doing' approach through a multi-stakeholder Thematic Working Group (TWG) was initiated in 2009 to prepare the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) and this TWG approach was continued to prepare the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) in 2021. Hence, the WG approach is deeply rooted in formulating such strategies. The multi-stakeholder process encourages cross-idea sharing, respects the concerns, views, ideas and organisational interests of each participant, and follows a 'leave-no-one-behind' approach. The GWL process further expanded it to engage water communities. During the strategy formulation period (from 1 July 2022 to 6 October 2023), over 85 per cent of the same WG members attended and contributed to the process. This process has contributed to enhanced coordination and communication with water communities.

## **Has GWL promoted any additional activities not exclusively linked to the response strategies?**

The GWL programme has enhanced understanding of the adverse impacts of climate change on water resources and WASH services. Efforts of the GWL team in presenting GWL programme highlights in seven provincial workshops generated awareness and concerns and provided inputs for the strategy. New thrusts on making climate policies and plans 'water-inclusive' and water policies and plans 'climate smart' have been reflected in water-related policies revised and approved in 2023 and the 16th Plan (prepared for five years) which will be finalised most likely in March 2024.



# Palestine

## Country Context: Water and Sanitation

Palestinian territories continue to face significant and growing shortfalls in the water supply available for domestic use. The two main regions in the State of Palestine, West Bank and Gaza, are very water-scarce with a water-dependent economy.

Nearly 660,000 Palestinians have limited access to water, with 420,000 persons obtaining less than 50 litres per capita on average daily. According to the Water Sector Regulatory Council (WSRC) in the State of Palestine, 33 per cent is the median rate. NRW is responsible for \$45 million of the more than 85 million cubic metres of freshwater that are lost annually and might have been used to alleviate water scarcity and inadequate supply. Most of these losses are absorbed by water service providers, threatening their financial viability, operational performance, and service delivery quality.

## What are the major barriers that were identified?

Three major bottlenecks were identified in Palestine:

1. Lack of integrated planning tools for water resources management based on climate change.
2. Lack of a national performance system for water resources management based on climate change.
3. Social behaviour resistance to and a lack of gender mainstreaming on the reuse of Treated Wastewater (TWW)

## Corresponding strategies to address these barriers include the following:

**1<sup>st</sup> barrier:** Developing of integrated planning tools for water resources management based on climate change.

**2<sup>nd</sup> barrier:** Developing of integrated management performance system for water resources management based on climate change.

**3<sup>rd</sup> barrier:** Mainstreaming social acceptance and use of Treated Wastewater (TWW), With a focus on Women and, Youth.

## What was the institutional setup of the working groups?

The 3 working groups were formed from different relevant institutions, including, the Palestinian Water Authority, Ministry of Agriculture, Environmental Quality Authority, Palestinian Energy and Natural Resources Authority, Ministry of Women Affairs, Palestinian Energy and Natural Resources Authority, Palestinian Central Bureau of Statistics PCBS, Ministry of Education, Palestinian Women Water Practitioners Network, and the Prime Minister's Office. It was vital to represent different institutions among the 3 WG members. Originally, around 35 bottlenecks were mentioned, reflecting the root causes, and three major bottlenecks were prioritized.

***How does the government of Palestine intend to see the Response Strategies implemented?*** *The government would like to see the RS implemented through approving them, identifying the responsibilities and looking for financing sources, public budget, and donors and exploring funding from the private sector through their social responsibility.*

## **How has the GWL working group process itself – diverse stakeholders meeting regularly for a year to work on the response strategies – changed how the water sector works, communicates, and/or coordinates in your country?**

The 3 WGs were formed, upon the members' interest. Almost all the WGs met physically regularly at the beginning but after the breakout of the war on October 7, it took some time to resume the WGs meetings. These were now virtual meetings. It is worth mentioning that the meetings were held in close collaboration with the lead institutions PWA through the project Focal Point, the GWP-Med and the WGs members.

## **Has GWL promoted any additional activities not exclusively linked to the response strategies?**

GWL program decided to implement the Water Tracker in Palestine at the beginning stage of the GWL program aiming at assessing water in relevant strategies, policies and plans about water in Palestine.

GWP-Med, in close coordination with GWPO and the focal point decided to conduct a training for 6 Palestinians from the WGs members on the assessment and development of strategies, the training was in Amman, Jordan using the European Foundation for Quality Management EFQM as a tool for achieving the desired outcome, and 6 Palestinians have certificates on the assessment of institutions performance.

GWP-Med in close collaboration with GWPO and the Palestinian Water Authority is preparing a policy brief.

To share the results of GWL work in Palestine, there is a proposition to organize an event with the Palestinian Women Water Practitioners Network and the Climate Change Department at the Arab American University.



**A working group meeting in Palestine**

### About the Global Water Leadership (GWL) Programme

Effective and equitable water management is becoming increasingly complex, and increasingly important, as climate change impacts add new uncertainty to policy decisions and financial investments. The Global Water Leadership in a Changing Climate programme (GWL) is working intensely in ten countries, bringing together key stakeholders and decision makers from two water management pillars – water resources and water and sanitation – to develop holistic, integrated policies and plans to enhance national water and climate resilience. The programme is funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO) and implemented by Global Water Partnership (GWP), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the Sanitation and Water for All Partnership (SWA) and the World Health Organization/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP).



[gwp.org/en/global-water-leadership-programme](http://gwp.org/en/global-water-leadership-programme)



[gwl.gwptz.org](http://gwl.gwptz.org)

