



# **External Review of Global Water Partnership**

## **Final Report**

**Richard Hoare – (Team Leader)**  
**Bert van Woersem, Gabor Bruszt, Doug Flint**  
**Juliet Pierce**

**June 2003**

**PARC Project: 78**

***The Performance Assessment Resource Centre***

*is managed by*  
***International Organisation Development Ltd***

*2 Shutlock Lane, Moseley, Birmingham B13 8NZ*  
*Tel: (+44) 121 444 7361, Fax: (+44) 121 444 8476*  
*Website: <http://www.parcinfo.org>*

---

## External Review of Global Water Partnership

### Final Report

#### Contents

<b>Executive Summary</b>	4
<b>1 Background</b>	
1.1 <i>Background to the External Review</i>	8
1.2 <i>Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation</i>	8
<b>2 Methodology for the External Review</b>	
2.1 <i>Approach to the Review</i>	10
2.2 <i>Structure of the Review and Programme</i>	10
<b>3 Structure and Objectives of GWP</b>	
3.1 <i>Overall Organisation</i>	11
3.2 <i>Objectives and Outputs</i>	12
3.3 <i>Strategic Alliances</i>	14
3.4 <i>Financial Management</i>	15
<b>4 Findings</b>	
4.1 <i>Context</i>	17
4.2 <i>Achievement of Overall Objectives</i>	17
4.3 <i>Global Linkages and Effects</i>	18
4.4 <i>Networks and Regions</i>	19
4.5 <i>Local Engagement</i>	22
4.6 <i>Technical Support and Capacity Development</i>	26
4.7 <i>Internal Communications</i>	27
4.8 <i>Desk Review</i>	27
4.9 <i>Performance Measurement</i>	28
<b>5 Conclusions</b>	
5.1 <i>Overall</i>	29
5.2 <i>Operational and Strategic Issues</i>	29
5.3 <i>Technical issues</i>	32
5.4 <i>Assessment against DAC Criteria</i>	32
5.5 <i>The Way Forward</i>	33
<b>6 Recommendations</b>	36
<b>Acronyms</b>	38
<b>In Volume 2 (separate volume)</b>	
<b>Annex A Background to the External Review</b>	
<b>Annex B Background to the Global Water Partnership</b>	
<b>Annex C Details of the External Review</b>	

The Global Water Partnership (GWP) was established in 1996 as an international network promoting an integrated approach to water resources management. It encourages all users of water – government departments, academics, community groups, NGOs, the private sector and other interested parties – to work together. The Partnership has established a global network including eleven regional water partnerships with a wide range of member organisations representing all stakeholder groups.

### **External Review of the Global Water Partnership**

This report covers the work of the External Review of the Global Water Partnership carried out between June 2002 and March 2003. The Review was sponsored and funded by DFID, NEDA and SIDA and was carried out by an independent Review Team under the overall direction of the Performance Assessment Resource Centre in the UK.

The Project Director was Juliet Pierce of PARC and the Review Team comprised:-

Richard Hoare – (Team Leader)

Bert van Woersem

Gabor Bruszt

Doug Flint

The team would like to thank all those who have given so freely of their time to assist with this Review

The conclusions and recommendations expressed in this Review are those of the independent consultants

## External Review of Global Water Partnership

### Final Report

#### Executive Summary

##### *Background to the Review*

This report describes the process and presents the findings of the External Review of the Global Water Partnership (GWP), which was carried out between June 2002 and March 2003. The United Kingdom's (UK) Department for International Development (DFID) managed the External Review on behalf of the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and commissioned the Performance Assessment Resource Centre (PARC) to carry out a Scoping Study and to lead the External Review process. The External Review team comprised four independent evaluators

##### *Objectives and Approach of the Review*

The objectives and methodology proposed for the External Review were to focus on four questions:

Is GWP doing the right things?

Is GWP doing the right things well?

What recommendations can be made to enhance GWP's effectiveness?

How can the goals and achievements of GWP be sustained?

A scoping report presented in August 2002 set out proposals for the main part of the Review. The approach included a Desk Study of documents, a questionnaire to GWP members and stakeholders and field visits. The choice of regions for field visit was discussed with the GWP Secretariat and donor representatives. Southern and Southeast Asia and Southern Africa presented differing levels of perceived success and differing strategies within the GWP regions, whilst Central and Eastern Europe represented a very recent regional structure. Within the time and budgetary constraints it was not possible to include any other regions such as Central and South America within the regional visit programme.

Field visits were carried out from September 2002 to January 2003, with preliminary findings included in the Progress Report in January 2002 prior to the drafting of the Final Report which was presented and discussed in Stockholm in April 2003.

##### *The Global Water Partnership*

GWP was established in 1996 as a donor initiative to take forward the Dublin-Rio Principles for Water (1992). The Partnership was designed to act as an international 'network of networks' to encourage learning and sharing of global experience, in order to promote an integrated approach to water resources management.

While retaining its overall objectives, GWP has evolved both its structure and its procedures gradually over the last seven years. GWP is based in Stockholm and for its first six years, it functioned as a unit of SIDA. From 1 July 2002, GWP became an independent inter-governmental organisation, known as the Global Water Partnership Organisation (GWPO).

GWP is actively engaged in, or building, eleven regional water partnerships, with country partnerships within these regions and around thirty strategic alliances with relevant multilateral, bilateral and international organisations to support strategic actions on IWRM.

GWP is financed entirely by grants from donor organisations. From its inception, 80-90% of GWP's funding has come from four principal donors: the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the World Bank.

### *Findings of the Review*

#### *Achievements of GWP*

There is clear evidence of significant achievements:

- i. a network of eleven regions has been established around the world
- ii. there is greater awareness of IWRM at global and regional levels. There is clear evidence in the regions of GWP's influence on government policy and activity. There have been notable achievements in policy change in a number of key countries: GWP's role in this respect is readily acknowledged in China, Thailand and Malaysia.
- iii. GWP as a 'neutral platform' is recognised, valued and being used successfully in the regions. GWP is recognised as a strong brand name advocating IWRM at global and regional levels, supported by a range of technical materials and website
- iv. GWP had a major role in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> World Water Forum and in WSSD and its involvement resulted in a significant increase in regional engagement. The recognition of and commitment to IWRM has also spread as a result of this engagement
- v. The "Framework for Action" has been a significant influence upon the GWP network and has been mentioned favourably by many parties at regional and national level.

#### *Challenges*

- i. There is a perception in some regions and countries that there is too much emphasis on general awareness-raising of IWRM and not yet enough emphasis on local engagement and capacity building at regional and country level to implement IWRM.
- ii. Although GWP was conceived as a network of networks, there are still weaknesses in communication between the various parts, and confusion as to roles and interactions. More attention is needed at regional and country level to ensure consistency and resilience, to remove confusion between RWPs and Regional TECs, and to ensure good regional management and responsiveness.
- iii. There is a lack of clarity about membership or partnership within GWP. As a result the brand name may be vulnerable to casual or improper use.
- iv. Links with international funding institutions and other relevant international bodies is not consistent across the whole network. There are instances where greater engagement is needed. GWP needs to strengthen and broaden its links in this area at both global and regional levels.

#### *Conclusions*

In 6 years GWP has set up a global network that has already made an effective and significant contribution to the global recognition of Integrated Water Resource Management. GWP has influenced policy and brought about change in legislation in the governance and

management of water. A strong global network and brand has been established. There is broad recognition of the value of the 'neutral multi-stakeholder platform' that it enables internationally and at the local level.

It has done this in a cost-effective way making very efficient use of very limited resources. The achievements made and clearly attributable to GWP represent a very significant contribution to international aid and lending programmes in the water sector. GWP has demonstrated its ability to perform, and can be considered to represent very good value delivered for the investment made. It remains a very effective and efficient vehicle for future donor investment to improve the management of water resources world-wide.

The rapid global progress has created enthusiasm and increasing demand upon GWP for support, action and local engagement in the regions. This is placing very significant pressures on the resources of GWP, which need to be addressed urgently to maintain momentum, to meet the greater demand for regional engagement and to safeguard the 'Brand' and reputation of GWP.

Regional administration has been provided through a variety of arrangements with local institutions or the local offices of other international bodies, with varying degrees of success. If regional management arrangements fail, it will damage GWP's credibility and inhibit progress. Progress in some regions has been very significant but there is an urgent need for more support to complete the setting up of RWPs and CWPs where real engagement and progress can be made.

There would be significant benefit to regional planning and to the commitment to staff and stakeholders if a longer financial planning horizon was adopted with donors committing to 3 to 5 year funding programmes. GWP's overall strategy is to move the main fund-raising activity to the regions. This will put increased responsibility on regional staff but will strengthen the link between funding availability, performance and value perception.

The objective behind the setting up of Area Water Partnerships (AWPs) should also be carefully considered. They should represent a real application of local engagement and be clearly seen as an extension of a strong country partnership with full government participation.

There are 600 organisations presently registered as "Partners" in GWP, ranging from small NGOs to Governmental departments. The role of partners and the relationship between membership at global and regional and country level is not consistently understood in the regions. There is no refreshment or renewal process to ensure that the lists represent current participating membership.

The Toolbox has been distributed across the network and is being used in universities. Delivery in the regions has not yet matched the integrated approach to capacity development originally envisaged and there is an expressed need for more basic tools and support particularly in the areas of governance and public administration as a part of the implementation of IWRM. There is enthusiasm in the regions and expressed by some TEC members for greater regional engagement to support implementation and capacity development in both technical and governance areas

### *DAC Criteria*

GWP has met the DAC criteria very well in its first six years of operation

### *The Way Forward*

The recognition and enthusiasm generated across its networks and in the regions is increasing demand on the limited resources available to GWP. It is also apparent that GWP

does not currently have sufficient resources to fulfil its potential by meeting the increasing demands upon it, consolidating its regional structures and moving to greater local engagement. To meet the demands and maintain the momentum and also to address some of the challenges noted in this Review, additional funding and resourcing will be needed.

If it is going to fulfil what is expected of it, the issue of structural change must be addressed. The role of each region is distinct but there are certain basic needs that are common to all. . All regions require a reliable and resilient resource capability to manage activities in the regions, with country partners especially country governments and with regional organisations. Regions also need more consistent and reliable communications within GWP. This should not be interpreted as the first step in the creation of a new bureaucratic organisation but rather some readjustment of priorities and reconsideration of current resource application.

### *Recommendations*

GWP should continue to be regarded as a cost effective and valuable instrument for progressing reform and awareness in water resource management with distinct roles globally, regionally and in country.

GWP needs to continue to evolve, to decentralise and to increase its local engagement. It should seek funding for increasing its resources to consolidate and complete its regional structures. There is a very urgent need to address current problems in the regions to improve communications across the network and connectivity with the centre and to overcome the long delays in setting up country partnerships.

There should be closer engagement with other international agencies in the regional context. Stronger and more consistent local resource support is required in the regions, especially in those regions where the enthusiasm and need for GWP is the greatest and the opportunity for engagement is clear. There should be stronger regional representation at the global level. In countries where there is little prospect of real government engagement beyond dialogue, GWP should review its investment and priorities.

Donors should commit to longer term funding to improve effectiveness and efficiency. Funding commitments for 3-5 years would provide a more realistic planning horizon for the acquisition of stronger local resources and for planning other regional initiatives.

Capacity Development should be seen as a key deliverable of GWP. The Toolbox has not yet been fully embraced across the regions. Associated Programmes such as CAPNET are not always clearly identified with GWP. Greater dialogue and promotion is needed. Greater ownership by GWP of the capacity development initiative should be considered to address the demand for comprehensive and longer-term commitment and a broader syllabus.

---

## External Review of Global Water Partnership

### Final Report

#### 1. Introduction

##### 1.1. Background to the Review

This report describes the process and presents the findings of the External Review of the Global Water Partnership (GWP), which was carried out between June 2002 and March 2003. In the interests of the readership of this report, it has been kept as brief as possible. Background to this study and more detailed information relating to the review has been attached as Annexes. The background to the External Review is set out in Annex A; which also contains the Terms of Reference developed as a result of the Scoping Study. Details of the structure, objectives and operations of GWP are set out in Annex B; while details of the conduct of the review, the programme of actions taken, including field visits and investigations, are presented in Annex C. Annex D contains the acronyms used throughout this report.

The GWP Secretariat and Steering Committee took the initiative early in 2002 of proposing a formal external review of GWP. It was intended that a comprehensive external review of GWP would be undertaken by a team of independent evaluators to provide an overview of GWP development and current issues for the attention of the in-coming Executive Secretary. The United Kingdom's (UK) Department for International Development (DFID) was asked to manage this External Review jointly with the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) and the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs. DFID commissioned the Performance Assessment Resource Centre (PARC) in the UK to carry out a Scoping Study and to lead the External Review process. The External Review team comprised four independent evaluators, with one representative from the Netherlands and Sweden, and two from the UK.

The Scoping Report was discussed at a meeting between representatives of the three donor agencies and the GWP Steering Group on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2002 in Stockholm. It was agreed at this meeting to proceed with the main part of the External Review in line with the proposals set out in the Scoping Report.

This final report derives principally from the work undertaken during Phase 2 (Desk Study) and Phase 3 (Field Studies), carried out by the full External Review Team. However, the report also relies on the findings and research from the earlier Scoping Study, and its associated Scoping Report, presented in August 2002.

##### 1.2. Objectives and Scope of the Evaluation

The Scoping Study describes the scale and complexity of the GWP, the need to find ways of measuring impact on policy as a result of GWP activity, and methods of measuring progress in the understanding and implementation of Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM). Given the rapid rise in membership and the relatively autonomous nature of the partnerships within the network, the Review Team intended to see how far the branding of GWP had been established as distinctive, and how far GWP was seen to be adding value both at the global and national levels.

The objectives and methodology proposed for the External Review were set out in the Scoping Study. The full Terms of Reference are in Annex A. The objectives of the External Review are summarised in *Box 1.2.* below:



**Box 1.2. Extract from Terms of Reference for the External Review**

In simple terms, the evaluation should focus on four questions:

Is GWP doing the right things?

Is GWP doing the right things well?

What recommendations can be made to enhance GWP's effectiveness?

How can the goals and achievements of GWP be sustained?

The External Review has been a substantial joint donor-funded initiative given that GWP's activities attract a current annual budget of USD 10 million and this was the first major independent external review of GWP since its establishment 6 years ago. The 'GWP Reference Group' for this review met in Stockholm on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2002 and comprised the GWP Chair, representatives of the three donors, the Executive Secretary, Chair of the TEC and Deputy Executive Secretary. Participants recommended that the Review Team should incorporate opportunities for iterative discussion with the Reference Group during the course of the Review. This was intended to ensure ownership of the recommendations, and engagement with the new Executive Secretary once that appointment was made.

The approach included a Desk Study of documents and the circulation and analysis of a questionnaire to a wide range of GWP members and stakeholders. In addition, field visits were undertaken to ensure a qualitative analysis of current impact at the national level in different contexts. The choice of regions for field visit was discussed at length with both the GWP Secretariat and with the three donor representatives. It was agreed that it was essential to visit all the Resource Centres identified within GWP. The selection of regional visits was confirmed on the basis that Southern and Southeast Asia and Southern Africa presented differing levels of perceived success and differing strategies within the GWP regions, whilst Central and Eastern Europe represented a very recent regional structure. It was agreed that within the time and budgetary constraints it was not possible to include any other regions within the regional visit programme.

## **2 Methodology for the External Review**

### **2.1. Approach to Review**

The approach included a Desk Study of documents and the circulation and analysis of a questionnaire to GWP members and stakeholders. In addition, field visits were undertaken to ensure a qualitative analysis of current impact at the national level in different contexts. The choice of regions for field visit was discussed at length with both the GWP Secretariat and with the three donor representatives. It was agreed that it was essential to visit all the Resource Centres identified within GWP. The selection of regional visits was confirmed on the basis that Southern and Southeast Asia and Southern Africa presented differing levels of perceived success and differing strategies within the GWP regions, whilst Central and Eastern Europe represented a very recent regional structure. It was agreed that within the time and budgetary constraints it was not possible to include any other regions such as Central and South America within the regional visit programme.

Field visits gave an opportunity to corroborate and expand on the findings recorded in the document review and questionnaire.

In order to ensure discussion and ownership of the findings and recommendations of this Draft Final Report, it was agreed that the report should be presented to a workshop including the GWP Secretariat and the donor group. After incorporating feedback from that event, the Final Report should be published.

### **2.2. Structure of the Review and Programme**

The overall structure and planning of the review is set out in detail in Annex A.

The Review was carried out in three Phases:

**Phase 1: Scoping.** At a special meeting in Stockholm on 15<sup>th</sup> August 2002, a Scoping Report was presented and discussed with the representatives of the Steering Committee, and the donors funding the review;

**Phase 2: Desk Review.** This was carried out concurrently with Phase 3, between September 2002 and February 2003. A Progress Report was presented in Stockholm in early January 2003. A Summary Programme for the Phase 2 Review is outlined in Annex C, with a brief explanation of the Desk Review in Section 2.5 below.

**Phase 3: Field Review.** Field visits were carried out from September 2002 to December 2002, with preliminary findings included in the Progress Report. Interviews with International organisations in New York and Washington took place in January 2003.

Details of the Programme are presented in Annex A.

### **3 Structure and Objectives of GWP**

#### **3.1. Overall Organisation**

The GWP was established in 1996 as a donor initiative to take forward the Dublin-Rio Principles for Water (1992). With a minimum of bureaucracy, the Partnership was designed to act as an international 'network of networks' to encourage learning and sharing of global experience, in order to promote an integrated approach to water resources management. Further details of GWP's objectives are given in section 3.2 below.

When GWP was launched and established in August 1996, it was based on the model provided by the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). The evolution of the partnership during the past six years has shown significant functional differences between GWP and CGIAR. As a result there have been gradual adjustments in the GWP structure and procedures.

GWP is based in Stockholm. It has been hosted by SIDA and has functioned as a unit of SIDA until 30<sup>th</sup> June 2002. From 1 July 2002, GWP changed its legal foundation and became an independent inter-governmental organisation, known as the Global Water Partnership Organisation (GWPO). This change has required significant adjustment in administrative and financial management. As part of its new independent international status, and under the terms of the recent Memorandum of Understanding with the Swedish Government, the GWPO Secretariat has now moved into new offices.

Currently GWPO is the only legal entity within the network. None of the regional structures have their own legal status.

GWP has undergone a number of key strategic planning exercises in order to set up a suitable monitoring framework to track progress. The 'Inception Report' of May 2001 has been the most recent. It specifies in detail the work outlined in the 'Comprehensive Work Programme and Follow up to the Framework for Action' (Dec 2000) against which the actions of the Secretariat, the Regions, the Technical Groups and the Resource Centres have been monitored.

The different organisational components of GWP are: -

- Steering Committee
- Technical Committee (TEC)
- Secretariat
- Regional Partnerships (currently nine) and some Country Partnerships
- Consulting Partners
- Financial Partners
- Resource Centres

Details of all these groups and bodies, as downloaded from the GWP website, are attached at Annex B.

The Secretariat has a small, full-time staff headed by an Executive Secretary and Deputy Executive Secretary. The Secretariat is in turn supported by three internationally recognised Resource Centres: DHI Institute of Water and Environment, Denmark; HR Wallingford, UK; and the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) Sri Lanka. A fourth, CEDEX/DGHOCA in Spain is planned.

The governance structure of GWP comprises:

- The Meeting of the Sponsoring Partners – representatives of the Governments and International Organisations who are the signatories of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Establishment of the Global Water Partnership Organisation;
- The Steering Committee and the appointed Chair;
  - the Nomination Committee is a sub-committee of the Steering Committee and is responsible for appointments to the Steering Committee, the Technical Committee and the Executive Secretary,
- The Partners' Meeting – representing all the enrolled Partners. "Partners" are any organisations subscribing to the principles of GWP and accepted as a "Partner" by the Executive Secretary.

While the Meeting of the Sponsoring Partners is the ultimate decision-making body of GWP, the Partners' Meeting has an important consultative role on all matters of significance for the governance, as well as the overall operations, of the network.

The Steering Committee has the powers to establish and accredit Committees, Regional Water Partnerships (RWPs), Regional Technical Advisory Committees (RTACs) and Country Water Partnerships (CWPs). - Partnerships are collectives of Partners operating in agreement with the GWP Conditions of Engagement. The GWPO Secretariat has three distinct functions: administration and finance, networks and communication. Administration and Finance has a small staff headed by a Chief Administration Officer and there is a Head of Communications. The Secretariat has five Network Officers responsible for internal communication and liaison with the nine regional partnerships.

In the past, GWP relied upon its Resource Centres to provide resources to develop its Framework for Action (FFA), to support its committees and to provide specialist inputs. It has also relied on UNOPS to contract TEC members and Steering Committee members.

Although intended as a network of networks, regional structures have tended to imitate the original central structures. The regional organisations have service support contracts with host organisations, such as IUCN in Harare, IWMI in Sri Lanka and Vituki in Budapest. GWP relies upon its regional host organisations to provide contractual and other legally based services. The host may also be the contracting organisation on behalf of GWP with donors.

### **3.2 Objectives and Outputs**

GWP's mission and objectives are set out in *Box 3.1* and the Programmatic Objectives and Programme Outputs from the FFA are reproduced in *Box 3.2*.

#### **Box 3.1 GWP Objectives and Outputs**

GWP Mission Statement (based on the Dublin Principles, 1992) is to support countries in the sustainable management of their water resources. The original mission, as interpreted in the Strategic Plan 1999, included a vision of Regional and National partners.

GWP objectives, as stated in the 2001 Annual Progress Report, are to:-

- clearly establish the principles of sustainable water resource management;
- support action at local, national, regional and river-basin level that follow principles of sustainable water resource management;
- identify gaps and stimulate partners to meet critical needs within their available human and financial resources;
- help match needs to available resources.

Four programmatic objectives (further detailed in *Box 3.2* below) are: -

- establishing partnerships and mobilising political will;
- building strategic alliances for action;
- promoting good practice in IWRM,
- developing and implementing regional actions.

### **Box 3.2. Programmatic Objectives and Programme Outputs**

In the FFA, performance by objective is proposed under nine outputs, as depicted in the right hand column below:

<b>Programmatic Objective</b>	<b>GWP Work Programme Outputs</b>
1. establishing partnerships and mobilising political will	1.1 on the ground partnerships established
	1.2. awareness raised and attitudes to water management changed
2. building strategic alliances for action	2.1. established alliances supported
	2.2.alliances with key international and regional organisations formed
3. promoting good practice in IWRM	3.1. knowledge of IWRM good practice generated and disseminated
	3.2. key practitioners to operationalise IWRM concepts identified and supported
	3.3. support to dialogue on key IWRM issues advanced
4. developing and implementing regional actions	4.1 Regional FFAs completed and tangible actions prioritised
	4.2. special studies identified and supported

The Annual Report (2001) details each of the Work Programme Outputs and compares 'Expected Results' with 'Actual Achievements' under each heading.

There are several identified outputs under FFA and 'Associates at Work' on the web-site. The principal one is the 'Toolbox', which is clearly intended to be of great importance as an aid to the RWPs in the overall dissemination of the principles and practices of IWRM and Good Governance.

Recent rapid progress has been made in setting up RWPs. There were nine at the start of this Review as follows:

Central America (CA)	South Asia (SAS)
Central and East Europe (CEE)	Southern Africa (SA)
Mediterranean (MED)	South East Asia (SEA)
South America (SAM)	West Africa (WA)
China	

During the course of the Review, 2 new RWPs were set up in Central Asia and East Africa.

The Inception Report (May 2001) sets out the GWP's central and regional Work Programme implementation arrangements for 2001-3. It includes a summary log frame and outlines

responsibilities and resource requirements. Progress has been reported against this plan in quarterly progress reports. These reports are beginning to show the way in which monitoring experience and indicators against outputs are being developed.

### 3.3. Strategic Alliances

The building of strategic alliances to form a well co-ordinated, multi-stakeholder approach is a key mechanism for implementing GWP's mission. GWP has been actively building strategic alliances with relevant multilateral, bilateral and international organisations to support strategic actions on IWRM. Box 3.3 below lists the organisations identified in the review with which GWP is engaged in a broad range of activities at various stages of development and success. Fuller details of the nature of the strategic alliances are set out in Annex B.

#### Box 3.3. Organisations with which GWP is collaborating in Strategic Alliances

Organisation	Activity
World Bank	Water and Sanitation Programme
	Urban environmental sanitation Network (UESNET)
	Ground Water Management (GW-MATE) GWP Associated Programme
FAO, (&ICID)	International Programme for Technology and Research in Irrigation and Drainage-GWP AP from onset
	Information Services on Water Conservation and Use in Agriculture (INFONET)
UNDP	Water Governance Dialogue in collaboration with ICLE
UNDP (and IHE)	CAPNET – a GWP Associated programme on capacity building for IWRM
	Water and sanitation
WHO (& many regional Partners)	Participatory Hygiene and Sanitation PHAST (East and Southern Africa)
WMO	SADC HYCOS – a GWP Associated programme on water resource monitoring and assessment for SA.
IAHR	Floods Management – A GWP Associated Programme
DFID	Ground water management (GW-MATE) – a GWP Associated Programme
IRC	Gender and Water Alliance - (GWALLIANCE) – a GWP Associated programme
GTZ	Information network (GLOBWINET) – GWP Associated programme
IUCN	Water and Nature Initiative (WANI)
	Water and Governance
WSSCC	Water and Sanitation in CEE, South Asia
WUP	Building Capacity of Water Utilities Partnerships in South Asia, WA, SA
ICLEI	Providing local authorities with framework to address water management issues
	Water governance dialogue in collaboration with UNDP
INBO	Development, strengthening and management of river basins
ICID	Food dialogue in CEE
ICPDR	CEE- observer status
	Public participation issue paper in collaboration with WWF (pp)
WWF	Food dialogue and public participation (pp) issues in CEE
SIWI	Stockholm Water Symposium
WWC	(a) Information management and exchange (b) Seating on each other's Steering Committees (c) Programme Co-operation in Dialogues on Effective Water Governance, Water Food and the Environment, Water and Climate, and the Financing panel for water infrastructure (d) Presentations and displays at future international events

### 3.4. Financial Management

#### Budgets

The budget planning process starts with the issuing of guidelines for planning and budgeting for the next budget year. The guidelines indicate the estimated level of financial resources for each region, some “specific advice” for planning and priorities for resource allocation by the region, and a time table for the planning and budgeting process of the year. The time table sets out a period from September to December when the Work Plan and Budget is brought together for consideration and approval by the Steering Committee in December. Following approval by the Steering Committee, the Financial Partners Group of GWP meet in February for the final discussion and commitments for financial contribution by the donors. Overall budgets and expenditures for the last five years are summarised in *Table 3.2*.

**Table 3.2. GWP Expenditure Overview**

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<b>US \$000s</b>					
Central Activities	1,033	1,615	1,781	2,434	3,696
Network & Governance	1,570	1,662	1,329	1,210	1,423
Total Central	2,603	3,277	3,110	3,644	5,119
Regions					
Activities		1,383	554	2 796	3,285
Network & Governance		928	1,726	1 310	996
Total Regions		2,310	2,280	4 106	4,281
<b>TOTAL GWP</b>	<b>2,603</b>	<b>5,587</b>	<b>5,390</b>	<b>7,749</b>	<b>9,400</b>

#### Accounting and Audit

Accounting at the regional level is carried out by the regional host organisation under the supervision and responsibility of the RWP or RTAC. The accounting systems used by the host organisations vary but the reporting to GWP is done according to the programme objectives and outputs and in the standard GWP format. The service contracts with the host organisations and with the Resource Centres specify that all accounts should be subject to the normal accounting practices of the service provider and in addition the audit procedures of GWP.

#### Funding

GWP is financed entirely by grants from donor organisations. From its inception, 80-90% of GWP’s funding has come from four principal donors: the Netherlands, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the World Bank. *Table 3.3* shows the contributions from all donors for the period 1998-2002.

**Table 3.3. GWP Donor Contributions 1998 to 2002**

	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
<b>US \$000s</b>					
Denmark	123	175	91	100	250
Finland		101	47		
France	54	79	111	112	107
Germany			24	120	299
Netherlands	328	716	556	1,111	2,990
Norway	66	64	78	111	608
Sweden	982	1,149	855	1,026	2,197
Switzerland	196	200	137	135	140
United Kingdom	221	2,229	3,363	3,001	2,722
World Bank	946	1,425	731	840	
Others (UNDP)		131	430	4	
Regional Partners				599	
<b>GWP TOTAL</b>	<b>2,841</b>	<b>6,076</b>	<b>6,425</b>	<b>7,160</b>	<b>9,313</b>
1) France: includes secondment of one Secretariat Staff member from 1997					
2) Netherlands: includes one JPO from 1999					
3) Sweden :includes core support to SATAC from 1998					



## 4. Findings

### 4.1 Context

In an organisation such as GWP, which has little bureaucracy and very few internal systems, there are few formal indicators of performance against which to measure achievement. Given the number of networks and partners within GWP, the Review Team could only gain the views of a relatively small sample. In addition many of the findings set out below are based upon individual perceptions expressed at interview or through questionnaires. The findings are therefore derived from qualitative rather than quantitative data. This was recognised at the Scoping Report stage and where possible anecdotal evidence has been triangulated with other data. The External Review's Progress Report included as many of the key emerging issues as possible so that these could be discussed at length with the GWP Secretariat and other key persons within GWP in Stockholm in January 2003. The draft of this report and complete set of findings were discussed at a meeting of the GWP Secretariat and donor group in Stockholm on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2003.

### 4.2 Achievement of Overall Objectives

Key achievements and challenges that have been identified in the Review process are summarised in *Box 4.1*. More detailed findings are set out below under the headings of Global Linkages and Effects, Networks and Regions; Local Engagement and Technical Support and Capacity Development.

#### **Box 4.1 Key Achievements and Challenges Identified in the Review**

##### *Achievements*

- i. There is clear evidence of significant achievements:
  - a regional network has been established
  - there is greater awareness of IWRM at global and regional levels
  - GWP is recognised as a strong brand name advocating IWRM at global and regional levels, supported by a range of technical materials and website
  - there is evidence in the regions of GWP's influence on government policy and activity (see *Box 4.2*)
  - GWP as a 'neutral platform' is recognised, valued and being used successfully in the regions.
- ii. GWP had a major role in the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> World Water Forum and its involvement resulted in a significant increase in regional engagement. The recognition of and commitment to IWRM has also spread as a result of this engagement.
- iii. There have been notable achievements in policy change in a number of key countries: GWP's role in this respect is readily acknowledged in China, Thailand and Malaysia.

##### *Challenges*

- v. There is a perception in the regions that there remains too much emphasis on general awareness-raising of IWRM and not yet enough emphasis on local engagement and capacity building at regional and country level to implement IWRM.
- vi. Although GWP was conceived as a network of networks, there are still

weaknesses in communication between the various parts and confusion as to roles and interactions. More attention is needed at regional and country level to ensure consistency and resilience, to remove confusion between RWPs and Regional TECs, and to ensure good regional management and responsiveness.

- vii. There is a lack of clarity about membership or partnership within GWP. As a result the brand name may be vulnerable to casual or improper use.
- viii. A clearer focus is needed to ensure consolidation of the gains made so far in order to ensure the implementation of IWRM at the country level.
- ix. GWP needs to strengthen and broaden its links with International Banks and other international and bilateral agencies at both global and regional levels.

### **4.3 Global Linkages and Effects**

GWP has established a very large regional network with activities apparent at the regional and country level. The 'brand' relating to both the GWP name, and to its definition of IWRM, has achieved a very high level of recognition across the global water sector.

There are many other international initiatives related to water resource management and a potential for confusion as to the different roles and objectives of all the actors. There is a need for GWP and its sponsors to seek closer co-operation with some other key international initiatives, such as the World Water Council (WWC), Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), International Water Association, International Commission for Irrigation and Drainage (ICID), etc. to seek to reduce overlap and to rationalise and unify the message. While there is evidence of successful engagement in many areas e.g. Thailand and China, some interviewees felt that there are instances where it appears that GWP is not engaging sufficiently and consistently with International Banks and other international and bilateral agencies at the operational level

#### *Second World Water Forum*

The "Framework for Action" has been a significant influence upon the GWP network and has been mentioned favourably by many parties at regional and national level. The document "Towards Water Security: A Framework for Action" (GWP, Stockholm Sweden, March 2000) was prepared for presentation at the Second World Water Forum and the Ministerial Conference at The Hague in March 2000. It was presented together with, and in support of, the World Water Vision, which was prepared under the guidance of the World Water Commission. GWP was asked by the Commission to organise inputs from all over the world to prepare an outline of the actions that would contribute to achieving the Vision. The FFA, prepared by GWP, was meant as a basis to achieve the Vision. Through regional and national meetings and workshops, this consultation process brought many stakeholders together to establish a shared view of appropriate strategies, mechanisms for implementation, and priorities for immediate action and investment. This process provided an excellent opportunity for GWP to show its potential as a "neutral platform" for discussions between stakeholders, and respondents felt that GWP responded well to this challenge. The external finance to facilitate this process was instrumental to its success as well as the commitment, technical ability and approach taken.

#### *Membership*

The building of networks with a broad range of partners representing stakeholders in the water sector is a key activity of GWP. However, the role of different partners in regard to their

decision-making powers in GWP is unclear to many interviewees in the regions. At the global level, there are approximately 600 organisations presently registered as “Partners” in GWP. Some of these groups are also registered with existing regional or country water partnerships. Partners at the global level represent a huge variety of organisations in terms of size, strength, focus, type, background, etc. They range from small, locally based NGOs to major Governmental departments or ministries with national responsibility for water policy. The role of partners within GWP is not clearly understood by many in the regions. Moreover, the relationship between membership at global level and membership and activities at regional and country level was unclear to all parties consulted. There is no refreshment or renewal process to ensure that the lists represent current and participating membership.

A recent definition of Partner is reproduced in *Box 4.3*.

#### **Box 4.3. Definition of a GWP Partner**

A recent GWP note regarding “conditions of engagement for GWP Regional and Country Water Partnerships” (GWP Stockholm, 25 November 2002) states that:-

‘GWP works through a decentralised and inter-connected global network of member institutions, called GWP Partners, that are organised on a regional and country basis in Water Partnerships. The GWP Partners can be government agencies, regional and local government institutions, training and research institutions, companies and organisations in the private and public sectors, civil society including non-governmental organisations, international and professional organisations and bilateral and multilateral development agencies.’

This new definition does not provide clarity regarding synchronous membership by the same body at global, regional and country levels. The issue of ‘global’ partners has not been referred to, as a result, misunderstandings regarding membership remain widespread amongst regional and country partnerships. This confusion was also reflected in the questionnaire responses.

#### **4.4 Networks and Regions**

The GWP network has grown very rapidly. The need to protect “the brand name” of GWP has already been recognised by the Secretariat. Conditions for engagement have recently been defined. These are intended to create a greater sense of identity and coherence and to ensure that the Water Partnerships address the GWP mission of supporting countries in the sustainable management of their water resources through IWRM. The responsibility for accepting a Water Partnership into GWP lies with the GWP Steering Committee. The Steering Committee has entrusted the GWP Secretariat with this task. Consequently the GWP Secretariat works with the respective RTACs and RWPs to agree the constitution of a Regional or Country Partnership.

Much of the achievement to date has resulted from the engagement of technical specialists within the regions in the RTACs. There has been significant commitment of funds to this. The activities and progress in the regions vary greatly. There is no simple single pattern or consistent set of indicators for success. The initial steps undertaken in all regions have been the raising of awareness about the benefits of IWRM and the stimulation of a stakeholder dialogue. These measures are the basic prerequisite for setting up a regional partnership. How the newly formed partnership acts and the direction it chooses to follow is largely determined by the particular RTAC or RWP. This reflects not only the regional needs but also the perception of where success may be achieved.

In general, having identified all key stakeholders, the key common features necessary to achieve the desired progress in the regions have been interpreted as:

**Step 1 Achieve engagement in the dialogue** with sufficient stakeholders to create a quorum to form an RWP or RTAC

**Step 2 Achieve engagement with government** and all other key stakeholders

**Step 3 Identify a clear and significant role for GWP** in advancing IWRM in the region

**Step 4 Build capacity and engage in a clear and significant plan**, to contribute to progress and success within the region and countries.

Experience so far has shown that the pattern for steps 1 and 2 are largely similar but, for the latter two, can be markedly different while still remaining within the overall aims and objectives of GWP. It is difficult to make a clear distinction between the continuation of the dialogue and conference programme to advance capacity building as an indication of success, and continuation only because no further progress is actually being achieved through regional momentum. According to the interviews conducted in the regions, the engagement of governments and other relevant international bodies working in the sector and in the region is a key component to success in Steps 3 and 4. Findings show that Government needs to be a participant within the CWP to enable any progress in the operation of Country Partnerships within each region.

The value of Area Water Partnerships (AWPs) to GWP if government is not a partner is much less clear. The motive for establishing AWP has not always clear. In some cases, it maybe related to showing progress within the CWP when key interactions with government and international institutions have been difficult, or have not worked at all.

There is confusion between the roles of regional TACs and Partnerships. No consistent view on this has been apparent. Within GWP both the terms "RWP" and "RTAC" are being used interchangeably. In the regions visited, all RTACs or RWPs have a small Secretariat and part-time Chair. In Southern Africa, and more recently in South Asia, RWPs are being set up. It is not clear to all in the regions whether, ultimately, this is to supplement or to replace the RTAC.

### *Membership in the Regions*

Membership is distributed as follows: 35% of the membership in South Asia, 23% in Southern and West Africa, 15% in USA & Western Europe as well as 15% in Central and Eastern Europe and less than 6% in the other regions (Southeast Asia 6%, Central Asia & Middle East, Mediterranean and Central & Southern America each 2%). From observations regarding the effectiveness of the regional and country partnerships it is clear that there is no relation between the size of the regional membership and the effectiveness of the GWP regional effort. There were no consistently maintained membership lists in the regions.

### *Finance and Accountability*

The GWP budgeting, approval and fund allocation process was seen by respondents to be complicated and is not fully transparent to RTAC, RWP and CWP members. The budgeting and fund allocation process to the regions has led to frustration at regional and country level. However, the new budget timetable and financial reporting procedures adopted by GWP should alleviate these concerns.

The transition to increased funding within the regions will increase the participation of regional staff in the process and also increase significantly the responsibility placed upon regional staff. It was difficult for GWPO and regional staff to plan in the absence of longterm donor commitments to funding.

## Organisation and Management

Tables 4.1 to 4.4 below summarise a number of subjective judgements about some key issues pertaining to the regional structures and CWPs, with special reference to organisational set-up, tangible outputs, linkages and focus on the future role. The qualifications given in these tables are merely indicative and based upon discussions held with a large number of parties at various levels during the field visits and other meetings. These tables have been compiled by the Review Team by scoring the different regions on the basis of information gained after the visits.

**Table 4.1 Key Factors in Organisational Set-Up of Regional TACs & RWPs**

	CEETAC	CHINATAC	SEATAC	SASTAC	SATAC/RWP
Organisational qualities					
• Formalised	***	***	***	****	***
• Robust	*	*	****	***	***
• Effective	**	****	*****	***	**
• All stakeholders actively involved	***	*	***	**	**

Note:

\*\*\*\*\* = high; \*\*\* = average; \* = low; nr = not relevant; nk = not known

**Table 4.2 Key Factors in Outputs and Future Focus of Regional TACs and RWPs**

	CEETAC	CHINATAC	SEATAC	SASTAC	SATAC/RWP
Tangible outputs policy influencing	***	*****	*****	**	*
Tangible outputs capacity building	**	*	*****	**	**
Formalised links with regional bodies	***	*	*****	**	***
Clear focus/ideas on future role	***	****	*****	***	***

Note:

\*\*\*\*\* = high; \*\*\* = average; \* = low; nr = not relevant; nk = not known

The assessments in Tables 4.1 and 4.2 are supported by the following specific findings:

- SEATAC is developing into a robust and effective WP with links to governments, ASEAN and an operational agenda including strong capacity building;
- The possible linkage in South East Asia with ASEAN and in Southern Africa with SADC could be highly significant, not only in terms of driving GWP and IWRM forward within the regions, but also in defining a model for use elsewhere;
- There have been recent problems with the management and organisation of both SASTAC and SATAC. In the latter case, there has been a hiatus in regional management over the last six months of 2002, resulting in frustration among a number of stakeholders at a crucial stage of RWP and CWP development;
- SEATAC and to a certain extent CHINATAC have successfully started the process of policy influencing e.g. by advising on IWRM related legislation, and by putting the

IWRM issue to regional forums e.g. SEATAC's efforts to influence ASEAN water policy;

- CEETAC has made good progress, including notable achievements regarding involvement with ICPDR and the dialogue on flood management in the Danube catchment;
- Capacity building is relatively high on the SEATAC agenda with the Malaysian WP playing a significant role;
- Ideas on the future role are relatively well developed in SEATAC. This was not clearly demonstrated either in SASTAC or SATAC.

### *Resilience*

There were strong desires among regional managers and stakeholders to see greater decentralisation of decision making within GWP, devolving towards the regional and country level.

All RTACS and RWPs have management contracts with local host organisations. The quality of these relationships and their performance is critical but varies greatly. In the case of Southern Africa, they had broken down. The system of using host organisations has been effective and efficient in the early development of the regions. Some hosting arrangements are working well and in these situations the regional activities may be able to continue in the same way. None of the RTACs or RWPs visited is likely to become self-sustaining in the near future. All are likely to require additional resources to achieve a resilient structure, e.g. initial support over legal issues during the next phase.

This would need to be accompanied by strong 'brand' management and linked to achieving greater resilience and continuity within the regional management. Once the regional structures (partnership or TAC) are seen to be performing, then they must be capable of sustaining that performance. At that point the local management arrangements and core funding to support them must be assured and continuous. However, as the funding emphasis moves towards regional application and regional self-sufficiency, there may be a corresponding need for changes in the contractual arrangements. The setting up of regions and country partnerships as legal entities may be necessary.

### *Communications and Relationships between Global, Regional and Country levels*

The whole GWP network is now large. It has relied upon the enthusiasm of a small number of key players and often fragile local administration. If it is to sustain its achievements and continue to progress, it will need to ensure investment in its management, communication and internal reporting systems.

The lack of sufficient dialogue between the centre and the regions has been raised by interviewees in all regions visited. This may be entirely due to the rapidity of setting up the regions and a general lack of central and regional resources to cope with the activities and initiatives that have been generated.

Structured relations between GWP Stockholm and the regions mainly take place through network officers. Use of network officers has, in general, been effective and cost efficient in the early part of the setting up of the network. Regional views vary but concerns have been expressed over the effectiveness of decision-making and communication of the network officer system. As the regions become better established and need to be more self-sufficient, the current role of network officers in Stockholm may need to be reviewed.

## **4.5 Local Engagement**

## Country Water Partnerships

Eleven CWP were visited, (Bangladesh, China, Hungary, Malaysia, Nepal, Philippines, Poland South Africa, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Zimbabwe). Very few CWPs have a membership structure with well-defined rights and obligations for members, but comprise loosely related parties that show interest in IWRM issues.

In South Asia, a number of AWP have been established. The role and place of these partnerships in GWP is not clear. Concerns regarding the reasons for setting up partnerships in this additional level and their control have been raised above in section 4.3.

An assessment of the CWP organisations as perceived from the field visits is given in *Table 4.3* below.

**Table 4.3 Assessment of the Organisation of Country Water Partnerships**

	Bangladesh	China	Hungary	Malaysia	Nepal	Philippines	South Africa	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Zimbabwe	Poland
<b>Organisational issues</b>											
• Formalised	****	*	****	****	***	*****	**	***	*	*	***
• Robust	***	*	**	*****	**	****	**	**	*****	*	***
• Effective	**	n.r.	***	*****	**	***	*	**	*****	*	**
• All stakeholder actively involved	***	***	**	****	***	****	**	***	**	*	***
• Government involvement	****	****	****	*****	**	****	**	**	****	*	**
• University involvement	****	***	*****	*****	**	*****	***	***	*****	*	****
• NGO involvement	****	**	**	****	*****	****	***	****	**	*	*
• Private sector involvement	**	**	**	****	***	*****	**	**	**	*	**

Note:

\*\*\*\*\* = high; \*\*\* = average; \* = low; nr = not relevant; nk = not known

The assessment in *Table 4.3* is supported by the following specific findings:

- Most CWPs are in the process of some kind of formalisation. The Philippine WP is the only fully formalised CWP with a relative balanced involvement of all possible stakeholders, including the private sector. Private sector involvement in CWPs remains very limited in most cases.
- The Malaysian WP (MyWP) is an outstanding organisation with a clear vision, strategy and strong membership from most stakeholders. GWP at various levels does not make sufficient use of the experience gathered in Malaysia.
- Progress in developing both the South Africa and Zimbabwe CWPs is currently stalled. Care is needed to ensure that new country partnerships are not launched and then not fully delivered. There is very significant threat to the global brand and regional reputation of GWP from this. One of the common problems encountered is the difficulty in setting up and registering the partnership as a legal entity. While the legal systems of countries do vary, there are many common features regarding this issue and some urgent effort should be applied to overcoming this problem overall before much of the goodwill both within the embryonic partnership group and the other stakeholders is lost. More control

should be applied over the launching of Country Partnerships to stay within the resource limitations of the organisation locally and as a whole.

### *Finance and Accountability*

CWPs get limited financial support within the GWP structure for an initial three-year period. The expectation is that the Country Partnership would reach a state of financial self-sufficiency by then. There was no indication that this is likely to be achievable in any of the countries visited. Given the difficulties and resource demands on setting up legal entities for the CWPs and RWPs, this issue requires urgent attention. The local accounting function for the regional and country organisations is normally provided by the host organisation. This has been described in more detail above in section 3.4.

### *Activities and Outputs*

The main outputs of GWP activities are expected to be engagement in regional dialogues and capacity building to influence policy. The focus of activity varies greatly between the regions. The GWP Toolbox has been designed to support these activities. Outside the academic institutions in the countries visited, the Toolbox has not achieved a high profile. In universities there was good evidence of its use as a teaching tool. Otherwise the concept of the Toolbox as a product to support a process is not well understood. It is perceived as a finished article and, judged as such it has not yet achieved the recognition anticipated.

Similarly the role and place of Resource Centres is not clear to the CWPs. There is actually very little interaction between the European based Resource Centres and the regional networks. Such interaction as does take place is normally by nominated experts who may have been contracted through a Resource Centre before GWPO was set up as a legal entity. While there will be an ongoing need to contract in expertise and support from the current Resource Centres and elsewhere, there seems to be little value derived from the specific designation of Resource Centres. It may be less confusing to discontinue the explicit designation.

An assessment of the CWP outputs and future focus as perceived from those interviewed is given in *Table 4.4* below:

**Table 4.4 Assessment of Outputs and Future Focus: Country Water Partnerships**

	Bangladesh	China	Hungary	Malaysia	Nepal	Philippines	South Africa	Sri Lanka	Thailand	Zimbabwe	Poland
<b>Policy influencing</b>											
Awareness on IWRM	****	****	*****	*****	****	****	***	****	****	**	***
Water related laws	*	*****	***	***	**	***	*	**	****	*	***
Re-structuring Government organisations	*	n.k.	**	***	**	***	*	**	*****	*	*
<b>Capacity building</b>											
• Key issue	*	***	***	*****	***	**	**	**	***	*	**
• Vision	*	****	***	*****	***	***	***	***	****	*	***
<b>Engagement with</b>	*	*	****	*****	*	***	*	*	*****	*	**



<b>regional organisations</b>												
<b>Clear focus and ideas on future role</b>	*	***	****	*****	***	***	***	***	****	*****	*	****

Note:

\*\*\*\*\* = high; \*\*\* = average; \* = low; nr = not relevant; nk = not known

The following, more specific, findings expand the assessment in Table 4.4:

- Awareness raising on IWRM issues has been relatively successful in most CWP's;
- Other, more direct policy influencing with special reference to the improvement of water related laws and the re-structuring of governmental institutions was in evidence in China and Thailand. Significantly, the GWP leadership in these two countries had direct access to the policy decision-making level;
- Capacity building is a very strong element of the Malaysian WP. In Southern Africa CAPNET activities take place through the WATERNET project in Zimbabwe. The relationship between RTAC/RWP Southern Africa and WATERNET is very limited, even though GWP's mission indicates that capacity building is a key IWRM issue that should be high on GWP's agenda;
- There is great variation in the way Partnerships are structured in countries. Being able to adapt readily to specific regional and local circumstances should be a strength of GWP. However, as mentioned earlier, there is a lack of clarity as to membership rules and responsibilities for partnerships at all levels;
- The achievements of country partnerships are very variable. Some have been highly successful in achieving policy influence; others have remained at the awareness raising conference and seminar stage. Some have developed AWP's. There is very limited demonstration of engagement in national prioritisation, planning or risk management;
- Area partnerships may be a good way to engage NGOs, and the public in general, but undoubtedly they represent a significant risk to the GWP brand and its reputation if not adequately controlled. Whether there is sufficient value to be achieved from sponsorship of area partnerships to justify the risks or the cost of management of those risks is a question that must be considered. It should be noted that in the countries visited where there is particular emphasis on AWP's, there is little apparent engagement in policy influence with government;
- In some countries (Thailand, China, Malaysia) there is evidence of strong links with government but there are also instances where the government's engagement in GWP is weak (South Asia and Southern Africa). It would seem to be of paramount importance to achieve government involvement in any country partnership,
- The involvement of the academic and technical 'water' community in CWP's is generally high. Involvement of the academic and technical community outside water, (civil service training, or social and management issues, for instance) is very limited. Engagement of NGOs is highly variable. In some cases, this is a deliberate choice, in others something yet to be achieved. There has been no demonstration of engagement with the charity aid sector, which is active in both water and poverty-reduction issues.

### *Resilience*

The issues related to resilience at country level are similar to those indicated above at regional level. A strong platform to produce evidence of effective activity seems to rely on the following three factors: that the Country Partnership has participation from Government; that the Country Partnership has confidence about its future funding; and that it is properly supported and administered. The issue of forward planning of funding was raised by a

number of interviewees. For an organisation such as GWP to progress effectively and efficiently, there is a need for the forward commitment of funding. This has already been identified above. None of the 11 CWP's visited envisaged local self-sufficiency within the short term. Reasons for this vary from failure so far to identify the appropriate funding source and to address it correctly, to the more common preoccupation with getting the basic systems into place. Self-sufficiency and consistency will be achieved more rapidly overall, if the setting up of basic systems is addressed now and properly supported from the centre.

#### *Relations between levels*

Most CWP's have no direct dialogue or reporting links to GWP Stockholm except to the Network Officers. Relations with the regional organisation (TAC or RWP) are largely informal links between personalities.

#### **4.6 Technical Support and Capacity Development**

GWP's technical outputs are the purview of the TEC. It is notable that the TEC has managed to retain and engage a membership of considerable international standing since GWP's inception.

The major tangible technical outputs and guidance include the Toolbox, a series of technical papers and the outputs of the Associated Programmes. The Toolbox was intended to be a living resource presenting a series of options, actions and examples that users could adopt and adapt to their own requirements and circumstances. There is recognition of the value of this information and data to assist institutional and technical strengthening. GWP has delivered seminars and workshops in all the regions covered. These have been seen as valuable and generally significant. However, most respondents wanted to see a change in balance between continuing the dialogue and moving towards regional and local action.

The GWP network has a thorough and complex theoretical knowledge and experience of IWRM. The key challenge remaining, recognised by the GWP itself in a number of earlier reports, is the translation of that generic knowledge into practical, on-the-ground actions, which are easily replicable at regional and country levels and have penetrating and lasting outcomes in terms of sustainable water use and security. The Actions & Partnerships Summary Note, Phase 1 (August 2002) concludes that few on the ground actions are reported or documented and some useful actions do not qualify as "on the ground actions". It also indicates that the structure of the work programme is not streamlined towards actions, and finally that only 25% of the membership directly manage or regulate water, possibly indicating a bias towards academic interest and international issues.

In the regions visited, the most recognised added value in this area appears to be the contributions of the core GWP team and the key regional players, rather than the material outputs. There is notable frustration in some regions that the core GWP team and particularly the TEC members are not more involved in regional engagement rather than global advocacy. There is a common view apparent in the regions that they would, in general, wish to see more regional engagement by key international figures within GWP.

The Toolbox is being used in academic institutions for teaching, but there has been no evidence presented of its use in executive roles. Views expressed include: 'it is an excellent teaching aid'; 'it is at too high a level'; 'if there were more case studies it might be more use'. There is an expressed need for support but in the review meetings there was more demand for more basic information and support on governance and general administrative issues.

The Associate Programmes are not consistently or universally understood. For instance, there is confusion relating to the ownership of CAPNET. Since capacity building is a core output for GWP, it is important to ensure that such critical inputs and outputs are closely managed by GWP to ensure quality control.

#### **4.7 Internal Communication**

While one of the key visible achievements of GWP has been the raising of awareness of IWRM amongst external partners, there have been many indications of poor internal communications, and poor understanding by one part of the GWP network of what other parts are doing. This has been discussed above in relation to the regional structures and region to centre and centre to region communication, but it is also apparent that there is a need for improved communication between all parts of the network. The GWP leadership are keen that GWP should be a network of networks rather than a hierarchy but there is still a sense of hierarchy within the organisation.

There is an apparent lack of clarity across the regions as to the roles of the Steering Group, the TEC and the Partners Meetings. The field interviews have also revealed that there are communication gaps affecting the central management structure and the committee membership. The committee structure is complex and the relationship between the Steering Committee and TEC is not clear to some members of both of these bodies as well as across the regions. There is a considerable administrative burden within GWP in servicing and informing its committee structure and yet it is important that the purpose and values of all the committees and groups are widely understood and appreciated. Interviewees and respondents felt that some simplification of the overall structure of the committees and the arrangement of their programmes may be appropriate to allow more direct interaction.

#### **4.8 Desk Review**

As noted in Section 2.5, the Desk Review consisted of two separate but parallel activities.

- Review of GWP technical documentation, and
- Development of a questionnaire and analysis of responses from GWP Members and Partners.

There was a disappointing response to the questionnaire request from members and partners. More than five hundred members were contacted and only some seventy responses were received. There is therefore concern over the representative nature of the sample and caution must be exercised over interpretation of the responses received. Some caution is needed over the validity of the GWP membership lists and the size of the active membership claimed. Common issues and impressions from the Desk Review are shown in *Box 4.4* below; more detail is presented in Annex C.

#### **Box 4.4 Principal Findings from the Desk Review**

##### *Document Review Findings:*

Since 1996, GWP has passed a number of important milestones, refining its objectives, with an ever-increasing focus on the need for output- and outcome-orientated, "on the ground" actions. This need is recognised by the Secretariat, the TEC, GWP sponsors, partners and members. GWP sees itself as a catalyst with a comparative advantage in facilitating, influencing and stimulating others to deliver or bring about actions and change.

##### *Questionnaire responses:*

Of the services currently provided by GWP, its members appear to value most highly:

the global network which provided access to specialists and the ability to share information, contributing to and learning from others;

linkage with global policy development through IWRM and links to international funding institutions; and

support with raising the profile of IWRM in country.

Two areas in which respondents wished GWP to concentrate on in future were:

providing technical support and advice on IWRM; and  
 setting up RWPs.

The technical documentation was appreciated by many, being easy to use and understand, especially for professionals and experts. Others indicated that it was too prescriptive, inaccessible (physically and intellectually), and would benefit from greater design input from developing country experts. The principal current users of the Toolbox appear to be academics and NGOs rather than executive water managers.

Respondents also valued CWPs, the dialogue processes on Water Governance and Water, Food and the Environment; while less value was placed on organisation and funding of attendance at international conferences and meetings.

Criticisms from respondents mainly related to the following:

- GWP trying to take on too many issues at too many levels for its resources
- Lack of transparency over funding
- Lack of funding and poor prioritisation of activities
- As a consultative forum with no legal powers, GWP was also seen to lack authority.
- At this point, more actions on the ground and capacity development were called for, with less effort on general 'awareness-raising'

### *Other International Organisations*

In Annex C a review is presented of the web-site information of four other high profile organisations which have all been referred to in the field interviews. The organisations concerned are Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council (WSSCC), the International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage (ICID), the World Water Council (WWC) and the Water and Sanitation Programme (WSP). The purpose of this review was not to make comparisons regarding the relative effectiveness of these organisations but to establish any declared areas of overlap in relation to GWP's objectives and activities.

These findings emphasise the importance of uncovering the distinctive role of GWP within the broad spectrum of similar organisations and to identify opportunities for rationalisation in the interests of both clarity and efficiency and more effective liaison.

### **4.9 Performance Measurement**

There are internal systems which have been put in place to monitor progress against the Strategy, the Programmatic Objectives (*Box 3.2*) and the annual plans. These provide considerable detail. The quarterly reports track progress within the regions and all other initiatives within GWP. However, the links between the system of reporting to centre and the evaluation of their own direction and achievement is not clear to all in the regions. There is a need to provide a simple link between regionally owned monitoring and evaluation of regional activities and reporting to the whole organisation. This issue has been identified in Section 4.3 above and consideration of four clear aspects of regional achievement has been identified during this review. It is proposed that this approach could form the basis for an

ongoing performance measurement system. This is developed further in Section 6 Recommendations.

---

## 5 Conclusions

### 5.1 Overall

**In just 6 years GWP, as a donor instigated initiative, has set up a global network that has already made an effective and significant contribution to the global recognition of Integrated Water Resource Management. GWP has influenced policy and brought about change in legislation in the governance and management of water. A strong global network and brand has been established. There is broad recognition of the value of the 'neutral multi-stakeholder platform' that it enables internationally and at the local level.**

**It has done this in a cost-effective way with very limited resources and represents very good value delivered for the investment made.**

It is also clear that the achievements made and the awareness across the regions that has been raised has now increased the demands upon GWP. There is very strong good will towards the Partnership and a demand for more action and engagement. As a means of improving policies related to water and the overall better management of water, GWP has demonstrated its ability to perform and it remains a very effective and efficient vehicle for future donor investment to improve the management of water resources world-wide.

This rapid progress towards global coverage and a functioning regional network has created enthusiasm and increasing demand for support, action in the regions and local engagement. This is placing very significant pressures on the resources of GWP, as an organisation, which need to be addressed urgently to maintain the momentum and to be able to meet the greater demand for regional engagement and to safeguard the 'Brand' and reputation of GWP.

It is clear that the GWP core team and the three current principal donors fully recognise the urgent need to strengthen regional structures within GWP. This review is intended *inter alia* to provide an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses within GWP and to highlight areas of the Partnerships structures and networks where attention may be needed to continue the success of the first six years. Comments and criticisms received by the review team during the field visits and interviews have been noted in section 4 above. In the paragraphs below conclusions relating to these findings are set out to provide detail of the issues and actions that the review team believe are now needed.

### 5.2 Operational and Strategic Issues

#### 5.2.1 Regional Engagement and Regional Structures

The very rapid expansion of GWP that has been achieved with the very limited resources has meant that its network is fragile, and systems for planning budgeting, and control of regional and country activities to ensure they are properly managed and 'on-message', have only recently been implemented. Quality assurance systems are needed throughout the network to minimise the threat to the 'Brand' through unauthorised action. There is now a need to ensure robust and consistent high quality administration of the regions to ensure transparency, accountability and continual focus upon GWP plans and commitments.

Regional administration has been provided through a variety of arrangements with local institutions or the local offices of other international bodies, to varying degrees of success. If regional management arrangements fail, it will damage GWP's credibility and inhibit

progress. Progress in some regions has been very significant but there is a general need for more support to complete the setting up of RWPs as legal entities and to register CWPS where real engagement and progress can be made. This is a very urgent requirement. The regional structures are fragile and opportunities and enthusiasm will fade if further engagement is held up by preoccupation of the local GWP leaders with the bureaucratic processes related to, for example, setting up legal entities. Greater certainty of funding availability would have a significant benefit in terms of providing dedicated regional resources where appropriate.

GWP's overall strategy is to move the main fund-raising activity to the regions. This will put increased responsibility on regional staff but will strengthen the link between funding availability and performance and value perception. This very important issue has not yet been fully implemented across all levels in GWP.

The success of GWP in engaging regional and country debate and action can readily be demonstrated. The network can be seen as well developed and there are many instances where it is apparent that the global regional and country debate has been advanced. However there are varying degrees of success in different countries. There are a number of identifiable cases where any real change will take much longer to achieve. In those countries where there only minimal engagement with government has so far been achieved, greater effort and resourcing will be needed if local partnerships are to be sustained.

#### *AWPs*

There are risks involved in establishing a further tier within the overall structure, since the resource implications to ensure that AWP's stay within the GWP 'aims and objectives' may not be fully appreciated. The objective behind the setting up of AWP's should also be carefully considered. If they represent a real application of local engagement and can be clearly seen as an extension of a strong country partnership with full government participation, then there may be value in the AWP. If the Country partnership is not strong or government is not fully involved then an AWP may not be relevant or may not be in the overall best interests of GWP or its regional success.

#### *Funding*

Consolidation and completion of the required regional structures will require additional funding. The transition to increased funding access at regional level will increase the participation of regional staff in the process and also increase significantly the responsibility placed upon regional staff. There would be significant benefit to regional planning and to the commitment to staff and stakeholders if a longer financial planning horizon was adopted with donors committing to 3 to 5 year funding programmes.

#### *Organisation*

Regional strengthening and greater organisational decentralisation would need to be accompanied by strong 'brand' management and linked to achieving greater resilience and continuity within the regional management. Once the regional structures (partnership or TAC) are seen to be performing, then they must be capable of sustaining that performance. At that point the local management arrangements and core funding to support them must be assured and continuous. However, as the funding emphasis moves towards regional application and regional self-sufficiency, there may be a corresponding need for changes in the contractual arrangements. The setting up of regions and country partnerships as legal entities may be necessary.

*In order to maintain its momentum and success, GWP needs to increase its regional engagement and consolidate its regional structures*

## 5.2.2 Control Systems and Communication - Resilience of Regional Administration and Management

Paradoxically, the very success of GWP in developing such an extensive network of RWPs and CWPs, with restricted resources, significantly exposes the organisation to vulnerability and may constrain its future effectiveness. GWP currently does not possess the human resources or the infrastructure to ensure that all parts of the network operate effectively and 'on-message'. Frustration is being expressed in the regions and goodwill, which is an essential component of GWP's cost-effective delivery, could be compromised. The regional structures are still very new and reliant on a very small number of persons. Considerable efforts are required to strengthen and sustain them. GWP should continue to decentralise the management of its activities towards the regional hubs. This would require development of the capacity for regional management of activities, including fund raising.

*There is a need to improve control systems and communication between all levels of the GWP structure, and to ensure the resilience of regional administration and management*

## 5.2.3 Committee Structure and Internal Communications

The roles and relations between the central committees (Steering Committee, TEC and Partners Meetings and global RTAC meetings) are not clear and there may be merit in reviewing the roles to achieve greater clarity and efficiency, and to provide more effective communication and unity of purpose.

*There is an opportunity to review GWP's committee structure to increase clarity, unity of purpose and to improve internal communications*

### *Membership*

In view of the importance given to the Annual Partners Meeting to provide the direction and strategy for GWP, there needs to be a clearer indication of the role and some means of reviewing and updating the membership.

## 5.2.4 Engagement with International Funding institutions and other International Agencies.

With assistance from donor and funding organisations, GWP needs to increase its own engagement both at the strategic global level and regionally with the funding institutions. There would be real value also in reducing the confusion created by so many overlapping global initiatives with similar and sometimes overlapping objectives.

*GWP needs to increase its engagement with international banks and other international agencies.*



### 5.3 Technical Issues

#### 5.3.1 GWP's Global Technical Resources.

It is the actions and participation of the key players in the Secretariat and the technical support programmes that is the most recognised contribution of GWP. However, the number of key players is very small and is a significant vulnerability. Resource Centres have provided a gateway to access a wider pool of people. There is concern in some regions about the preponderance of 'northern hemisphere' expertise. There are opportunities for more inter-regional technical cooperation.

#### 5.3.2 Capacity Development and the Toolbox.

There is an expressed need for more basic tools and support particularly in the areas of governance and public administration for the many 'technical' officials facing public engagement for the first time, as a part of the implementation of IWRM. While there has been take up of the Toolbox in some areas and especially in Universities, delivery in the regions has not yet matched the integrated approach to capacity development originally envisaged. It is not always seen as part of an overall programme of support and capacity development. Potential users need to understand that the Toolbox is a contribution to an overall process is not an end product in itself. To be successful it needs to be supported by a programme of on-site capacity development, perhaps in conjunction with CAPNET. There is enthusiasm in the regions and expressed by some TEC members for greater regional engagement to support implementation of IWRM and capacity development in both technical and governance areas

The Associate Programmes are not consistently understood and there is confusion as to both their ownership and purpose in the regions. There is some confusion regarding 'ownership' of some of these initiatives. This leads to both loss of recognition of GWP's contribution and confusion over responsibility for delivery. For instance, the link between the Toolbox and CAPNET is generally not recognised.

### 5.4 Assessment against the DAC Criteria

As stated in section 2.1, the terms of reference requested that the Review Team apply the DAC Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance to GWP. These have been borne in mind throughout the Review and *Box 5.1* below contains a summary conclusion for each of the five key DAC criteria. Overall, the conclusion is that GWP has met the DAC criteria very well in its first six years of operation.

#### **Box 5.1: Conclusions assessed against DAC Criteria**

<b>Relevance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GWP promotes IWRM -the participatory approach it embodies, offers a neutral platform which can bridge political divides and bring together the necessary stakeholders to challenge and resolve the key water management issues.</li> <li>• GWP's objectives remain valid. GWP is well placed to facilitate the uptake of IWRM and policy change in respect of water management in the world's most challenged regions and countries.</li> <li>• Broadly speaking, GWP's activities and programme outputs are consistent with its overall goal, objectives, intended impacts and effects.</li> </ul>
------------------	--

<b>Effectiveness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GWP has set up a substantial global network that incorporates the broad spectrum of stakeholder interests on water issues. It has also established a strong 'brand' and been very effective in raising the profile of IWRM.</li> <li>• GWP has contributed significantly to stimulating and advancing the global IWRM debate. The regional network has been effective in raising awareness, providing support in technical areas, and developing governance skills and an understanding of water management.</li> <li>• The network is very new and fragile and requires attention to ensure that its relevance and effectiveness are retained. GWP has not yet been fully effective in consistently delivering technical support beyond the initial awareness raising and regional mobilisation.</li> <li>• On the basis of GWP's 4 main objectives (see Box 3.1), GWP has made considerable and effective advances on objectives 1 and 2. These were necessary precursors to objectives 3 and 4, where some progress has been made and more focused effort is now required.</li> </ul>
<b>Efficiency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall the value for money has been very good. There are areas such as communications between regions and the Secretariat and between the Steering Committee, TEC and the regions that could be improved in terms of the effectiveness of those involved and the efficiency of the investment.</li> </ul>
<b>Impact</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GWP's participation and influence in the 2<sup>nd</sup> World Water Forum (WWF) and the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) and the 3<sup>rd</sup> WWF are indicators of impact, as is the recognition that the GWP regional network now enjoys.</li> <li>• GWP's impact can be summarised by the fact that a growing network of committed stakeholders and interested parties has now been established in 11 regions, with others developing. The principal challenge now is to have a wider effect on policy change, with corresponding practical actions and outcomes on the ground. Global water challenges are complex and substantial and, although GWP's influencing agenda has made significant progress but there remains much more to do.</li> </ul>
<b>Sustainability</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For some time to come the global water debate will be driven mainly by multilateral and bilateral funding agencies. GWP will remain dependent on its current donors for the foreseeable future but the emphasis on funding should move from the centre to the regions and into donors' regional programmes where the effectiveness and value can be more directly assessed.</li> <li>• The GWP network is fragile but regional expectations have been raised that GWP can fulfil. There is an urgent need to reinforce regional support and to consider the restructuring of GWP to improve communication and to increase regional/global interaction.</li> </ul>

### 5.5 The Way Forward

The overall conclusion of the review is that GWP has been successful in setting up its global network, in advancing the awareness of IWRM and establishing itself as a recognised and

valued part of global water reform. However, the network is very fragile and depends on the goodwill and efforts of a small number of key persons. The recognition and enthusiasm generated across its networks and in the regions is increasing demand on the limited resources available to GWP and there is a real danger that GWP may not currently have sufficient resources to meet the demands and to consolidate its success. There is frustration in many parts of the network regarding poor communication, and some confusion over the overall direction of the organisation. This is a very new organisation and its rapid expansion requires consolidation whilst not inhibiting its continued progress. Some specific corrective actions and attention will be needed urgently.

GWP has developed a wide global network but needs to ensure that all the actors within the network stay 'on message' and provide robust and resilient performance in the regions. The regions differ widely in their needs and this calls for different responses from within the GWP network. All regions share the ambition to have greater control of resources within the regions, to produce greater interaction with governments at country and regional levels, and to ensure stronger interaction between global and regional levels. All the regions with which the Review Team had contact wished to see an evolution from 'Advocacy to Action', recognising that achieving this will require some reallocation of resources. However to do this successfully, GWP will require greater resources and funding and longer term commitment of investment and funding.

There appears to be two basic options available:

**Option 1. Reduce strategic ambition;**

There has been no call for GWP to reduce its ambition but GWP is dependent upon donors. More funds and resources are needed to complete the network and consolidate the structure whilst also addressing the demands for more regional engagement. If those funds are not forthcoming then in order to ensure that GWP does not fail in the future, it would need to reduce its engagement to a level that it can deliver reliably within its resources.

GWP has been very successful in raising awareness of IWRM through participation in global and regional conferences and seminars, and through global advocacy publications. The regions have been set up and, in some regions they have been able to replicate similar advocacy roles, supported by capacity development through the Toolbox, seminars and workshops. In some regions, there may be no ambition among the members to do more. However, the current GWP strategy is clearly focused on providing real engagement in the regions, on moving from 'Advocacy to Action' and on providing a real facilitation role in the effective development and better management of water resources. These latter ambitions and activities could be curtailed. GWP could remain focused upon advocacy, awareness and support to capacity development.

This approach would not reflect the wishes of the regional members. It would not deliver the best return on investment to date, or value for money to GWP's sponsors in the future. There are major opportunities for GWP to assist the regions to take the IWRM debate forward and by providing the neutral platform and facilitation role to move local stakeholders into effective action.

**Option 2. Increase funding and resources to deliver the current ambition robustly managing quality and 'Brand';**

The review has demonstrated the success of GWP but also the need to consolidate its success without reducing the overall momentum. If it is going to fulfil what is expected of it, the issue of structural change must be addressed. The role of each region is distinct but there are certain basic needs, outlined above, that are common to all. All regions require a reliable and resilient resource capability to manage

activities in the regions, with country partners especially country governments and with regional organisations. Regions also need more consistent and reliable communications within GWP. GWP has achieved great success very efficiently with a very small resource base and permanent staff so the changes required now should not be interpreted as the first step in the creation of a new bureaucratic organisation, but rather some readjustment of priorities and reconsideration of current resource application.

The Review Team concludes that in regard to '*The Way Forward*':-

- Adoption of Option 2 would be the most appropriate, building on the efforts and investments already made in GWP and responding to a very clear message communicated from the regions during this review
- Close consultation with GWP has been maintained throughout the review process and the findings and conclusions have been presented as clearly as possible to facilitate the urgent decisions that GWP needs to make.
- The Review Team perceive that the major risk to the continued success of GWP is simply that GWP currently may not have the internal resources in staff time and funding to adequately address all the issues identified in this review with the urgency that they require.

## 6 Recommendations

**GWP should continue to be regarded as a cost effective and valuable instrument for progressing reform and awareness in the global water sector.**

On the basis of the discussions and gleaning of views from key persons both within and outside GWP and both globally and in the regions, it is concluded that of the options outlined above the most appropriate option warranting urgent attention is Option 2: -

**Increase funding and resources to deliver the current ambition robustly managing quality and 'Brand';**

More detailed recommendations are set out as follows:

- A. **The strategy for engagement should be clear.** The findings of the review point clearly to three main areas for consideration for the focus of GWP:
  - i. **Policy influencing** for improved water laws, restructuring water management, inclusion of IWRM in Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), World Bank sector plans, country development plans, *etc.*;
  - ii. **Providing a neutral platform**, using GWP as a recognised partnership for action engaging at global, regional and country levels and with international and regional institutions;
  - iii. **Developing capacity and awareness**, building understanding and technical skills in all aspects of IWRM, with particular emphasis on governance and administration related to water;
- B. **The responsibilities and objectives for the different levels (global, regional, country) within GWP should be defined more clearly.** At the global level, apart from the determination and management of the strategic direction, greater emphasis should be placed on engagement with other international players, particularly those involved in international development, to ensure the planning and internalising of IWRM and its tools into all appropriate lending and funding policy;
- C. **Regional management needs to be decentralised and strengthened.** There should be closer engagement with other international agencies in the regional context, particularly those related to development funding. There should be closer control of all activities within the region to protect the brand and to maintain the direction of GWP. Stronger and more consistent local resource support is required in the regions, especially in those regions where the enthusiasm and need for GWP is the greatest and the opportunity for engagement is clear. There should be stronger regional representation at the global level.
 

Action should be taken to strengthen the internal management systems and controls within GWP to ensure that the regions all remain within the overall plan and strategic direction;
- D. **In order to provide funding for more robust regional management of effective local engagement, current levels of funding for the regions should be reviewed and increased.** However, in countries where there is little prospect of real government engagement beyond dialogue, GWP should review its investment and priorities;
- E. **Donors should commit to longer term funding to improve effectiveness and efficiency.** Funding commitments for 3-5 years would provide a more realistic planning horizon for the acquisition of stronger local resources and for planning other regional initiatives.

- F. **Capacity Development should be seen as a key deliverable of GWP.** The Toolbox has not yet been fully embraced across the regions. Associated Programmes such as CAPNET are not always clearly identified with GWP. Greater dialogue and promotion is needed. Greater ownership by GWP of the capacity development initiative should be considered to address the demand for comprehensive and longer-term commitment and a broader syllabus.
- G. **Performance Measurement**

There are internal systems which have been put in place to monitor progress against the Strategy, the Programmatic Objectives (*Box 3.2*) and the annual plans. The four steps in Section 4.3 above are proposed to be applied to the log frame and to performance reporting as simple tests of overall regional and country achievement. This would aid clarity concerning the overall progress within the regions and countries and all the activities within the different regions can be assessed in terms of their relevance to a simple set of benchmarks.

The Steps originally set out in Section 4.3 above should be used as a framework against which each region should develop its own specific set of indicators. The regional performance framework is shown in *Box 6.1* below:

***Box 6.1. Framework for Determination of Key Performance Indicators***

**Step 1 Achieve and maintain engagement in the dialogue** and a quorum of sufficient key stakeholders to operate a RWP or RTAC;

**Step 2 Achieve and maintain engagement by government** and all other key stakeholders;

**Step 3 Identify a clear and significant role for GWP** in advancing IWRM in the region;

**Step 4 Build capacity and engage in a clear and significant plan,** to contribute to progress and success within the region and countries.

Since the emphasis should be upon the quality of membership in terms of their ability to participate in and influence the debate rather than the mere number of registered 'partners', there could be an indicator to show how regions are reviewing and refining their membership over time. Similar consideration could be given to the other steps to provide overall key performance indicators such as water policy change and water law change as appropriate.

## Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AIT	Asian Institute of Technology
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AWP	Area Water Partnership
BWDB	Bangladesh Water Development Board
BWP	Bangladesh Water Partnership
CAPNET	International Network for Capacity Building (Associated Programme, GWP)
CATAC	Central America Technical Committee (GWP)
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CWP	Country Water Partnership
CEE	Central & Eastern Europe
CEETAC	Central & Eastern Europe Technical Committee (GWP)
CHINATAC	China Technical Committee (GWP)
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (of the OECD)
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DFID	UK Department for International Development
DHI	Danish Hydrological Institute of Water and Environment (a GWP Resource Centre)
DID	Department for Irrigation & Drainage (Philippines)
EA-RWP	Eastern Africa Regional Water Partnership
FAO	Food & Agriculture Organisation (UN)
FFA	Framework for Action
GOB	Government of Bangladesh
GOP	Government of Philippines
GTZ	Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (German development organisation)
GWP (O)	Global Water Partnership (Organisation)
IAHR	International Association of Hydraulic Engineering and Research
ICID	International Commission on Irrigation and Drainage
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives
ICPDR	International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River
INBO	International Network of Basin Organisations
IPTRID	International Programme for Technology Research in Irrigation and Drainage (adopted Associated Programme, GWP)
IREC	Interim Regional Executive Council (South Asia)
IRI	International Resource Institute
IUCN	World Conservation Union (formerly International Union for the Conservation of Nature)
IWHR	Institute for Water Resources and Hydropower Research (China)
IWMI	International Water Management Institute, Sri Lanka (a GWP Resource Centre)
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
IWSD	Institute of Water and Sanitation Development
JPO	Junior Professional Officer
LGED	Local Government Engineering Department (Bangladesh)
MANCID	Malaysia National Committee on Irrigation and Drainage
MEDTAC	Mediterranean Technical Committee (GWP)
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MyWP	Malaysian Water Partnership
NEDA	Netherlands Development Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
NEDA	National Economic Development Authority (Philippines)
NWP	Nepal Water Partnership
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation & Development
O&M	Operation and Maintenance

---

PARC	Performance Assessment Resource Centre
PRC	People's Republic of China
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PWMC	Philippines Water Management Coalition
PWP	Philippines Water Partnership
PWWA	Philippines Water Works Association
RBO	River Basin Organisation
RWP	Regional Water Partnership
RTAC	Regional Technical Advisory Committee
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community
SAMTAC	South American Technical Committee (GWP)
SARDC	Southern African Research and Documentation Centre
SASTAC	South Asia Technical Committee (GWP)
SATAC	Southern Africa Technical Committee (GWP)
SEATAC	Southeast Asia Technical Committee (GWP)
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SIWI	Stockholm International Water Institute
SLWP	Sri Lanka Water Partnership
SPBP	Service Provider Benchmarking and Performance (Associated Programme, GWP)
TEC	Technical Committee
TORs	Terms of Reference
UESNET	Urban Environmental Sanitation Network (Associated Programme, GWP)
UK	United Kingdom of Great Britain & Northern Ireland
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNICEF	United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund
UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD/ US\$	United States Dollars
WATAC	West Africa Technical Committee (GWP)
WFE	Water, Food & Environment (National Dialogue process)
WCA	Water Conservation in Agriculture (Associated Programme, GWP)
WHO	World Health Organisation
WMO	World Meteorological Organisation (UN)
WQMP	Water Quality Management Programme (Associated Programme, GWP)
WSCU	Water Sector Co-ordination Unit (SADC)
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WSSCC	Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council
WSP	Water and Sanitation Programme (adopted Associated Programme, GWP)
WUP	Water Utilities Partnerships (Africa) (adopted Associated Programme, GWP)
WWC	World Water Council
WWF	World Water Forum
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
ZNWP	Zimbabwe National Water Partnership