# The Republic of Serbia Country Questionnaire for Indicator 6.5.1

# Degree of integrated water resources management implementation(0 – 100)

## Introduction

UN Environmentis supporting countries in monitoring and reporting on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6, including target 6.5: “By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate”[[1]](#footnote-2). The targetsupports the equitable and efficient use of water resources, which is essential for social and economic development, as well as environmental sustainability.

Indicator 6.5.1 is: Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0 – 100).

## About the Questionnaire

The questionnaire contains four sections, each covering akey component of IWRM:

**1. Enabling Environment:**Creating the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM, which includes the most typical policy, legal and strategic planning tools for IWRM.

**2. Institutions and Participation:**The range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions and other stakeholder groups that help to support the implementation of IWRM.

**3. Management Instruments:** The tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.

**4. Financing:**Budgeting and financing made available and used for water resources development and management from various sources.

Each section has two sub-sections covering the “National” and “Other” levels. Various levels are covered to address the target 6.5 wording “… at all levels.” “Other” levels include sub-national, basin, local and transboundary (see glossary). Questions relate to these levels depending on their relevance to the particular aspect of IWRM.

For each question, a score between 0 and 100 should be selected, in increments of 10, unless the country judges the question to be ‘not applicable (n/a)’. The score selection is guided by descriptive text for six thresholds, which are specific to each question.If a country judges the degree of implementation to be between two thresholds, the increment of 10 between the two thresholds may be selected. The potential scores that may be given for each question are: 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100.

Respondents are strongly encouraged to add their justification for the score given in the space provided after each question, referencing evidence wherever possible (e.g. quoting reports, laws, plans etc.).Respondents are also welcome to provide additional relevant information or links to further documentation in the spaces provided after each question.Note that if ‘Very high’ or ‘n/a’ (not applicable) is selected as a response to any of the questions, the respondents are required to provide a brief justification for this.

## Glossary

* **Authorities / organizations /institutions / departments:** administrative units.
* **Basins:**Includes rivers, lakes and aquifers, unless otherwise stipulated. For surface water, the term is interchangeable with ‘catchments’ and ‘watersheds’.
* **Federal countries:** Refers to countries made up of federated states, provinces, territories or similar terms.
* **IWRM:** Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) is a process that promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources in order to maximise the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems. IWRM is not an end in itself but a means of achieving three key strategic objectives:
	+ efficiency to use water resources in the best way possible;
	+ equity in the allocation of water across social and economic groups;
	+ environmental sustainability, to protect the water resource base, as well as associated ecosystems.
* **‘Most significant’ interstate basins:** For federal countries only. Basins that cross state/provincial borders and are of reasonably high significance to those states and/or the country.
* **National (level):**Refers to the highest level of administration in a country.
* **Sub-national /state (level):**refers to levels of administration other than national. For federated countries, these are likely to be provinces or states. Non-federated countries may still have sub-national jurisdictions with some responsibility for water resources management, e.g. regions, counties, departments.
* **Programs:** Nation-wide plans of action with long-term objectives, for example to strengthen monitoring, knowledge sharing and capacity development, with details on what work is to be done, by whom, when, and what means or resources will be used**.**
* **Stakeholders:** In this questionnaire, stakeholders are the main groups important for water resources management, development and use
* **Water Resources Management**is the activity of planning, developing, distributing and managing the optimum use of water resources. Ideally, water resource management planning has regard to all the competing demands for water and seeks to allocate water on an equitable basis to satisfy all uses and demands. An integrated approach (see IWRM) is needed to ensure water resources management is not isolated within sector silos resulting to inefficiencies, conflicts and unsustainable resource use.

## Enabling Environment

This section covers the enabling environment, which is about creating the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM. It includes the most typical policy, legal and planning tools for IWRM[[2]](#footnote-3).Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation.Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or n/a (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. You are strongly encouraged to provide the justification and references to evidence for the score in the grey cell to the right of the score. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information required are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation. If ‘Very high (100)’ or ‘n/a’ is selected, a justification should be provided.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. Enabling Environment |
|  | Degree of implementation (0 – 100) |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| 1.1 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) at the national level? |
| a | National water resources policy, or similar | Development not started or not progressing. | Exists, but not based on IWRM. | **Based on IWRM, approved by government and starting to be used by authorities to guide work.** | Being used by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.  | Policy objectives consistently achieved. | Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically reviewed and revised.  |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | Adopted strategic framework: Water Management Strategy of Republic of Serbia, Official Gazette of RS 3/2017 (<http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/Strategija_FINAL.pdf>)River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River Basin on the territory of the Republic of Serbia has been drafted, but not adopted <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/dokumenta/javne-rasprave/plan%20dunav.pdf>Most relevant strategic documents related to water sector are: * National Environmental Approximation Strategy for the Republic of Serbia (NEAS, 2011) <http://www.ekoregistar.sepa.gov.rs/nacionalna-strategija-za-aproksimaciju-u-oblasti-zivotne-sredine-za-republiku-srbiju>
* Water Sector Approximation Strategy (2012) (<http://ambassadors-env.com/wp-content/uploads/Strategija-aproksimacije-u-oblasti-voda-2012.pdf>)
* National Strategy of Sustainable Use of Natural Resources and Goods, 2011 (<http://www.zzps.rs/novo/kontent/stranicy/propisi_strategije/S_prirodnih%20resursa.pdf>)
* National Programme for Environmental Protection (NPEP), 2010 and Action Plan for the period 2015-2019 (<http://www.eko.minpolj.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Nacrt-akcionog-plana-Nacionalnog-programa-zzs.pdf?lang=lat>)
* National Sustainable Development Strategy (NSDS), 2008 (<http://www.ekourb.vojvodina.gov.rs/sites/default/files/NACIONALNA%20STRATEGIJA.doc>)
* Strategy for Agriculture and Rural Development of RS for the period 2014-2024, 2014 <http://uap.gov.rs/wp-content/uploads/2016/05/STRATEGIJA-2014-2020-.pdf>
* Strategy for Poverty Reduction in Serbia, 2003 (<http://www.srbija.gov.rs/extfile/sr/211704/strategija-za-smanjenje-siromastva-u-srbiji_cyr.pdf>)
* National Milenium Development goals in RS, 2006 (<http://www.minrzs.gov.rs/files/doc/porodica/strategije/Nacionalni%20milenijumski%20ciljevi.pdf>)
* Floods Emergency and Recovery Project – Environmental and Social Management Framework, 2017 ( <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/20170312> FINAL ESMF SERBIA FERP, 115p.pdf
* Floods Emergency and Recovery Project – Resettlement Policy Framework, 2017 (http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/20170223 FINAL RPF SERBIA FERP, 45p.pdf)
 |
| b | National water resources law(s) | Development not started or not progressing. | Exists, but not based on IWRM. | **Based on IWRM, approved by government and starting to be applied by authorities.** | Being applied by the majority of relevant authorities. | All laws are being applied across the country.  | All laws are enforced across the country, and all people and organizations are held accountable. |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/dokumenta/zakoni/zakon-o-vodama.pdf>The main requirements for IWRM are set in the Water Law (Officiel Gazzette of the Republic of Serbia, no 30/2010, 93/2012 and 101/2016). Primary and secondary legislation require revision to be fully aligned with IWRM principles.In adition, legislation for the water, environment, forestry, land use, health, and other relevant sectors is not coherent. Furthermore, there is overlaping of responsibilities among authorities.  |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| c | National integrated water resources management (IWRM) plans, or similar | Development not started or not progressing. | **Being prepared, but not approved by government.** | Approved by government and starting to be implemented by authorities. | Being implemented by the majority of relevant authorities. | Plan objectives consistently achieved. | Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically reviewed and revised. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River Basin on the territory of the Republic of Serbia has been drafted. <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/dokumenta/javne-rasprave/plan%20dunav.pdf>The plan was to adopt the River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River Basin on the territory of the Republic of Serbia by the end of the year 2016. Due to long period of adoption of the strategic framework, the fact that the Draft RBMP for the Danube River on the territory of the Republic of Serbia is partially in accordance with WFD, the decision was made not to continue with the formal adoption of the Draft RBMP for the Danube River on the territory of the Republic of Serbia, but to dedicate on the preparation of the River Basin Management Plan for the territory of the Republic of Serbia 2021-2027 fully in accordance with EU water related legislation. Work plan for the preparation of the River Basin Management Plan for the territory of the Republic of Serbia 2021-2027 has been prepared, and Republic Water Directorate and PWMCs Srbijavode and Vode Vojvodine started with preparation. |
| 1.2 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support IWRM at other levels? |
| a | Sub-national[[3]](#footnote-4)water resources policies or similar | Development not started or delayed in most sub-national jurisdictions. | Exist in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM. | Based on IWRM, approved by the majority of authorities and starting to be used to guide work.  | **Being used by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.**  | Policy objectives consistently achieved by a majority of authorities. | Objectives consistently achieved by all authorities, and periodically reviewed and revised.  |
| Score or n/a: | **60** | Justification/evidence | The following policy and strategic documents related to water management were adopted by the Assembly of the APV:* Strategy for Water Supply and Water Protection in APV, 2009 (<http://www.ekourb.vojvodina.gov.rs/sites/default/files/sajt%20strategija%20vodosnabdevanja%20i%20zastite%20voda%20apv.pdf>)
* Development Programme of APV 2014-2020(<http://www.region.vojvodina.gov.rs/upload/Program_razvoja_AP_Vojvodine_2014_2020_3891.pdf>) and Action Plan for Priority Realization of Development Programme 2014-2020, 2014 (<http://www.region.vojvodina.gov.rs/upload/Akcioni_plan_3841.pdf>)

Strategy for Water Supply and Water Protection in AP Vojvodina clearly sets priorities, guidelines and recomendations in the field of water supply and water protection on the territory of AP Vojvodina, but it needs revision and reassesment in order to be fully based on IWRM. Action Plan for Priority Realization of Development Programme 2014-2020 set out priority projects related to water management in AP Vojvodina.  |
| b | Basin/aquifer management plans[[4]](#footnote-5) or similar, based on IWRM | **Development not started or delayed in most basins/aquifers of national importance.**  | Being prepared for most basins/aquifers of national importance. | Approved in the majority of basins/aquifers and starting to be used by authorities. | Being implemented in the majority of basins/aquifers. | Plan objectives consistently achieved in majority of basins/aquifers. | Objectives consistently achieved in all basins/aquifers, and periodically reviewed and revised.  |
| Score or n/a: | **10** | Justification/evidence | River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River Basin on the territory of the Republic of Serbia has been drafted. <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/dokumenta/javne-rasprave/plan%20dunav.pdf>The plan was to adopt the River Basin Management Plan for the Danube River Basin on the territory of the Republic of Serbia by the end of the year 2016. Due to long period of adoption of the strategic framework, the fact that the Draft RBMP for the Danube River on the territory of the Republic of Serbia is partially in accordance with WFD and IWRM, the decision was made not to continue with the formal adoption of the Draft RBMP for the Danube River on the territory of the Republic of Serbia, but to dedicate on the preparation of the River Basin Management Plan for the territory of the Republic of Serbia 2021-2027 fully in accordance with EU water related legislation. Work plan for the preparation of the River Basin Management Plan for the territory of the Republic of Serbia 2021-2027 has been prepared, and Republic Water Directorate and PWMCs Srbijavode and Vode Vojvodine started with preparation.River Basin Managements for Water Distrcits are not prepared jet. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| c | Arrangements for trans boundary water management in most important basins / aquifers[[5]](#footnote-6) | Development not started or not progressing. | **Being prepared or negotiated.** | Arrangements are adopted. | Arrangements’ provisions are partly implemented. | Most of the arrangements’ provisions are implemented. | The arrangements’ provisions are fully implemented. |
| Score or n/a: | **30** | Justification/evidence | <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/lat/medjunarodna-saradnja-bilateralna.php>Republic of Serbia is member of two international commissions:* International Sava River Basin Commision (<http://www.savacommission.org>) - Law on the Ratification of the Sava River Basin Framework Agreement and its Navigation Regime Protocol, and of the Agreement Amending the Sava River Basin Framework Agreement and its Navigation Regime Protocol (Official Gazette of FRY - International Agreements, 12/2004)
* International Commision for the Protection of the Danube River (<https://www.icpdr.org>) – Law on the Ratification of the Convention on Cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the Danube River (Official Gazette of FRY- International Agreements, 2/2003)

 Bilateral agreements with Hungary and Romania are valid, but need innovation. The negotiations on new proposal of these agreements started, but jet not finalized.* Regulation on the Ratification of the Agreement between the FPRY and the PR of Hungary on Water Management Issues (Official Gazetteof FPRY-International Agreements, 15/1956)
* Regulation on the Ratification of the Agreement Between the FPRY and the PR of Romania on Hydraulic Engineering Issues Relating to Hydraulic Engineering Systems on Watercourses Which Define or Cross the State Border (Official Gazetteof FPRY-International Agreements, 8/1956)

<http://www.mfa.gov.rs/sr/images/stories/bilaterala_ugovori/madjarska_vazeci.pdf><http://www.mfa.gov.rs/sr/images/stories/bilaterala_ugovori/rumunija_vazeci.pdf>Bilateral agreements with Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina are under development. |
| d | FEDERAL COUNTRIES ONLY: Provincial/state water resources laws. | Development not started or delayed in most states. | Exist in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM.  | Based on IWRM, approved in most states and starting to be applied by authorities in the minority of states. | Some laws being applied in the majority of states. | All laws being applied in the majority of states. | All laws being applied in all states, and all people and organizations are held accountable. |
| Score or n/a: | n/a |  | n/a |
| Average ‘Enabling Environment’ score | **33** | In case of ‘n/a’ for any questions, they should be omitted from the average calculation.  |

## Institutions and Participation

This section is about the range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions that help to support the implementation of IWRM. It includes some of the most typical institutions at different levels of society for IWRM. It includes institutional capacity and effectiveness, cross-sector coordination, stakeholder participation and gender equality. The 2030 Agenda stresses the importance of partnerships that will require public participation and creating synergies with the business sector. Note that public participation is also addressed in the ‘means of implementation’ Target 6.b: “Support and strengthen the participation of local communities in improving water and sanitation management”, which is monitored by indicator 6.b.1: “Proportion of local administrative units with established and operational policies and procedures for participation of local communities in water and sanitation management”.

**Terminology used in the questions:**

**Government authorities:** could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.

**Capacity for leading implementation**: in this context is that the responsible authorities should be adapted to the complexity of water challenges to be met and have the required knowledge, technical facilities and skills, including planning, rule-making, project management, finance, budgeting, data collection and monitoring, risk management and evaluation. It should include the ability to manage potential conflicts of interest between different sectors and/or stakeholder groups, particularly at the basin/aquifer level.

* **Sectors** relates to coordination between the government authorities responsible for water management and those responsible for other sectors (such as agriculture, energy, climate, environment etc.) that are dependent on water, or impact on water. Coordination between groundwater and surface water development/management should also be optimised. The relevant sectors should be considered according to their importance for the country.
* **Stakeholder** includes all interested parties who are, or may be, affected by any water resources issue or intervention. It includes organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. While definitions of stakeholders typically include the private (or business) sector, this particular stakeholder group is deal with separately in this questionnaire (see below).

**Business** includes private for-profit groups. It does not include government or civil society.

Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation. Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or n/a (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. You are strongly encouraged to provide the justification and references to evidence for the score in the greycell to the right of the score. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information required are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation. If ‘Very high (100)’ or ‘n/a’ is selected, a justification should be provided.

|  |
| --- |
| 2. Institutions and Participation |
|  | Degree of implementation (0 – 100) |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| 2.1 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at the national level? |
| a | National government authorities’[[6]](#footnote-7) capacity[[7]](#footnote-8) for leading implementation of national IWRM plans or similar | No dedicated government authorities for water resources management. | **Authorities exist, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.**  | Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan formulation. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan implementation. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and evaluation of the IWRM plan. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan revision. |
| Score or n/a: | **30** | Justification/evidence | Authorities responsible for water management issues at national level are:* Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection – Republic Water Directorate (<http://www.rdvode.gov.rs>)
* Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection – Environmental Protection Agency ([www.sepa.gov.rs](http://www.sepa.gov.rs))
* Republic Hydrometheorological Service of Serbia ([www.hidmet.gov.rs](http://www.hidmet.gov.rs))
* Ministry of Construction, Transport and Infrastructure (<http://www.mgsi.gov.rs/>)
* Ministry of Health (<http://www.zdravlje.gov.rs/>)
* Ministry of Mining and Energy (<http://www.mre.gov.rs/>)
* PWMC Srbijavode ([www.srbijavode.rs](http://www.srbijavode.rs)*)*
* PWMC Vode Vojvodine ([www.vodevojvodine.com/](http://www.vodevojvodine.com/)*)*
* Institute for Nature Conservation of Serbia ([www.zzps.rs](http://www.zzps.rs))

Institutional reform is slow but is showing efficiency gains. Most common constraints to the development of appropriate institutional arrangements relate to mandates, cross-sector coordination, capacity, and participation/ awareness. |
| b | Coordination between national government authorities representing different sectors[[8]](#footnote-9) on water resources, policy, planning and management  | No communication between different government sectors on policy, planning and management. | **Communication:****Information on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available between different sectors.** | Consultation: Information, experiences and opinions are shared between different sectors. | Participation: Opportunities for different sectors to take part in policy, planning and management processes. | Representation: Formal consultation between different government sectors with the objective of agreeing on collective decisions on important issues and activities. | Co-decisions and co- production: Shared power between different sectors on joint policy, planning and management activities. |
| Score or n/a: | **30** | Justification/evidence | There is a lack of fruitful vertical (national/provincial/local level) and horizontal (inetrsectoral) coordination and cooperation on issues related to water management. Information exchange between different authorities/agencies/companies dealing with water management is present, but there are sometimes problems with slow administrative procedures. Unless good-quality data is available for all the institutions involved, cooperation and efficient joint management cannot be achieved. |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| c | Public participation in water resources, policy, planning and management[[9]](#footnote-10) at national level. | No communication between government and stakeholders on policy, planning and management. | Communication:Information on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to stakeholders. | **Consultation:** **Government authorities occasionally request information, experiences and opinions of stakeholders.** | Consultation: Government authorities regularly request information, experiences and opinions of stakeholders. | Participation: Regular opportunities for stakeholders to take part in relevant policy, planning and management processes. | Representation: Formal representation of stakeholders in government processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities, as appropriate. |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | Public participation and the involvement of stakeholders in the decision-making process on water management issues remains a challenge, while access to information on water is generally better organized. However, the regulations laying down the practical procedures to implement public participation are largely missing.  |
| d | Business[[10]](#footnote-11)participation in water resources development, management and use at national level. | No communication between government and business about water resources development, management and use. | **Limited communication between government and business about water resources development, management and use.** | Regular consultation between government and business about water resources development, management and use. | Limited opportunities for private sector involvement established for water resources development, management and use activities. | Regular opportunities for private sector involvement established for water resources development, management and use activities. | Effective private sector involvement established for water resources development, management and use activities. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | PWMCs have communication with business sector; other responsible authorities have limited communication, mainly in cases when water acts are needed. But some good examples exists, such as the case of Užice City problem<http://www.graduzice.org/userfiles/files/Izvestaj%20instituta%20J%20Cerni.pdf> |
| e | Gender-specific objectives for water resources management at national level.[[11]](#footnote-12) | Gender not explicitly addressed throughout national laws, policy or plans. | **Gender partially addressed throughout national laws, policies or plans.** | Gender addressed in national plans but with limited budget and implementation. | Gender addressed in national plans, partially funded and objectives partly achieved. | Activities adequately funded and objectives mostly achieved.  | Objectives fully achieved and adequately address gender issues.  |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Not specified in our laws and regulations | National Strategy for Gender Equality for the period 2016-2020 with Action Plan for the period 2016-2020 is adopted in2016 (<http://www.mgsi.gov.rs/lat/dokumenti/nacionalna-strategija-za-rodnu-ravnopravnost-za-period-od-2016-do-2020-godine-sa-akcionim>). Gender issues related to water management are not specifically addressed in this strategic document. Also, water related strategic documents do not address this issue. |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| f | Developing IWRM capacity[[12]](#footnote-13)at the national level | No capacity development specific to water resources management.  | **Occasional capacity development, generally limited to** **short-term / ad-hoc activities.** | Some long-term capacity development initiatives are being implemented, but geographic and stakeholder coverage is limited. | Long-term capacity development initiatives are being implemented, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is adequate. | Long-term capacity development initiatives are being implemented, with effective outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is very good. | Long-term capacity development initiatives are being implemented with highly effective outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is excellent.  |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Generally, there is occasional development, mainly through projects. Activities on upgrading and developing the capacity for IWRM at the national level are missing, these activities usually take place through the transfer of knowledge by experts from EU countries in the framework of twinning projects, projects of cross-border and transnational cooperation. The ongoing project Further Implementation of Environmental Approximation Strategy have one component related to strengthening institutional capacities in all relevant institutions to implement Serbian environmental legislation harmonised with EU legislation at all levels of governance |
| 2.2 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at other levels? |
| a | Basin/aquifer level[[13]](#footnote-14)organizations[[14]](#footnote-15)for leading implementation of IWRM plans or similar. | No dedicated basin authorities for water resources management. | **Authorities exist, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.**  | Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan formulation. |  Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan implementation. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and evaluation of the IWRM plan. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan revision. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Division of responsibilities in water sector at provincial level follows the same pattern as on the state level. Responsibilities related to water sector are split among 5 secretariats (Provincial Secretariat for Agriculture, Water Management and Forestry- PSAWMF, Provincial Secretariat for Urban Planning and Environmental Protection -PSUPEP, Provincial Secretariat for Energy, Construction and Transport-PSECT, Provincial Secretariat for Regional Development, Interregional Cooperation and Local Self-government-PSRDICLSG, Provicial Secretariat for Health-PSH. Same as at the national level, PSAWMF has key responsibilities in water management and PSUPEP in water quality management (environmental monitoring and information system, EIA, SIA, IPPC, inspection control) in Vojvodina.  |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| b | Public participation[[15]](#footnote-16) in water resources, policy, planning and management at the local level[[16]](#footnote-17)  | No communication between local government and stakeholders on policy, planning and management. | **Communication:****Local level information on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to stakeholders.** | Consultation: Government authorities occasionally request local level information, experiences and opinions of stakeholders. | Consultation: Government authorities regularly request local level information, experiences and opinions of stakeholders. | Participation: Regular opportunities for stakeholders to take part in relevant local level policy, planning and management processes. | Representation: Formal representation of stakeholders on local authority processes contributing to decision-making on important local issues and activities, as appropriate. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Public participation on local level has been reduced to occasional requests for information, but there are some good examples, like the mechanism for the promotion of public participation through “Tips for protected goods", which since last year has become a legal obligation.<http://www.mis.org.rs/vss/pages/sr/ekoloski-programi/biodiverzitet/projekat-3za.php> )http://www.wwf.rs/?206557/WWF-i-predstavnici-medija-u-Specijalnom-rezervatu-prirode-Gornje-Podunavlje<http://d2ouvy59p0dg6k.cloudfront.net/downloads/obnova_vlaznih_stanista_na_podrucju_mure__drave_i_dunava___srb.pdf> |
| c | Gender-specific objectives at sub-national levels[[17]](#footnote-18) | **Gender not explicitly addressed throughout sub-national laws, policy or plans.** | Gender partially addressed in sub-national laws, policies or plans. | Gender addressed in sub-national plans but with limited budget and implementation. | Gender addressed in sub-national plans, partially funded and objectives partly achieved. | Activities adequately funded and objectives mostly achieved.  | Objectives fully achieved and adequately address sub-national gender issues.  |
| Score or n/a: | **10** | Not specified in our lows and regulations | Development Programme of AP Vojvodina 2014-2020 and Action Plan for Priority Realization of Development Programme 2014-2020 are adopted by the Assembly of AP Vojvodina in 2014. Gender issues are addressed in this document but are not specifically related to water management.  |
| d | Gender-specific objectives and plans at trans boundary level[[18]](#footnote-19) | **Gender not explicitly addressed in trans boundary policies or plans.** | Gender partially addressed in trans boundary policies or plans. | Gender addressed in trans boundary plans but with limited budget and implementation. | Gender addressed in trans boundary plans, partially funded and objectives partly achieved. | Activities adequately funded and objectives mostly achieved.  | Objectives fully achieved and adequately address trans boundary gender issues.  |
| Score or n/a: | **10** | Justification/evidence | Gender issues are not explicitly addressed, but there is no restrictions on cross-border agreements for gender equality |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| e | Organizational framework for trans boundary water management for most important basins / aquifers[[19]](#footnote-20) | No organizational framework(s). | Organizational framework(s) being developed. | Organizational framework(s) established. | **Organizational framework(s)’mandate is partly fulfilled.** | Organizational framework(s)’mandate is fulfilled for the most part. | Organizational framework(s)’mandate is fully fulfilled. |
| Score or n/a: | **60** | Justification/evidence | International Sava River Basin Commision (<http://www.savacommission.org>)International Commision for the Protection of the Danube River (<https://www.icpdr.org>)Bilateral Commisions with Romania and Hungary |
| f | FEDERAL COUNTRIES ONLY: Provincial / State authorities responsible for water resources management | No dedicated provincial/state authorities for water resources management. | Authorities exist, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.  | Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan formulation. |  Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan implementation. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and evaluation of the IWRM plan. | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan revision. |
| Score or n/a: | n/a |  |  |
| Average ‘Institutions and Participation’ score | **25** | In case of ‘n/a’ for any questions, they should be omitted from the average calculation. |

## Management Instruments

This section includes the tools that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions. It includes management programs, monitoring water resources and the pressures on them, knowledge sharing and capacity development.

**Terminology used in the questions:**

* **Limited, Adequate, Very good, Excellent:** Are terms used describe the status, coverage and effectiveness of the management instruments assessed in this section. Respondents should apply their own judgement based on the ‘best-practice’ descriptions of management instruments in the glossary, the section introduction, and through footnotes. For example, ‘adequate’ may imply that the basic minimum criteria for that particular management instrument are met. Respondents are encouraged to provide qualifying information to the question score in the ‘Justification’ cell immediately below each question.
* **Management instruments:** Can also be referred to as management tools and techniques, which include regulations, financial incentives, monitoring, plans/programs (e.g. for development, use and protection of water resources), as well as those specified in footnotes on questions and thresholds below.
* **Monitoring:** collecting, updating, and sharing timely, consistent and comparable water-related data and information, relevant for science and policy. Effective monitoring requires ongoing commitment and financing from government. Resources required include appropriate technical capacity such as laboratories, portable devices, online water use control and data acquisition systems. May include a combination of physical data collection, remote sensing, and modelling for filling data gaps.
* **Short-term / Long-term:** In the context of management instruments, short-term includes ad-hoc activities and projects, generally not implemented as part of an overarching program with long-term goals. Long-term refers to activities that are undertaken as part of an ongoing program that has more long-term goals/aims and implementation strategy.

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or n/a (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. You are strongly encouraged to provide the justification and references to evidence for the score in the grey cell to the right of the score. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information required are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation. If ‘Very high (100)’ or ‘n/a’ is selected, a justification should be provided.

|  |
| --- |
| 3. Management Instruments |
|  | Degree of implementation (0 – 100) |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| 3.1 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at the national level? |
| a | National monitoring of water availability[[20]](#footnote-21) (includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country). | No national monitoring systems in place. | Monitoring systems established for a limited number of short-term / ad-hoc projects or similar. | **Long-term national monitoring is carried out but with limited coverage and limited use by stakeholders.**  | Long-term national monitoring is carried out with adequate coverage but limited use by stakeholders. | Long-term national monitoring is carried out with very good coverage and adequate use by stakeholders. | Long-term national monitoring is carried out with excellent coverage and excellent use by stakeholders.  |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | Republic Hydrometheorological Service of Serbia and Serbian Environmental Protection Agency perform surface and ground water monitoring <http://www.sepa.gov.rs/download/KvalitetVoda2015.pdf><http://www.sepa.gov.rs/download/VodeSrbije/StatusPovrsinskihVodaSrbije.pdf><http://www.hidmet.gov.rs>Also, some monitoring has been implemented through projects (<http://www.rgf.bg.ac.rs>, “, <https://jaroslav-cerni.ls.rs/rs/>, http://gzs.gov.rs)<http://www.batut.org.rs/download/izvestaji/Izvestaj%20povrsinskih%20voda%202016.pdf>Since 2003, Provincial Secretariat for urban planning and environmental protection (PSUZŽS) carries out monitoring of surface and ground water on the territory of AP Vojvodina, as a complement to the National water quality monitoring.[www.ekourb.vojvodina.gov.rs/monitoring-i-informacioni-sistem-životne-sredine/monitoring-površinskih-i-podzemnih-voda](http://www.ekourb.vojvodina.gov.rs/monitoring-i-informacioni-sistem-%C5%BEivotne-sredine/monitoring-povr%C5%A1inskih-i-podzemnih-voda) |
| b | Sustainable and efficient water use management[[21]](#footnote-22)from the national level,(includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country). | No management instruments being implemented. | **Use of management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects or similar.**  | Some management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited coverage across different water users and the country.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with adequate coverage across different water users and the country.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with very good coverage across different water users and the country, and are effective.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with excellent coverage across different water users and the country, and are highly effective.  |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Use of instruments for efficient water management is limited to individual projects.Instruments and mechanisms are not defined by legislation. |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| c | Pollution control[[22]](#footnote-23)from the national level | No management instruments being implemented. | Use of management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects or similar.  | **Some management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited coverage across sectors and the country.**  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with adequate coverage across sectors and the country.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with very good coverage across sectors and the country, and are effective.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with excellent coverage across sectors and the country, and are highly effective.  |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | Pollution control is done through inspection control, within the Ministry of Agriculture and Environmental Protection.[http://www.eko.minpolj.gov.rs/organizacija/sektori/sektor-inspekcije-za-zastitu-zivotne-sredine/odeljenje-za-sprecavanje-i-kontrolu-zagađivanja-zivotne-srdine](http://www.eko.minpolj.gov.rs/organizacija/sektori/sektor-inspekcije-za-zastitu-zivotne-sredine/odeljenje-za-sprecavanje-i-kontrolu-zaga%C4%91ivanja-zivotne-srdine)Some instruments are implemented through projects ( <http://www.sepa.gov.rs/>, <http://www.mpzzs.gov.rs/>, <http://www.pzzp.rs/rs/sr/>, <http://www-zzps-rs>) |
| d | Management of water-related ecosystems[[23]](#footnote-24)from the national level | No management instruments being implemented. | Use of management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects or similar.  | Some management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited coverage across different ecosystem types and the country.  | **Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with adequate coverage across different ecosystem types and the country. Environmental Water Requirements (EWR) analysed in some cases.** | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with very good coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are effective. EWR analysed for most of country.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with excellent coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are highly effective. EWR analysed for whole country. |
|  | Score or n/a: | **60** | Justification/evidence | <http://www.sepa.gov.rs/><http://www.mpzzs.gov.rs/><http://www.pzzp.rs/rs/sr/>http://www.vojvodinasume.rs/zastita-zivotne-sredine/http://www.srbijasume.rs/pdf/ZPD.pdfhttp://www.srbijasume.rs/zastprirdob.html<http://www.zzps.rs/novo/index.php?jezik=&strana=izvestaj><http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/dokumenta/podzak/Pravilnik%20o%20kriterijumima%20za%20zasticene%20oblasti.pdf> |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| e | Management instruments to reduce impacts of water-related disasters[[24]](#footnote-25)from the national level | No management instruments being implemented. | Use of management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects or similar.  | **Some management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited coverage of at-risk areas.**  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with adequate coverage of at-risk areas. | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with very good coverage of at-risk areas, and are effective.  | Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with excellent coverage of at-risk areas, and are highly effective.  |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | General plan and Operational plans for flood protection exists and they are implemented, Flood risk management plans are drafted, but still not adopted <http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/lat/uredjenje-vodotoka.php>The methodology for the development of Plans for the defense of the torrential flooding on streams where there are no facilities for protection against harmful effects of water <http://data.sfb.bg.ac.rs/sftp/prostorno.uredjenje/ZAKONI%20I%2AKTI/Metodologija%20za%20odbranu%20od%20bujicnih%20poplava.pdf>Some management tools for reducing the impact of disasters related to water are carried out, but with limited coverage of high-risk areas (<http://www.mpzzs.gov.rs/>, <http://www.hidmet.gov.rs/>). Preparation of register and description of landslides is ongoing activity (<http://gzs.gov.rs/> , <http://www.rgf.bg.ac.rs/>)Floods Emergency and Recovery Project – Environmental and Social Management Framework, 2017 (http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/20170312 FINAL ESMF SERBIA FERP, 115p.pdf)Floods Emergency and Recovery Project – Resettlement Policy Framework, 2017 (http://www.rdvode.gov.rs/doc/20170223 FINAL RPF SERBIA FERP, 45p.pdf) |
| 3.2 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at other levels? |
| a | Basin management instruments.[[25]](#footnote-26) | No basin level management instruments being implemented.  | **Use of basin level management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects.** | Some basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited geographic and stakeholder coverage.  | Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with adequate geographic and stakeholder coverage.  | Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with effective outcomes and very good geographic and stakeholder coverage. | Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with highly effective outcomes and excellent geographic and stakeholder coverage.  |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | RBM instruments were used in the context of an ad hoc short-term projects: River Basin Management Plan Kolubara, River Basin Management Plan Nadela, Basin management of Palic and Ludos Lake, Memorandum of Understanding on cooperation in the implementation of project management in the Drina River Basin in the Western Balkans |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| b | Aquifer management instruments.[[26]](#footnote-27) | No aquifer level management instruments being implemented.  | **Use of aquifer level management instruments is limited and only through short-term / ad-hoc projects.** | Some aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, but with limited geographic and stakeholder coverage.  | Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with adequate geographic and stakeholder coverage.  | Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with effective outcomes and very good geographic and stakeholder coverage. | Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with highly effective outcomes and excellent geographic and stakeholder coverage.  |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Management instruments issued used ad hoc in the context of short-term projects (JOINTISZA , TAIEX) |
| c | Data and information sharing within countries at all levels[[27]](#footnote-28) | No data and information sharing. | **Limited data and information sharing on an ad-hoc basis.**  | Data and information sharing arrangements exist on a more long-term basis between major data providers and users. | Data and information sharing arrangements implemented on a more long-term basis, with adequate coverage across sectors and the country. | Data and information sharing arrangements implemented on a more long-term basis, with very good coverage across sectors and the country. | All relevant data and information are online and freely accessible to all. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Serbian regulations do not obligate different institutions to exchange information and reports. Some institutions, such as SEPA, publish their reports via their web-site. The information exchange is mostly limited to personal collaboration and connections. |
| d | Trans boundary data and information sharing between countries | No data and information sharing. | Limited data and information sharing on an ad-hoc or informal basis.  | Data and information sharing arrangements exist, but sharing is limited. | **Data and information sharing arrangements implemented adequately.**  | Data and information sharing arrangements implemented effectively.[[28]](#footnote-29) | All relevant data and information are online and accessible between countries. |
|  | Score or n/a: | **70** | Justification/evidence | Data exchange is required under ratified agreements and procedures are defined by different rules and protocols for the individual areas  |
| Average ‘Management Instruments’ score | **37** | In case of ‘n/a’ for any questions, they should be omitted from the average calculation. |

## Financing

This section concerns the adequacy of the finance available for water resources development and management from various sources.

Finance for investment and recurrent costs can come from many sources, the most common being central government budget allocations to relevant ministries and other authorities. Finance from Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) specifically for water resources should be considered part of the government budget. Note that the level of coordination between ODA and national budgets is tracked by the ‘means of implementation’ indicator 6.a.1: “Amount of water- and sanitation-related official development assistance that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan”, as part of reporting on Target 6.a: “By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-building support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies”.

“Other sources” include fees and tariffs levied on water users, polluter fees or grants from philanthropic or similar organisations. In kind support should not be included as it is not easily measurable but can be mentioned in the ‘Justification/evidence’ section.

Investments should cover all aspects of water resources development and management but exclude any related to drinking water supply and sanitation services as they are covered in other monitoring processes.

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or n/a (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. You are strongly encouraged to provide the justification and references to evidence for the score in the grey cell to the right of the score. This will help achieveagreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information required are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation. If ‘Very high (100)’ or ‘n/a’ is selected, a justification should be provided.

|  |
| --- |
| 4.Financing |
|  | Degree of implementation (0 – 100) |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| 4.1 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at the national level? |
| a | National budget[[29]](#footnote-30) for investment including water resources infrastructure[[30]](#footnote-31). | No budget allocated in national investment plans. | **Budget allocated but only partly covers planned investments.** | Sufficient budget allocated for planned investments but insufficient funds disbursed or made available. | Sufficient budget allocated and funds disbursed for all planned programmes or projects. | Funding available and all planned projects under implementation. | Planned programs completed, post-evaluation carried out and new funding cycle for programs underway. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | There are no advanced infrastructure development and coordination of water resources management and infrastructure development, so further efforts are needed to ensure appropriate levels of development and coordination.More effort is needed to increase levels of financing for water resources management and to raise revenues from water resource and ecosystem services. Appropriate recording of financing for water resources development and management is needed in reporting mechanisms. |
| b | National budget for the recurrent costs of the IWRM elements[[31]](#footnote-32) | No budget allocations made for recurrent costs of the IWRM elements.  | **Allocations made for only a few of the elements and implementation at an early stage.** | Allocations made for at least half of the elements but insufficient for others. | Allocations for most of the elements and some implementation under way. | Allocations include all elements and implementation regularly carried out. | Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach fully utilised. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Implementation of IWRM elements is in direct connection and dependence on water policy. It is expected that the issue of policy development, legislation and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity building and management tools (research studies), test environment and gender equality, data collection and monitoring, will be established in the new Water Law, respecting IWRM elements as defined in the footnote 29  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| 4.2What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at other levels? |
| a | Sub-national or basin budgets for investment including water resources infrastructure. | No budget allocated In sub-national or basin investment plans. | **Budget allocated but only partly covers planned investments.** | Sufficient budget allocated for planned investments but insufficient funds disbursed or made available. | Sufficient budget allocated and funds disbursed for all planned programmes or projects. | Funding available and all planned projects under implementation. | Budget fully utilised, programmes completed as planned and post evaluation carried out. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Budget fund for water of AP Vojvodina has been established for recording special funds intended for the financing of activities of general interest that are financed in accordance with the Water Act. The assets of this budget fund are used for financing the activities of general interest on the territory of AP Vojvodina in accordance with the annual program.  |
| b | Revenues raised from dedicated levies on water users at basin, aquifer or sub-national levels.[[32]](#footnote-33) | No revenues raised at the sub-national level. | **Processes in place to raise local revenue but not yet implemented.** | Limited revenues raised from charges, but are not used for IWRM activities. | Limited revenues raised from charges cover some IWRM activities. | Revenues raised from charges cover most IWRM activities. | Local authorities raise funds from multiple sources and fully cover costs of IWRM activities. |
| Score or n/a: | **20** | Justification/evidence | Revenues from special duties defined in the Water Lawt are not fully regulated, nor are implemented in practice. The sources of funds have not been fully defined, as well as the administrative procedures that have not been implemented. |
| c | Financing for trans boundary[[33]](#footnote-34) cooperation[[34]](#footnote-35) | No specific funding allocated from the MS budgets nor from other regular sources. | MS agreement on country share of contributions in place and in-kind support for the cooperation organisation / arrangement.  | **Funding less than 50% of that expected as contributions and by regulation.** | Funding less than 75% of that expected as contributions and by regulation. | Funding more than 75% of that expected as contributions and by regulation. | Full funding of that expected as contributions and by regulation. |
| Score or n/a: | **40** | Justification/evidence | The amounts of funds are defined by the Program of water management for the current year issued by the competent Ministry. A few years ago means are provided at the level of 50% of the real necessary. |
| Average ‘Financing’ score | **24** | In case of ‘n/a’ for any questions, they should be omitted from the average calculation. |

1. This is being done as part of the GEMI initiative, coordinated by UN-Water, for monitoring and reporting of SDG targets 6.3 - 6.6, 6a and 6b. Support is provided in close collaboration with a number of UN-Water members and partners. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For examples of good practices of policies, laws and plans, please see: GWP (Editor) (2004): Catalyzing Change: A handbook for developing IWRM and water efficiency strategies. Stockholm: Global Water Partnership (GWP). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, counties, regions, or departments. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or other reasons. This question only refers to these basins/aquifers. These basins/aquifers are likely to cross administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 1.2c refers specifically to trans boundary arrangements for basins/aquifers shared by countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. An arrangement can be a bilateral or multilateral treaty, convention, agreement or other arrangement (e.g. memorandum of understanding) between riparian countries on the management of a trans boundary basin/aquifer. Refers to international basins/aquifers only. Arrangements may be interstate, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial, interagency or between regional authorities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. ‘Government authorities’ could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. ‘Capacity for leading implementation’ in this context is that the responsible authorities should be adapted to the complexity of water challenges to be met and have the required knowledge and technical skills, including planning, rule-making, project management, finance, budgeting, data collection and monitoring, risk management and evaluation. Beyond having the capacity to lead implementation of the activities listed in the thresholds, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Relates to coordination between the government authorities responsible for water management and those responsible for other sectors (such as agriculture, energy, climate, environment etc.) that are dependent on water, or impact on water. Coordination between groundwater and surface water development/management should also be optimised. The relevant sectors should be considered according to their importance for the country. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. Stakeholderincludes all interested parties who are, or may be, affected by any water resources issue or intervention. It includes organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. Businessincludes private for-profit groups. It does not include government or civil society. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. Gender-specific objectives at national level can include: 1) Presence of designated ministerial responsibility for gender in relation to water policies. Presence of designated ministerial responsibility for water in the gender-equality ministry or related designated agency for gender; 2) Gender Parity of male and female participants in meetings of national decision-making authorities (counting the number of women and men participating in meetings); and 3) The presence of gender-specific objectives and commitments (or gender strategies) in national strategies, national plans and national laws regarding national water policy.
Source: adapted from WWAP 2015 “Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data” <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002345/234514E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. IWRM capacity development: refers to the enhancement of skills, instruments, resources and incentives for people and institutions at all levels, to improve IWRM implementation. Capacity needs assessments are essential for effective and cost-effective capacity development. Capacity development programs should consider gender balance and disadvantaged/minority groups in terms of participation and awareness. Capacity development is relevant for many groups, including: local and central government, water professionals in all areas - both public and private water organisations, civil society, and in regulatory organisations. In this instance, capacity development may also include primary, secondary and tertiary education, and academic research concerning IWRM. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or for other reasons. This question only refers to these basins/aquifers. These basins/aquifers likely cross-administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 2.2e refers specifically to trans boundary management of basins/aquifers shared by countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
14. Could be organization, committee, inter-ministerial mechanism or other means of collaboration for managing water resources at the basin level. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Stakeholder includes all interested parties who are, or may be, affected by any water resources issue or intervention. It includes organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Examples of ‘local level’ include municipal level (e.g. cities, towns and villages), community level, basin/tributary/aquifer/delta level, and water user associations. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Gender-specific objectives at sub-national level can include: 1) Proportion of seats held by male and female in local water authorities’ executive boards; 2) Gender Parity of M/F participation in meetings of sub-national decision-making authorities (counting the number of women and men participating in meetings); 3) The presence of gender strategy in local plans and local implementation policies. Source: adapted from WWAP 2015 “Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data”
<http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002345/234514E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. Gender-specific objectives at the transboundary level: 1) Presence of a specific gender strategy in transboundary agreements, in other transboundary arrangements, in their implementation plans and in all transboundary water impact assessments; 2) Gender Parity of male and female participants in meetings of transboundary decision-making authorities (counting the number of women and men participating in meetings.Source: adapted from WWAP 2015 “Questionnaire for collecting sex-disaggregated water data” <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0023/002345/234514E.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
19. An organizational framework can include the existence of a joint body, joint mechanism or commission for transboundary cooperation.Refers to international basins/aquifers only. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. See definition of monitoring in Terminology. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. Management instruments include demand management measures (e.g. technical measures, financial incentives, education and awareness raising to reduce water use and/or improve water-use efficiency, conservation, recycling and re-use), monitoring water use (including the ability to disaggregate by sector), mechanisms for allocating water between sectors (including environmental considerations). [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. Includes regulations, water quality guidelines, economic tools (e.g. taxes and fees), water quality trading programs, water quality monitoring, education, consideration of point and non-point (e.g. agricultural) pollution sources, construction and operation of wastewater treatment plants, watershed management. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. Water-related ecosystems include rivers, lakes and aquifers, as well as wetlands, forests and mountains. Management of these systems includes tools such as management plans, the assessment of Environmental Water Requirements (EWR), and protection of areas and species. Monitoring includes measuring the extent and quality of the ecosystems over time. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
24. **Management instruments** can cover: understanding disaster risk; strengthening disaster risk governance; investing in disaster risk reduction; and enhancing disaster preparedness. **Impacts** include social impacts (such as deaths, missing persons, and number of people affected) and economic impacts (such as economic losses in relation to GDP). **Water-related disasters** include disasters that can be classified under the following: Hydrological (flood, landslide, wave action); Meteorological (convective storm, extra tropical storm, extreme temperature, fog, tropical cyclone); and Climatological (drought, glacial lake outburst, wildfire). [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Basin and aquifer management: involves managing water at the appropriate hydrological scale, using the surface water basin or aquifer as the unit of management. This may involve basin and aquifer development, use and protection plans. It should also promote multi-level cooperation, and address potential conflict, among users, stakeholders and levels of government for the management of water resources. To achieve ‘Very high (100)’ basin and aquifer management scores, surface and groundwater management must be integrated. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. See previous footnote on basin management instruments, which also applies to aquifers. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. Includes more formal data and information sharing arrangements between users, as well as accessibility for the general public, where appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. E.g. institutional and technical mechanisms in place that allow for exchanging data as agreed upon in agreements between riparians (e.g. regional database or information exchange platform with a river basin organization including technical requirements for data submission, institutionalized mechanisms for QA and for analysing the data, etc.). [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Allocations of funding for water resources may be included in several budget categories or in different investment documents. Respondents are thus encouraged to examine different sources for this information. When assessing the allocations respondents should take account of funds from government budgets and any co-funding (loans or grants) from other sources such as banks or donors. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. Infrastructure includes ‘hard’ structures such as dams, canals, pumping stations, flood control, treatment works etc as well as soft infrastructure and environmental measures such as catchment management, sustainable drainage systems etc. For this survey do not include infrastructure for drinking water supply or sanitation services. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. ‘IWRM elements’ refers to all the activities described in sections 1, 2 and 3 of this survey that require funding, e.g. policy, law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity building, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. For example, abstraction & bulk water charges, environmental fees such as pollution charges, Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes, and the sale of secondary products and services, significant contributors. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. Trans boundary includes surface and groundwater basins that cross one or more national borders. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. In this question “Member States (MS)” refers to riparian countries that are parties to the arrangement. “Contributions” refers to the annual share of funds agreed from MS national budgets to support the agreed TB cooperation arrangement. Regular funds obtained from for example, water user fees (e.g. hydropower charges) and polluter-pays fees on the basis of existing regulation are also taken into account as sustainable funding. As variable and unsustainable, donor support is not considered. . [↑](#footnote-ref-35)