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Main feedback received from countries

• **Robustness** of the questionnaire and of the process
  • Good opportunity to support **national coordination**, cooperation and data sharing among national institutions, institutions but statistical offices were rarely involved
  • Assess the **strengths and weaknesses** of the existing national framework for transboundary waters, review agreements and arrangements
  • Potential to also engage with **civil society**
  • Good opportunity to discuss cooperation with **neighbours**

• **Length of questionnaire**
  • "Took longer than expected but was worth it."
  • Make use of the information collected in future reporting exercises
  • Avoid overlap and simplify questions
  • More opportunities to explain answers should be added
Countries perspectives

• “really well prepared and due to the high number of replies also a considerable success”;

• “a beneficial mechanism to evaluate effectiveness of provisions tackling the issues raised on protection and management of transboundary waters”

• “Reporting fostered cooperation within departments in the ministries”. 
Countries perspectives

• “good opportunity to review all existing agreements”

• “we have realized that what is written in the agreement does not need to be reflected in reality. As our bilateral agreements are very old and long lasting, the cooperation with our neighboring countries went much further than what is set in the agreement, much more issues are discussed as it is very easy to establish ad hoc working group than to change the agreement. Involvement of public is raising but that is not reflected in the agreements.”
Making the most of reporting on SDG6.5.2

National level

Preparing the report with a consultative approach helps raising attention and support on the topic and can be used to

• Communicate internally and to populations => possibility to develop “fact sheets" and develop political messages

• Influence policies and funding plans (voluntary national reviews, national development plans, funding strategies with donors, speeches on budget)
Making the most of reporting on SDG6.5.2

Transboundary level

Consultation on relations with riparians helps developing a **common understanding of challenges and opportunities** that can become a basis for discussion for next steps.

Use reports (especially Section II of the report) in:

⇒ Formal or informal discussions with riparians
⇒ Discussions with joint bodies, if existing
Making the most of reporting on SDG6.5.2

Regional and global levels
Reports can feed into political dialogue at regional and global level

• Regional organizations can use them in their technical and political reports and forums
Monitoring and review: global scale

**2030 Agenda**
"Follow-up and review processes at all levels... will be voluntary and country-led... the outcome from national-level processes will be the foundation for reviews at the regional and global levels......review will be primarily based on national official data sources”

- Annual global review at the High-Level Policy Forum (HLPF)
- Reviews means of implementation and global partnership
- Voluntary National Reviews

- **SDGs reports**
  - data on global indicators, by major regions; annual data requests
  - Annual reports of the Secretary-General on all SDGs
  - Periodic Synthesis Reports on SDG6 by UN-Water
  - Periodic reports from the custodian agencies on the different indicators

- **2020 VNRs**: Morocco, Syrian Arab Republic
Results of the 1st reporting under the Water Convention on monitoring & assessment & information exchange

• **Data & information exchange among Parties**
  - 84% of the responses confirmed data and info exchanged with riparian
  - Data and info exchange in nearly all reported transboundary waters
  - although at least 7 river and lake basins not at basin level
  - shared database or platform is only present in the minority of cases – 24%

• **Monitoring & assessment among Parties**
  - 68% of the responses confirmed joint monitoring takes place
  - although joint monitoring and assessment is reported not to take place in at least 32 river and lake basins
  - Only 35% have joint methodology

⇒ Data exchange and monitoring and assessment are long term challenges also for Parties

**Subjects on which information and data are exchanged** (Art. 13) – based on all responses to section II, question 6(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental conditions</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research activities and application of...</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emission monitoring data</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned measures taken to prevent,...</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point source pollution sources</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffuse pollution sources</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing hydromorphological alterations</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharges</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water abstractions</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future planned measures with...</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other subjects</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**If joint monitoring is carried out, how is this done?** (Art. 11(1)) – based on all responses to section II, question 7(b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National monitoring stations...</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint and agreed methodologies</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint sampling</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common monitoring networks</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common agreed parameters</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of the first reporting on SDG6.5.2
Main difficulties identified in data exchange

Regional nuances

- **Africa**: lack of technical infrastructure and capacity & consequently, harmonization and data quality. Monitoring stations lacking or insufficient, personnel and internet connection. Lack of trust among riparians, political instability.

- **Europe**: harmonization and data availability: different standards (methodology, frequency, format); governance issues on a national level, affecting transboundary cooperation. Lack of real-time data exchange (on water quality, discharges)

- **Americas**: lack of public access to information, lack of technical infrastructure

- **Asia**: lack of cooperation and trust among countries
Questions for consideration

• What are the benefits of the reporting process at national level and how might those benefits be maximized?

• Even if reporting is done at national level, how can it be used at transboundary level (basin or sub-basin)?

• How can the outcomes of the reporting exercise best be used at the regional and global levels?

• Identification of 1-2 priority actions for possible improvements
Thanks for listening!

Contacts
transboundary_water_cooperation_reporting@un.org
transboundary_water_cooperation_reporting@unesco.org

Further information
UNECE: www.unep.org/water/transboundary_water_cooperation_reporting.html
UNESCO: https://en.unesco.org/themes/water-security/hydrology

UN-WATER SDG6 monitoring: www.sdg6monitoring.org/indicator-652
UN-WATER SDG6 data portal: www.sdg6data.org/indicator/6.5.2