Country Survey Instrument for SDG Indicator 6.5.1

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| **Country** | **BAHAMAS** |
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| Are you the national Focal Point for any other SDG indicator (apart from 6.5.1)? **If yes, please insert ‘X’ for all that apply:** \_\_6.1.1 \_\_6.2.1 \_\_6.3.1 \_\_6.3.2 \_\_6.4.1 \_\_6.4.2 \_\_6.5.2 \_\_6.6.1 \_\_6.a.1 \_\_6.b.1 \_\_Other SDG indicator(s) (please specify here): | |
| **SDG 6.5.1 in-country data collection and reporting process overview** *(Please provide further details on the consultation process in Annex E)* | |
| Were other institutions/stakeholders involved and consulted in the reporting process for this indicator? \_X\_Yes \_\_No | |
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## Part 1 – Introduction

This is the official survey instrument for country reporting on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 6.5.1: “Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0 – 100)”. The indicator measures progress towards target 6.5: “By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate”. The target supports the equitable and efficient use of water resources, which is essential for social and economic development, as well as environmental sustainability. The actions to achieve target 6.5 directly underpin the other water-related targets within SDG-6: “Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all”. Further guidance on completing this survey instrument is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 [monitoring guide](http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/). Both this survey instrument and the monitoring guide are available from UN Environment in six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and Portuguese through the Help Desk by emailing [iwrmsdg651@un.org](mailto:iwrmsdg651@un.org).

### About the indicator:

Indicator 6.5.1 represents the degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation, on a scale of 0 – 100. It is calculated based on scores from approximately 30 questions covering different aspects of IWRM.

### About the survey instrument

The primary purpose of the survey instrument is global monitoring and reporting on indicator 6.5.1. It has been designed to also be useful as a simple diagnostic tool for countries to identify strengths and weaknesses of different aspects of IWRM implementation. It measures implementation in incremental steps, which allows countries to identify barriers and enablers to furthering IWRM. The completed survey instrument can be used as an input to planning and working towards target 6.5.

The survey contains four sections, each covering a key dimension of IWRM (see definition in Annex A: Glossary):

**1. Enabling environment:** Policies, laws and plans to support IWRM implementation.

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

**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 (apart from drinking water supply and sanitation) from various sources.

Each section has two sub-sections covering the “National” and “Other” levels, to address the target 6.5 wording “… at all levels.” “Other” levels include sub-national, basin, local and transboundary (see Annex A - Glossary). Questions relate to these levels depending on their relevance to the particular aspect of IWRM. For most “other level” questions, the score should reflect the situation in most of the basins/aquifers/jurisdictions, unless specified otherwise. For the transboundary level questions, the score should reflect the situation in most of the ‘most important’ transboundary basins / aquifers, which should be listed in the table in Annex B. Filling out that table: increases the transparency of the transboundary questions; makes the information more useful for dialogue with neighbouring countries; and enhances coordination with [SDG indicator 6.5.2](http://www.sdg6monitoring.org/indicators/target-65/indicators652/) on arrangements for transboundary cooperation. It is recognised that water resources management in federal countries may be more complex due to responsibilities at different administrative levels. You may further explain any specific circumstances relating to the level of decentralization of water resources management and responsibility in your country (e.g. federal countries and other large countries) in Annex C.

### How to complete the survey

**Scoring:** 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)’. It is not possible to omit questions. 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.

The thresholds for each question are defined sequentially. This means that the criteria for all lower levels of implementation must be met in order for a country to respond that it has reached a specific level of implementation for each question. Furthermore, if an aspect of IWRM is specified in a lower threshold, it is implicit that this aspect is also addressed in the higher thresholds for that question. **Bold** text in the thresholds helps the reader differentiate between thresholds.

**The thresholds are indicative and are meant to guide countries in choosing the most appropriate responses, i.e. selected responses should be a reasonable match, but do not have to be a perfect match, as each country is unique**.

Instructions on how to calculate the overall indicator 6.5.1 score are provided in section 5.

**Narrative responses:** for each question, there are two free-text fields: “Status description” and “Way forward”. General guidance on the type of information that countries may find useful to include in each field is as follows:

**Status description:** e.g. refer to relevant activities/initiatives/laws/policies/plans/strategies or similar; comment on the degree of implementation as it relates to the threshold descriptions; barriers/enablers; and reflect on progress since the first round of reporting on SDG indicator 6.5.1 (baseline in 2017/18). Where possible, provide a brief explanation of why the score is different to the baseline. If reporting was not submitted for the SDG baseline, reflect on recent rates of implementation of relevant activities.

**Way forward:** e.g. already planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of that aspect of IWRM, including identifying barriers and enablers. Include draft interim target-setting for each question where appropriate (e.g. consider actions or recommendations for making progress). Any actions or recommendations provided in this field are neither binding nor comprehensive, but may be used as inputs to country planning processes.

Specific additional guidance is provided in each field for each question. Experience from baseline reporting shows that the free-text responses to each question are important, as they: increase the robustness, transparency and objectivity of the indicator scores; facilitate stakeholder consensus on each question score; help countries track progress between reporting periods; and help countries to analyse what is required to reach the next threshold.

In each field, enter the narrative response by replacing “xxx”. It is recommended that the guidance text is left in the free-text fields during the data collection process, but that this guidance text is deleted before final submission.

### Progress and differences since baseline reporting

172 countries established a baseline for indicator 6.5.1 in 2017/18. This is the second round of data collection. Where available, countries should refer to the baseline survey responses, available here: <http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/>. Countries are encouraged to consider progress, or lack of progress, since the baseline, in the ‘Status description’ fields, and give reasoning for differences in scores.

The current survey version is highly comparable, though not completely identical, to the baseline survey. Some minor amendments have been made following a review process, and noteworthy changes to the baseline are described in footnotes for relevant questions. A summary of changes is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 [monitoring guide](http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/).

### Data collection and submission

A broad stakeholder engagement process is encouraged to complete the survey instrument. This helps to increase stakeholder participation and ownership of water management and decision-making processes, and makes the completed survey instrument a more robust and useful diagnostic tool for further discussions and planning. Country Focal Points are asked to fill in the Reporting Process Form in Annex E to increase transparency and increase stakeholder confidence in the results at all levels. The extent and mode of stakeholder engagement is up to each country, and further guidance is provided in the monitoring guide. Coordination with Focal Points for other SDG indicators is encouraged where feasible and relevant.[[1]](#footnote-2)

The national IWRM Focal Point is responsible for the Quality Assurance and formal submission of the completed survey instrument to UN Environment. The survey instrument should be emailed to the IWRM Help Desk at UN Environment: [iwrmsdg651@un.org](mailto:iwrmsdg651@un.org).

Upon request, the Help Desk will provide support to the national IWRM focal points on matters such as interpretation of questions and thresholds, the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement in countries, and support to submitting the final indicator scores.

# Part 2 – The survey

# 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. Enter free text in the “Status description” and “Way forward” fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. 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 that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 | 40 |
| **Status description**: Critical policy framework exists, but has not been implemented. In 2007, the state water corporation, Water & Sewerage Corporation (WSC) commissioned the creation of an IWRM Plan, which included policy recommendations and objectives for advancing IWRM implementation. However, due to poor coordination and participation, The Bahamas is not succeeding in implementing this effort. Most of the decision-making lies within a single sector and WSC does not have the human or financial capital to move the initiative forward. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** With the creation of the Department of Environmental Planning & Protection (DEPP), water resource management is supposed to centralized. Presently, responsibility for water resource management is spread across a wide variety of government entities including, but not limited to, WSC, Department of Environmental Health Services (DEHS), and the Ministry of Public Works. Public education is also needed to increase transparency and accountability. | | | | | | | |
| **b.** National water resources **law(s)**. | | Development **not started** or not progressing**.** | **Exists**, but not based on IWRM. | Based on IWRM, **approved** by governmentand starting to be applied by authorities. | **Being applied** by the majority of relevant authorities**.** | Alllaws are being **applied** across the country. | Alllaws are **enforced** across the country, andall people and organizations are held accountable. |
| Score | 40 |
| **Status description:** The recently enacted Environmental Planning & Protection Bill (2019) prioritizes “the integrated protection of the environment of The Bahamas” and “the sustainable management of [The Bahamas’] natural resources,” including surface waters, wetlands and groundwater (s. 6.1-2; p. 11). However, coordinated development and management between all the different stakeholders requires additional, detailed strategic planning and oversight. Very important details on how the laws are to be implemented and enforced are not defined.  Water and sanitation are guided by the following: Water Supplies (Out Islands) Act (1953); Out Islands Utilities Act (1965); WSC Act (1976); Environmental Health Services Act (1987); Ministry of Public Works & Utilities; Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries & Local Government; Public Utilities Commission Act (1993); Environment, Planning & Protection Act (2019). | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** In addition to clearly defining IWRM in legislation, Bahamian lawmakers can also strengthen the legislative functions of the Department of Environmental Planning & Protection (DEPP) for water resources management. Stronger implementation of policies and regulations regarding water pollution (especially in the cruise industry) are also recommended. Lawmakers should also initiate the creation of a water resources life cycle management plan whereby stakeholders (public and private) have shared input and accountability values. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | 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** ornot 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 | 50 |
| **Status description:** The IWRM Plan was completed in 2007 and is generally being applied. Enforcement of the legal aspects relative to water is fragmented between agencies. No specific groundwater legislation has been enacted to date; there is reliance on the Forestry Act, which enables creation of Forestry Reserves, for the protection of the primary water resource areas. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** A more detailed national action plan with assigned multi-year funding for implementation is required. This must be accompanied with accountability and transparency. | | | | | | | | |
| **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 relevantauthorities to guide work. | Policy objectives consistently **achieved** by a majority of authorities. | Objectives consistently achieved by all authorities, and periodically **reviewed** and revised. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** The Out-Islands Water Supplies Act details provisions for water supply by means of stand pipes and taps in public spaces on Family Islands. While the 2007 IWRM Plan speaks to some subnational policy issues (e.g. wetland restoration, agricultural water supply, and wastewater management), the Plan is focused in New Providence, where the majority of the water demand is. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Strengthen IWRM implementation at the subnational level. Also, since fresh water is an increasingly scarce resource, it is recommended to encourage installation of rainwater catchment systems not only in Family Islands, but in the capital as well. Rainwater systems can reduce dependence on well water in some locations. Contamination of aquifers threaten the quality of well water. | | | | | | | |
| **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. | **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 | 30 |
| **Status description:** Because The Bahamas does not have any major surface water bodies, the concept of “basin” plans is not applicable and this response mainly considers groundwater aquifers on individual islands. There is currently no approved groundwater management plan; however, the nation’s major groundwater reserves are protected indirectly by the Forestry Act. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** The Bahamas continues to conduct detailed groundwater surveys to establish sound management plans to mitigate against identified risks. However, additional stakeholder participation is needed, as The Bahamas is an archipelagic nation. Concerns, while very common, can be specific for each island. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **c**. **Arrangements for transboundary water management.**[[5]](#footnote-6) | | Development **not started** or not progressing. | **Being prepared** or negotiated. | Arrangementsare **adopted**. | Arrangements’provisions are **partly** **implemented**. | Arrangements’provisions are **mostly** **implemented**. | The arrangements’ provisions are **fully implemented**. |
| Score | N/A |
| **Status description:** The Bahamas is an island nation with no transboundary freshwater. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** N/A | | | | | | | |
| **d.** **Sub-national** water resources **regulations**[[6]](#footnote-7)(laws, decrees, ordinances or similar).[[7]](#footnote-8) | | Development **not started** or delayedin most sub-national jurisdictions. | **Exist** in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM**.** | Based on IWRM, **approved** in most jurisdictions and starting to be applied by authorities in some jurisdictions. | **Some** regulations **being applied** in the majority of jurisdictions. | **All** regulations **being** **applied** in the majority of jurisdictions. | All regulations being applied and **enforced** in all jurisdictions, and all people and organizations are held accountable. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** There is some legislation (i.e. Water Supplies Out Island) that addresses regional regulations; albeit much more transactional improvements are required. Because all organisations with regulatory power are headquartered on New Providence, monitoring and enforcement of national legislation on the Out Islands (or “Family Islands”) often falls on NGOs and civil society. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** With the recent creation of DEPP, there is an opportunity to enforce water regulations with the newly created environmental officer positions. | | | | | | | |

# Institutions and participation

This section is about the range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions that support the implementation of 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 private sector.

The burdens of water-related work carried out predominantly by women have been acknowledged for decades,[[8]](#footnote-9) which has led to a focus on women’s practical needs around water, especially in relation to carrying water and managing it within the home. In the context of water resources management, there has been growing recognition that, a strategic and practical focus on increasing women’s voice and influence, at all levels of decision-making, must become a priority. Furthermore, mainstreaming gender in the water sector supports a range of targets in the SDGs, including under Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls.[[9]](#footnote-10) Including a gender-related question in this survey (q.2.2d) also addresses the call for gender disaggregated data in the 2030 Agenda.[[10]](#footnote-11)

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

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or “n/a” (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the “Status description” and “Way forward” fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. 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 that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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**[[11]](#footnote-12) for leading IWRM implementation. | | **No** dedicated government authoritiesfor water resources management. | Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management. | Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[[12]](#footnote-13) 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(s). | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**. |
| Score | 50 |
| **Status description:** DEPP (est. Jan 2020) has a clear mandate to collaborate with relevant agencies to develop plans for integrated water resource management (Environmental Planning & Protection Bill, 2019, s. 6.e). However, the present levels of capacity for IWRM are all domiciled within WSC (primary responsibilities for water resources management). More needs to be done to orchestrate the implementation of the 2007 IWRM plan and include all stakeholders. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** To effectively implement IWRM, The Bahamas needs to centralize water resource management. Given the current organizational framework, this would be best done with a transfer of knowledge or support expertise to the DEPP. | | | | | | | | |
| **b. Coordination between** nationalgovernment authorities representing **different sectors**[[13]](#footnote-14) on water resources, policy, planning and management. | | **No information** sharedbetween different government sectors on policy, planning and management. | **Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available between different sectors. | | **Communication:** Information, experiences and opinions are **shared between** different sectors. | **Consultation:** Opportunities for different sectors to **take part** in policy, planning and management processes. | **Collaboration:** Formal **arrangements** 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 | 50 |
| **Status description:** There is some history of cross-sector consultation on water resources policy, planning and management; for example, stakeholders from over 11 government ministries and agencies were consulted during the formulation of the 2007 IWRM plan. More recently, PAHO conducted a multi-stakeholder workshop on the health, water and sanitation components of the Over-the-Hill (OTH) Community Development Partnership Initiative. The Ministry of Public Works, Ministry of the Environment & Housing, Water and Sewerage Corporation (WSC) and stakeholders from other sectors were involved in this workshop. Collaboration between the WSC and OTH Initiative continued after the workshop to mobilize environment wardens to advocate for water conservation, and improvement of waste disposal to avoid contamination of groundwater. Mechanisms for coordination exist, but are utilised infrequently (e.g. in extreme conditions). | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Progressive collective action on IWRM implementation requires regular cross-sector engagement and communication. A standardized template of policy design, coordination and implementation can be used to ensure cross-sector coordination. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **c.** **Public participation**[[14]](#footnote-15) inwater resources, policy, planning and management at national level. | | **No information** sharedbetween government and the public on policy, planning and management. | **Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to the public. | **Communication:**  Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public**.** | **Consultation:**  Government authoritiesregularly **use** information, experiences and opinions of the public. | **Collaboration:**  **Mechanisms**[[15]](#footnote-16) established, and regularly used, for the public to take partin relevantpolicy, planning and management processes. | **Representation:** Formal representation ofthe public in government processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities, as appropriate. |
| Score | 20 |
| **Status description:** Through the University of The Bahamas, water resources management programs have tentatively been established for public education on hydrological issues. The public also has access to all legislation through government websites. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** In 2017, following the XII Meeting of National Committees and Focal Points of the UNESCO International Hydrological Program for Latin America & the Caribbean (IHP-LAC) in Nassau, Bahamas, the present parties agreed to establish a mechanism at the University of The Bahamas for the National dissemination of hydrological knowledge. | | | | | | | |
| **d.** **Private sector**[[16]](#footnote-17) **participation** inwater resources development, management and use. | | **No information** sharedbetween government and private sector about water resources development, management and use. | **Information** made available between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use. | **Communication** between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use. | **Consultation:** Government authorities regularly involve the private sector in water resources development, management and use activities. | **Collaboration: Mechanisms**[[17]](#footnote-18) established, and regularly used, for private sector involvement and partnership. | **Representation:** Effective private sector involvement established for water resources development, management and use activities. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** Additional communication needed between government and key private sector representatives, such as RO water providers and megaresort holders. Inclusion of the private sector in the management of this resource is critical. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Schedule regular meetings/updates to engage private sector representatives on a regular basis. Representatives from the public water sector should be included in negotiation of Heads of Agreement for major developments. Resorts and other major developments should also be required to develop a complete water use management plan, report on indicators and monitor to ensure compliance. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) | |
| **e. Developing IWRM capacity**.[[18]](#footnote-19) | | **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 | 30 |
| **Status description:** As previously mentioned, in 2017, an agreement was made to establish a mechanism for the national dissemination of hydrological knowledge; little has been done to advance this issue. There is limited IWRM capacity in a few institutions, but engagement on the issue is sporadic. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Develop long-term programs and research within The University of The Bahamas. Strategies to target appropriate research through calls for proposals from international, regional and national experts are required. | | | | | | | | |
| **2.2 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at other levels?** | | | | | | | | |
| **a.** **Basin/aquifer level**[[19]](#footnote-20) **organizations**[[20]](#footnote-21) for leading implementation of IWRM. | | **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[[21]](#footnote-22) 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(s). | | Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** In the islands of The Bahamas, the most important aquifers are on Andros, Grand Bahama, Abaco and New Providence islands. While the nation mostly relies on RO for water supply, the first three represent a significant portion of the nation’s limited freshwater reserves; the fourth supports a sizeable population in the nation’s capital through groundwater abstraction from private wells. WSC-WRMU and UNESCO-IHP continue to coordinate water resources concerns with Utility Firms and/or NGOs on Andros (Andros Conservation), Abaco (Friends of the Environment, UNICEF), Grand Bahama (GB Utilities), and New Providence (BNT, BREEF, ReEarth, TNC). However, the responsibilities are spread over numerous organizations with unclear day-to-day directions. The mandate may exist, but efforts taken are not comprehensive enough to provide any benefit to water resource management. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Clearly define roles and assign responsibilities with key deliverables. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) | |
| **b.** **Public participation**[[22]](#footnote-23) inwater resources, policy, planning and managementat the **local** **level.**[[23]](#footnote-24) | | **No information** sharedbetween government and the public on policy, planning and management. | **Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made availabletothe public**.** | **Communication:**  Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public**.** | **Consultation:**  Government authoritiesregularly **use** local level information, experiences and opinions of the public. | **Collaboration:**  **Mechanisms**[[24]](#footnote-25) established, and regularly used, for the public to take partin relevantpolicy, planning and management processes. | **Representation:** Formal representation of the public in local authority processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities, as appropriate. | |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** Information exists in some cases and/or sectors, but it is not effectively shared. Not enough is being done to engage the public on the status of water. Town halls and public meetings on water resources policy, planning and management are held in emergency situations. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Increase public awareness about water resources management, with special emphasis on the unique issues on each island. | | | | | | | | |
| **c.** **Participation of** **vulnerable groups** in water resources planning and management.[[25]](#footnote-26) | | Participation of vulnerable groups **not explicitly addressed** in laws, policies, or plans. | Vulnerable groups **partially addressed,** butno explicit proceduresin place.[[26]](#footnote-27) | **Some procedures in place**, but limited budget and human capacity for implementation. | Procedures in place, with **moderate participation** of vulnerable groups (moderate budget and human capacity). | **Regular participation** of vulnerable groups (sufficient budget and human capacity, and participation is monitored). | | **Meaningful[[27]](#footnote-28) and regular participation** of vulnerable groups, as appropriate. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description**: Through the Over the Hill Community Development Partnership Initiative, community group leaders advocate for the water-related needs of the urban poor communities. The extent of monitoring for their participation in planning and managing water resources is unclear. We are not aware of participation of vulnerable groups on Family Islands and other communities in New Providence. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Persons living in informal communities and urban poor communities need to be more prominent in consultative processes. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **d.** **Gender included in laws/plans or similar** within water resources management.**[[28]](#footnote-29)** | | Gender considerations **not explicitly included** in national/ subnational laws/plans or similar. | Gender considerations **partially included** in laws/plans or similar. | Gender considerations **included** (but limited implementation, budget or monitoring)**.** | Gender **objectives[[29]](#footnote-30) partly achieved** (activities partially monitored and funded). | Gender objectives **mostly achieved** (activitiesadequately monitored and funded). | Gender objectives **consistently achieved** and effectively address gender issues (activities and outcomesreviewed and revised). |
| Score | 10 |
| **Status description**: Gender consideration is not paramount in policy language or strategies. However, requests are made for female attendees at workshops, meetings and the like. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Continue to include women in IWRM conversations and aim for gender-parity in decision-making processes. | | | | | | | |
| **e**. **Organizational framework for transboundary water management**.[[30]](#footnote-31) | | **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 **mostly fulfilled**. | Organizational framework(s)’ mandate is **fully fulfilled**. |
| Score | N/A |
| **Status description:** The Bahamas is an island nation with no transboundary freshwater. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** N/A | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **f.** **Sub-national**[[31]](#footnote-32) **authorities** for leading IWRM implementation.[[32]](#footnote-33) | | **No** dedicated sub-national authoritiesfor water resources management. | Authorities **exist**, with clear mandateto lead water resources management. | Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[[33]](#footnote-34)to effectively leadIWRM 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(s). | Sub-national authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**. |
| Score | 20 |
| **Status description:** There are subnational water providers (e.g. Paradise Utilities, Grand Bahama Utilities Company and New Providence Development Company) but they are not all monitored by WSC. Mechanism for the involvement of administrative authorities on the Family Islands also remains unclear. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Creation of sub-national committees and/or councils with clear mandates to lead IWRM implementation. | | | | | | | |

# 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. Many of the questions in this section relate to other SDG 6 targets and indicators (see 6.5.1 [monitoring guide](http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/)), and coordination between different SDG reporting processes is encouraged where feasible.

**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. Please provide qualifying information to the question score in the ‘Status description’ 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. Enter free text in the “Status description” and “Way forward” fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. 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 that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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**[[34]](#footnote-35) (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 useby stakeholders. | **Long-term** national monitoring is carried out with **adequate** coverage but limited useby stakeholders. | | Long-term national monitoring is carried outwith **very good** coverage and adequate useby stakeholders. | Long-term national monitoring is carried out with **excellent** coverage and excellent useby stakeholders. |
| Score | 50 |
| **Status description:** There are no national water monitoring systems. However, as per the US Army Corps of Engineers’ December 2004 report (Water Resources Assessment of The Bahamas), there are recording stations on eight islands to monitor climate conditions under the CPACC (Caribbean Planning for Adaptation to Global Climate Change), but these are insufficient to adequately monitor weather patterns. There is no stakeholder access to information on water availability; access is limited to WSC and other connected entities. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Improve monitoring schemes and availability of monitoring systems and the information they collect. | | | | | | | | |
| b. **Sustainable and efficient water use** **management[[35]](#footnote-36)** 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** coverageacross 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 | 30 |
| **Status description:** Use of reverse osmosis technologies lessen priority to address existing marginal or sub optimal freshwater resources utilization. | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** The Environmental Planning & Protection Act (2019) authorizes the DEPP to work with relevant authorities to develop a sustainable water resource management plan. | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **c.** **Pollution control**[[36]](#footnote-37)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** coverageacross 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 | 50 |
| **Status description:** Most activities are undertaken on a case-by-case basis as a short-term reaction to a pollution event. UNESCO-IHP, through the Graphic Programme has assisted with water quality checks on both Andros and Grand Bahama. In Abaco, following Hurricane Dorian (2019), IsraAid and UNICEF have assisted with groundwater quality assessments. PAHO/WHO also provide technical guidance on issues of water, sanitation and hygiene and deployed a consultant post-disaster to test water quality in Abaco and Grand Bahama. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** The Environmental Planning & Protection Act (2019) authorizes the DEPP to work with relevant authorities to develop a plan for “the prevention of pollution and environmental degradation” (s.6.2.f). | | | | | | | |
| **d.** **Management of water-related ecosystems**[[37]](#footnote-38)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** coverageacross 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 | 40 |
| **Status description:** There is a balance between wetland and groundwater resources, but there are no freshwater surface bodies in The Bahamas. Management of water-related ecosystems is guided by several acts, protocols, plans and policies, including (but not limited to): UNEP Land-Based Sources of Marine Pollution Protocol (2010), Bahamas National Trust Act, Forestry Act, and National Wetlands Policy. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Because The Bahamas is an archipelago, national coverage is difficult. There is a need to improve monitoring throughout the country. An established UNESCO-IHP Ecohydrological Site remains under the management of the Exuma Foundation/Recycle Exuma/University of Miami on Great Exuma. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | 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[[38]](#footnote-39)** 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** coverageof 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 | 60 |
| **Status description:** Protocols for managing water-related disasters are outlined in the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) National Disasters Plan: Instructions for Emergency Situations. The plan includes instructions for actions to be taken before, during and after floods and storm surges. Because the majority of water demand in The Bahamas is now met by purchasing SWRO, drought/water scarcity is not identified as a disaster threat. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Increase public awareness of the dangers of groundwater over-abstraction, especially in the absence of groundwater legislation. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **3.2 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at other levels?** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **a.** **Basin management instruments**.[[39]](#footnote-40) | | | **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-termbasis, with **effective** outcomesand **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage. | Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-termbasis, with **highly effective** outcomesand **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage. |
| Score | 20 | |
| **Status description:** As an archipelago with no surface water bodies, management at the basin-level it is not necessarily appropriate. However, The Bahamas National Trust has a national park system for the protection of hundreds of acres of wetlands, forests and islands throughout the nation. The Bahamas is also party to the 2010 LBS Protocol, which controls land-based activities to protect water bodies. | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **b.** **Aquifer** **management instruments**.[[40]](#footnote-41) | | **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** outcomesand **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage. | Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **highly effective** outcomesand **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage. |
| Score | 40 |
| **Status description:** To date, The Bahamas lacks groundwater regulations to protect the freshwater reserves / water resources reserves. Fortunately, the primary groundwater resource areas on Abaco, Andros, and Grand Bahama are within the protected Forestry Reserve Areas for the Nation. Water & Sewerage Cooperation (WSC) monitors water quality, water availability, and abstraction rates for the primary water reserve areas. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Under the newly established DEPP, one organization will be responsible for water, climate and biodiversity, providing opportunity for a more comprehensive approach to aquifer management. | | | | | | | |
| **c.** **Data and information sharing within countries** at all levels.**[[41]](#footnote-42)** | | **No** data and information sharing. | **Limited** data and information sharingon an **ad-hoc** basis. | Data and information sharingarrangements **exist** on a more **long-term** basis between major data providers and users. | Data and information sharingarrangements **implemented** on a more **long-term** basis**,** with **adequate** coverageacross sectors and the country. | Data and information sharingarrangementsimplementedon a more **long-term** basis**,** with **very good** coverageacross sectors and the country. | All relevant data and information are online and freely accessible to all. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** Data to private and public stakeholders has historically been shared upon request, if it exists. Data collection is a serious challenge for the country. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Hopeful that additional collaborations between Government and the University of The Bahamas on research initiatives shall achieve additional data / information sharing opportunities. | | | | | | | |
| **d.** **Transboundary data and information sharing between countries.** | | **No** data and information sharing. | **Limited** data and information sharingon an **ad-hoc** or informal basis. | Data and information sharingarrangements **exist**, but sharing is **limited.** | Data and information sharingarrangements **implemented adequately.** | Data and information sharingarrangements **implemented effectively.[[42]](#footnote-43)** | All relevant data and information are online and accessible between countries. |
| Score | N/A |
| **Status description:** The Bahamas is an island nation with no transboundary freshwater. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** N/A | | | | | | | |

# 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 [Official Development Assistance (ODA)](https://www.oecd.org/dac/stats/officialdevelopmentassistancedefinitionandcoverage.htm) 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’ SDG 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”.

“Various 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 ‘Status description’ field.

**Investments should cover all aspects of water resources development and management but exclude any related to drinking water supply, sanitation and hygiene 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. Enter free text in the “Status description” and “Way forward” fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. 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 that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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**[[43]](#footnote-44) for water resources **infrastructure**[[44]](#footnote-45)(investment and recurrent costs). | | **No budget** allocated in national investment plans. | **Some 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** **most** planned programmes or projects. | Sufficientfunds disbursed for investment and recurrent costs,and **being utilised in all** planned projects. | Budget **fully utilised** for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. |
| Score | 20 |
| **Status description:** Because of the nation’s transition to RO water supply, limited funds are disbursed for investment in hard infrastructure. Some money is built into the national annual budget for subsidies to WSC and to the Ministry of Public Works for infrastructure operation and maintenance. Since The Bahamas relies less on its natural freshwater reserves for water supply, ‘soft’ infrastructure and environmental measures to protect the ecological value of these reserves are key areas for future funding. Environmental planning is a function of the DEPP, which, to date, has mostly received funds to begin operation. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Increase investment in ‘soft’ infrastructure and environmental measures. | | | | | | | |
| **b.** **National budget** for **IWRM elements**[[45]](#footnote-46) (investments and recurrent costs). | | **No budget** allocations made for investments and recurrent costs of the IWRM elements. | **Allocations** made for **some** 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 (investments and recurrent costs). | Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** Money built into the national budget for WSC subsidies and to fund the activities of DEPP. Funding also allocated towards the Government and Public Policy Institute at the University of The Bahamas, which facilitates discourse, research and training that impacts the sustainable development of The Bahamas. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** A major obstacle is the current financial situation of WSC. WSC was designed to self-fund by charging consumers enough to cover all its activities. However, many consumer accounts are in arrears and the corporation has not been financially viable for years. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **4.2 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at other levels?** | | | | | | | |
| **a.** **Sub-national or basin budgets** for water resources **infrastructure[[46]](#footnote-47)** (investment and recurrent costs). | | **No budget** allocated in sub-national or basin investment plans. | **Some 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 most** planned programmes or projects. | Sufficient funds disbursed**,** for investment and recurrent costs,and **being utilised in all** planned projects. | Budget **fully utilised**, for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. |
| Score | n/a |
| **Status description:** Fund availability for infrastructure on the individual islands of The Bahamas flows generally from the national level. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** n/a | | | | | | | |
| **b.** **Revenues** raised for IWRM elements.[[47]](#footnote-48) | | **No revenues** raised for IWRM elements. | **Processes in place** to raise revenue but **not yet implemented**. | **Some revenue raised,** but generally not used for IWRM activities. | Revenues raised cover **some** IWRM activities. | Revenues raised cover **most** IWRM activities. | Revenues raised **fully cover** costs of IWRM activities. |
| Score | 30 |
| **Status description:** There are some revenue raising processes in place for the state water provider, but they have not been successful. As previously described in 4.1b, WSC was designed to be self-funded through user charges but operates at a loss. IWRM is, therefore, not a financial priority; it is not referenced in the latest government budget (2020) or the latest publicly available Annual Report of the Water and Sewerage Corporation (2015). | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** Create alternative mechanisms to raise revenues or reform WSC structure. | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Very low (0) | Low (20) | Medium-low (40) | Medium-high (60) | High (80) | Very high (100) |
| **c.** **Financing for transboundary cooperation.**[[48]](#footnote-49) | | **No specific funding** allocated from the Member State (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 | N/A |
| **Status description:** The Bahamas is an island nation with no transboundary freshwater. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** N/A | | | | | | | |
| **d.** **Sub-national or basin budgets** for **IWRM elements**[[49]](#footnote-50) (investment and recurrent costs). | | **No budget** allocations at sub-national or basin level for investments and recurrent costs of IWRM elements. | **Allocations** made for **some** 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 (investments and recurrent costs). | Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. |
| Score | N/A |
| **Status description:** Budgets in The Bahamas are more centralized. | | | | | | | |
| **Way forward:** N/a | | | | | | | |

# Indicator 6.5.1 score

### How to calculate the indicator 6.5.1 score

Please complete the table below as follows:

1. Calculate the average score of each of the four sections by averaging all question scores in each section, rounded to the nearest whole number.

*Example: Section average of 41.5 should be rounded to 42. Section average of 70.2 should be rounded to 70.* If ‘not applicable’ is selected for any question, this should not be included in the indicator calculations, and therefore will not affect the average score. However, questions with a score of ‘0’ (zero) should be included.

1. Calculate the average of the four section scores (whole numbers) to give the overall score for indicator 6.5.1, rounded to the nearest whole number.

*Example: Calculating final IWRM score from four section scores: (81+ 63 + 47 + 58)/4 = 62.25. Final 6.5.1 score (rounded to a whole number) = 62.*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section** | **Average Scores** (all values rounded to nearest whole number) |
| Section 1 Enabling environment | 37 |
| Section 2 Institutions and participation | 30 |
| Section 3 Management instruments | 40 |
| Section 4 Financing | 27 |
| **Indicator 6.5.1 score**  **= Degree of IWRM implementation (0-100)\*** | **34** |

\* Use rounded section average scores (to the nearest whole number), to calculate the indicator score, and round this to the nearest whole number.

**Interpretation of the score**

The score indicates the ‘degree of implementation of integrated water resources management’, on a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 signifying ‘very low’ implementation, and 100 signifying ‘very high’ implementation. However, the true value of the survey to countries lies within the scores, ‘status description’ and ‘way forward’ for each question, as this helps to identify which actions need to be taken to move towards a greater degree of implementation of IWRM. See the monitoring guide for further information on interpretation of scores and target setting.

# Annexes:

## Annex A: Glossary

* **Authorities:** could beministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/departments/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.
* **Basins:** Includes rivers, lakes and aquifers, unless otherwise specified. 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.
* **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 federal countries, these are likely to be provinces or states. Non-federal 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**.**
* **Transboundary:** Refers to surface and groundwater basins that cross one or more national borders (see Annex B).
* **Stakeholders:** In this survey, stakeholders are the main groups important for water resources management, development and use.Examples of stakeholders in each group are given in footnotes as they appear in the survey.
* **Water Resources Management** is the activity of planning, developing, distributing and managing the optimum use of water resources. Ideally, water resource management planning considers 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.

## Annex B: Transboundary level

The transboundary questions for indicator 6.5.1 focus on the degree of implementation of IWRM at the transboundary level, as relevant to implementation of IWRM ‘at all levels’, as specified in target 6.5. Countries sharing basins of transboundary waters (rivers, lakes or aquifers) should answer the questions on transboundary issues. This information is complemented by indicator 6.5.2 ‘Proportion of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation’.

To enable tracking of progress over time and for transparency, in the table below please list the transboundary (or ‘international’) basins or aquifers that are included in this survey. The 6.5.1 baseline reporting may be used as a starting point. Only the most important transboundary basins or aquifers that are regarded as significant, in terms of economic, social or environmental value to the country (or neighbouring countries), need to be included in this survey. It is up to countries to decide which ones these are. Where feasible, basins/aquifers listed in this table, and the scores given, should be cross-referenced with tables and scores in the 6.5.2 reporting template ([www.sdg6monitoring.org/indicators/target-65/indicators652/](http://www.sdg6monitoring.org/indicators/target-65/indicators652/)), and the focal point for 6.5.2 should be consulted in this process. In the absence of 6.5.2 data or national databases, global databases on transboundary river basins (<http://twap-rivers.org/indicators/>), and transboundary aquifers (<https://www.un-igrac.org/ggis/explore-all-transboundary-groundwaters>), may be referred to. If you include a national (sub-basin) as part of a larger transboundary basin, please ensure to also include the name of the larger basin. When answering transboundary questions, the majority of the basins below must meet the criteria described in each threshold to achieve the score for that threshold.

The columns on the right of the table are optional though recommended. Filling them out would: provide countries with valuable information and a quick diagnostic tool for the status in each basin/aquifer; increase the transparency of the transboundary level responses in this survey for stakeholders both within and between countries; help countries reach consensus on scores for the transboundary questions; and provide a valuable cross-reference for indicator 6.5.2. For each basin/aquifer, a score should be given for each of the four transboundary questions in the survey, following the guidance and thresholds in the survey questions. To supplement this data, you are encouraged to provide a summary of the situation for the transboundary basins/aquifers in the ‘Status description’ and ‘Way forward’ fields to transboundary questions within Part 2 of this survey, to the extent feasible.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Annex not applicable. No transboundary waters in country.** | **OPTIONAL THOUGH RECOMMENDED\*** | | | |
|  | **Important transboundary basins** | **Arrangements (1.2c)** | **Institutions (2.2e)** | **Data sharing (3.2d)** | **Financing (4.2c)** |
| 1. | [Name] |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Please add/delete rows as needed |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Important transboundary aquifers** |  |  |  |  |
| 1. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Please add/delete rows as needed |  |  |  |  |

\* These columns may be useful to countries in determining the approximate status for each transboundary basin/aquifer, and thereby be useful in discussions on the respective question scores in Part 2 of this survey instrument.

## Annex C: Barriers, enablers and next steps for furthering IWRM implementation

This section is not used in calculating indicator 6.5.1, but is designed to be useful for countries to identify the main challenges and next steps to further IWRM implementation. It builds on the free text fields for each question – “Status description” and “Way forward” – to identify the key issues.

The third question below aims to improve transparency by documenting the main differences in opinion between stakeholders. You may amend the structure to make it more useful to the planning process in the national context. For each question, you may consider aspects under each of the four IWRM dimensions in the survey, or you may identify aspects/issues that cut-across questions and IWRM dimensions. Some issues not addressed by the questions may also be brought up here.

1. What are the main challenges/barriers to progress of IWRM implementation in the country?  
     
   Responsibility for water resource management in The Bahamas remains fragmented across several government institutions with limited communication between stakeholders. One of the primary constraints to IWRM implementation in The Bahamas, therefore, remains the limited integration between the water sector and other sectors, in particular, the environment. Because of this extreme fragmentation, The Bahamas also suffers from a lack of comprehensive, updated, and publicly-available water resources data.   
     
   Other key challenges include:
   * minimal and fragmented management of the collective impact of water processes and programs including sanitation, waste disposal and storm water runoff;
   * unclear institutional responsibility leading to unaccountability;
   * low revenue collection;
   * outdated laws;
   * the limited availability of resources and/or lack thereof for implementation of the IWRM plan;
   * the lack of public awareness and education;
   * and the absence of a standardised approach to incorporating IWRM principles into the planning and implementation of projects.
2. What are the main next steps to overcome challenges and further IWRM implementation?   
     
   With the establishment of the Department of Environmental Planning and Protection (DEPP) in January 2020, the department assumed centralized responsibilities for water resource management, including a mandate to develop plans and best practices for water resource management (Environmental Planning and Protection Bill 2019, sec. 13, p. 15). One of the main next steps to further IWRM implementation, therefore, is for DEPP to utilise its regulatory power to advance rulemaking for IWRM and facilitate stakeholder collaboration.   
     
   Additionally, independent research and development at the University-level, with private sector/donor funding is recommended to promote multidisciplinary thought and collective action for IWRM implementation. There is also a need to introduce instruments that integrate macro-economic concerns and policy areas in water policy to ensure an efficient social allocation of water.
3. What were the main points of difference in stakeholder opinion in answering the survey questions?   
     
   Stakeholder opinion varied mainly on issues related to national laws, policies and plans to support IWRM, as well as the status of national government authorities to support IWRM implementation. The gap in stakeholder opinion appears to be the result of the lack of public awareness of laws, policies and procedures, as water professionals tended to give higher scores in these categories than activists and researchers.   
     
   Similar score variability was noted on questions related to sub-national policy and procedure. Because The Bahamas is an archipelago, many stakeholders have location-specific knowledge of water resources management, limiting their ability to speak on subnational water resource management nation-wide.
4. Additional comments.  
     
   An archipelago of over 700 islands and cays, The Bahamas’ geography creates unique challenges when completing a survey of this nature. Due to the flat topography of the islands and porous limestone rock, there is very little surface water and no freshwater rivers. As such, basin and aquifer level questions were answered according to groundwater management on the 17 major islands.[[50]](#footnote-51) However, water resources vary between islands, with northern islands (e.g. Grand Bahama, Abaco) having larger freshwater reserves than southern islands (e.g. Inagua, Mayaguana). The answers provided, therefore, place more emphasis on water resources management on the primary water resources islands – Andros, Grand Bahama and Abaco—and New Providence, home to over 70% of the nation’s population.  
     
   Although a water-scare country by UN standards, The Bahamas’ increased reliance on sea-water reverse osmosis (SWRO) has reduced some of the strain on the fragile local freshwater lens.  
     
   Please note that the freshwater lenses on Grand Bahama and Abaco were impacted by Hurricane Dorian in September 2019. Water resources studies, in response to the damaged sustained to the local freshwater lenses, have proceeded on Grand Bahama and Abaco with the support of UNESCO-IHP and IsraAid, respectively.

## Annex D: Priority water resource challenges

Please indicate the challenge level for each of the water resource issues below. This information will not affect the overall indicator score.

This checklist may be useful to countries in stakeholder discussions and planning. Over time, it can also help countries to evaluate whether the implementation of IWRM can help to reduce the challenge level relating to different water resources issues. The information will also help to develop regional and global oversight of key water resources challenges, and track progress of how challenge levels may change over time.

Note that ‘challenge level’ in this case refers to the level of difficulty associated with addressing each issue. For example, if effective and financed systems are in place for providing water for domestic use, then this may be assigned a ‘low’ challenge level, even though this issue would likely be classified as high priority / importance in most countries. ‘Low’, ‘Medium’ and ‘High’ are intentionally broad and intuitive categories.

Comments (optional):

Because the islands of The Bahamas are low-lying, the freshwater lens remains susceptible to salt-water intrusion due to over-abstraction of ground water and sea level rise. The lack of potable groundwater on Grand Bahama after Hurricane Dorian attests to the vulnerability of the islands.

As we transition to reverse osmosis, the need to protect groundwater resource remains paramount. A stakeholder expressed serious concern over mining interests on Andros Island and the threat they pose to not only the nation’s largest freshwater sources, but also one of the most diverse wetland nursery systems in the region.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Water resource challenges** | **Level of difficulty associated with addressing the challenge** | | | |
| **Low** | **Medium** | **High** | **Not relevant** |
| **Water uses** | | | | |
| Water for agriculture |  |  |  |  |
| Water for domestic use |  |  |  |  |
| Water for industry |  |  |  |  |
| Water for energy |  |  |  |  |
| Water for ecosystems/environment |  |  |  |  |
| Water for growing cities |  |  |  |  |
| **Threats to the resource** | | | | |
| Water scarcity / over-abstraction (surface) |  |  |  |  |
| Water scarcity / over-abstraction (groundwater) |  |  |  |  |
| Water quality / pollution (surface) |  |  |  |  |
| Water quality / pollution (groundwater) |  |  |  |  |
| Water-related ecosystem degradation |  |  |  |  |
| Water-related ecosystem loss |  |  |  |  |
| **Threats to people and economic activity** | | | | |
| Floods |  |  |  |  |
| Droughts |  |  |  |  |
| Coastal vulnerability |  |  |  |  |
| Conflicts over water resources |  |  |  |  |

## Annex E: 6.5.1 country reporting process form

A common query received after the baseline data collection period was on the reporting process and which stakeholders were involved in reporting.

To improve transparency and increase confidence in results, you are invited to provide a brief overview of the reporting process. e.g. main actors involved; meetings/workshops held; other means of gathering inputs from stakeholders; and finalisation/approval processes. Also note the main challenges/strengths of the process. Use as much space as needed.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Focal Point affiliation | Professional Engineer/Hydrologist at the Water & Sewerage Corporation (WSC), and Department Head of the Water Resources Management Unit (WRMU) - Bahamas |
| Brief process overview:  Thirty-four stakeholders from various governmental, non-governmental, inter-governmental and academic organizations were invited to participate in the 2020 consultation process. Of the 34 invited, 24 stakeholders participated in an informational webinar during which the Focal Point and Facilitator provided stakeholders with information on SDG 6.5 and the reporting process for SDG Indicator 6.5.1. At the end of the webinar, stakeholders were given the opportunity to voice preliminary concerns with water resource management in The Bahamas and provided with details for accessing the online survey instrument and supplemental reading materials. Seven (7) stakeholders completed a digitized version of the “Country Survey Instrument for SDG Indicator 6.5.1” and the results were shared with 20 stakeholders during a follow-up webinar. Because of the low completion rates of the survey, and concerns about the inaccessibility of the survey language, the Focal Point and Facilitator engaged in a deep analysis of the survey responses, identifying missing perspectives and major discrepancies in the data. The reporting task force then directed questions toward stakeholders based on their expertise and circulated a proposed draft of the report to water management professionals for comment. The results of various rounds of stakeholder consultation, comment and revision are presented in this report. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Stakeholder groups** | **Level of engagement** (mark with ‘X’) | | | **Additional information** (e.g. which stakeholder organisations were involved) |
| **Low** (given opportunity to contribute) | **Medium** (some input) | **High** (discussion/ negotiation) |
| National water agencies |  |  | X | Water & Sewerage Corporation |
| Other public sector agencies | X |  |  | Ministry of Environment & Housing; Department of Environmental Planning & Protection; Department of Environmental Health Services; Department of Marine Resources; |
| Sub-national water agencies | X |  |  | Grand Bahama Utilities Co.; |
| Basin/Aquifer agencies |  |  |  |  |
| Water User Associations |  |  |  |  |
| Civil society |  | X |  | Bahamas National Trust; BREEF; Cat Island Conservation Institute; ReEarth Bahamas; Rotary Club of Nassau; Bahamas Environment Protection Foundation; Andros Conservation; Exuma Foundation |
| Private sector | X |  |  | BRON Ltd., Atlantis Resorts, SEV Consulting Group |
| Vulnerable groups |  |  |  |  |
| Gender expertise |  |  |  |  |
| Research/academia |  |  | X | UNESCO Graphic Programme; University of The Bahamas (UB); UB Government & Public Policy Institute; |
| Transboundary expertise |  |  |  |  |
| Other SDG focal points | X |  |  | *(e.g. FPs from other indicators)* |
| Other non-governmental organizations |  | X |  | WHO/Pan-American Health Organization, The Nature Conservancy, UNICEF, Water Mission |

1. Monitoring of 6.5.1 is being done as part of the UN-Water initiative on integrated monitoring of SDG 6. Support is provided in collaboration with UN-Water members and partners. For a list of questions that relate to other SDG indicators (mainly in section 3), please see the monitoring guide. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. For examples of good practices of policies, laws and plans, please see case studies under ‘enabling environment’ in the Global Water Partnership (GWP) [IWRM ToolBox](https://www.gwp.org/en/learn/iwrm-toolbox/About_IWRM_ToolBox/). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national policies, please answer this question by considering how national policies are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response. [↑](#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 transboundary arrangements for basins/aquifers shared by countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. For ‘transboundary’ definition and guidance on how to fill out all transboundary level questions, see Annexes A and B. All transboundary level questions should reflect the situation in most of the ‘most important’ transboundary basins/aquifers, as listed in Annex B. An ‘arrangement’ should be a formal commitment, and may be referred to as a bilateral or multilateral agreement, treaty, convention, protocol, joint declaration, memorandum of understanding, or other arrangement between riparian countries on the management of a transboundary basin/aquifer. Refers to international basins/aquifers only. Arrangements may be interstate, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial, interagency or between regional authorities. They may also be entered into by sub-national entities. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national regulations, please answer this question by considering how national regulations are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. This question has replaced question 1.2d from the baseline survey instrument, which was for federal countries only. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. E.g. Dublin Principle Nr. 3 (1992): “Women play a central part in the provision, management and safeguarding of water”. “[the] role of women … has seldom been reflected in institutional arrangements for the … management of water resources. Acceptance and implementation of this principle requires positive policies to address women’s specific needs and to equip and empower women to participate at all levels in water resources programmes, including decision-making and implementation, in ways defined by them.” [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. E.g. SDG target 5.5 “Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life.” [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. E.g. SDG target 17.18 “By 2020, … increase … the availability of … data disaggregated by … gender, … and other characteristics relevant in national contexts.” [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
11. ‘Government authorities’ could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
12. ‘Capacity’ 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/conflict management and evaluation. Beyond having the technical capacity, authorities should also have the financial capacity to actually be leading the implementation of these activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
13. 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-14)
14. ‘The public’ includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is addressed separately in the next question. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
15. Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
16. Private sector includes for-profit businesses and groups. It does not include government or civil society. While this question is mainly focused at the national level, please respond at the level that is most relevant in the country context. Please explain this, including differences between implementation at different levels, in the ‘Status description’ field. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
17. Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for private sector participation. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
18. 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-19)
19. 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 transboundary management of basins/aquifers shared by countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
20. Could be organization, committee, inter-ministerial mechanism or other means of collaboration for managing water resources at the basin level. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
21. For the definition of ‘capacity’ in this context, see footnote 12. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
22. ‘The public’ includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is dealt with separately in question 2.1d. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
23. 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-24)
24. Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
25. Vulnerable groups: groups of people that face economic, political, or social exclusion or marginalisation. They can include, but are not limited to: indigenous groups, ethnic minorities, migrants (refugees, internally displaced people, asylum seekers), remote communities, subsistence farmers, people living in poverty, people living in slums and informal settlements. Also referred to as ‘marginalised’ or ‘disadvantaged’ groups. While women are often included in definitions of ‘vulnerable groups’, in this survey gender issues are addressed separately in question 2.2d. The score given for this question should reflect the situation for the majority of the vulnerable groups. This question has been added since the baseline to capture an element of stakeholder participation which is important in the context of ‘leave no-one behind’ – one of the key principles of Agenda 2030. [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
26. ‘Procedures’ can include operational processes to, for example, raise awareness, reduce language barriers, and facilitate interaction with specific vulnerable groups. [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
27. ’Meaningful’ implies voices of vulnerable groups are heard, contribute to decision-making, and influence outcomes. It follows the UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation which provides for “Participation and Inclusion: … all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realized.” [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
28. See gender discussion at beginning of section 2. Gender-responsive mechanisms can include laws, policies, plans, strategies or other frameworks or procedures aimed at achieving gender objectives related to women’s participation, voice and influence. Gender-responsive mechanisms may originate within the water sector or at a higher level, but if they are primarily addressed at a higher level, then there should be evidence of gender mainstreaming within the water sector to achieve scores in this question. In the baseline survey, national, sub-national, and transboundary levels were addressed in three separate questions. These questions have been merged into a single question, allowing countries to answer the question at the level which is most relevant in the national context. The situation at different levels can be explained in the ‘Status description’ cell, as appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
29. Gender objectives ultimately refer to equal participation and influence in water resources management at all levels. Ways of monitoring this include (please identify any of these or similar in the ‘Status description’ field): 1) Presence of Gender Focal Point responsible for gender policy and gender concerns in authorities that deal with water resources; 2) Gender parity in decision-making processes at all levels (e.g. in meetings or board members/committee members); 3) Presence of gender-specific objectives and commitments in strategies, plans and laws related water policy; 4) Presence and role of local women’s groups/organizations receiving technical and/or financial support from government/non-government organizations involved in water resources management activities; 5) Budget allocation, and procedures for collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data of local populations, when planning for water-related programmes / projects, including infrastructure; 6) Presence of measures for improving gender parity and equity in human resources (HR) policies of authorities. Source: adapted from [UNESCO WWAP Toolkit on Sex-disaggregated Water Data, 2019](http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/water/wwap/display-single-news/news/the_2019_water_gender_toolkit_has_been_launched/). [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
30. An organizational framework can include a joint body, mechanism, authority, committee, commission or other institutional arrangement. Refers to international basins/aquifers. [↑](#footnote-ref-31)
31. Sub-national can include, but not limited to: provincial, state, county, local government areas, council. In this case, sub-national should not include basin/aquifer levels as this is dealt with in question 2.2a. Answer this question for the highest sub-national level(s) that are relevant in the country, and specify what these are. [↑](#footnote-ref-32)
32. This question has replaced question 2.2f from the baseline survey, which was for federal countries only. This is in recognition of the fact that many countries have sub-national authorities for water resources management, even if they are not federal countries. [↑](#footnote-ref-33)
33. For the definition of ‘capacity’ in this context, see footnote 12. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities. [↑](#footnote-ref-34)
34. See definition of monitoring in Terminology. [↑](#footnote-ref-35)
35. 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-36)
36. Includes regulations, water quality guidelines, water quality monitoring, economic tools (e.g. taxes and fees), water quality trading programs, education, consideration of point and non-point (e.g. agricultural) pollution sources, construction and operation of wastewater treatment plants, watershed management. [↑](#footnote-ref-37)
37. 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 extent and quality of the ecosystems over time. [↑](#footnote-ref-38)
38. ‘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, extratropical storm, extreme temperature, fog, tropical cyclone); and Climatological (drought, glacial lake outburst, wildfire). [↑](#footnote-ref-39)
39. 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. To achieve ‘Very high (100)’ basin and aquifer management scores, surface and groundwater management should be integrated. [↑](#footnote-ref-40)
40. See previous footnote on basin management instruments, which also applies to aquifers. [↑](#footnote-ref-41)
41. Includes more formal data and information sharing arrangements between users, as well as accessibility for the general public, where appropriate. [↑](#footnote-ref-42)
42. 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-43)
43. 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-44)
44. 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.** Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance. [↑](#footnote-ref-45)
45. ‘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-46)
46. 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.** Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance. [↑](#footnote-ref-47)
47. For ‘IWRM elements’, see above footnote. **Level**: revenues are likely to be raised from users at the local, basin, or aquifer levels, though may also be raised at other sub-national or national levels (please indicate which level(s) in the status description). **Revenue raising** can occur through public authorities or private sector, e.g. through fees, charges, levies, taxes and ‘blended financing’ approaches. E.g. dedicated charges/levies on water users (including household level *if* revenues are spent on IWRM elements); abstraction & bulk water charges; discharge fees; environmental fees such as pollution charges, Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes; and the sale of secondary products and services. [↑](#footnote-ref-48)
48. 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 based on existing regulation are also considered as sustainable funding. As variable and unsustainable, donor support should not be considered in the scoring, but may be referred to in the ‘Status description’ and ‘Way forward’ fields. [↑](#footnote-ref-49)
49. ‘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. This question has been added since the baseline survey, acknowledging the importance of funding being available at more ‘operational’ levels. [↑](#footnote-ref-50)
50. Abaco, Acklins, Andros, Berry Islands, Bimini, Cat Island, Crooked Island, Eleuthera, Exuma, Grand Bahama, Inagua, Long Island, Mayaguana, New Providence, Ragged Island, Rum Cay, and San Salvador. [↑](#footnote-ref-51)