

DRAFT

THE FOURTH WORLD WATER FORUM (WWF-4)

Framework Theme No. 2 Implementing Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) Approaches

Baseline Document

INTRODUCTION

The 4th World Water Forum, scheduled for Mexico in March 2006, includes a theme on implementing integrated water resources management. GWP has been asked to be the “beacon” (or convening agency) for this theme. In accepting this responsibility, GWP is committed to build on the experience of the many countries around the world with which it is working to promote the adoption of IWRM approaches, with particular attention to the current focus on the preparation of IWRM and Water Efficiency Strategies, as called for in the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation.

This baseline document for the theme lays out the conceptual foundations underpinning the integrated water resources management methodology and also offers reflections on how to catalyze change through IWRM strategies. Its purpose is to help trigger a productive debate at the Forum, serve as a reference for all participants, encourage pre-Forum dialogue, and steer other preparatory activities.

The paper draws heavily on the recent GWP publication “Catalyzing Change: A Handbook for the developing integrated water resources management (IWRM) and water efficiency strategies”, which is available at www.gwpforum.org.

THE CASE FOR INTEGRATION

We need flexible tools for addressing water challenges and optimizing water’s contribution to sustainable development. Integrated Water Resource Management is one such tool – it is not a goal in and of itself.

IWRM is about strengthening frameworks for water governance to foster good decision-making in response to changing needs and situations. By seeking to avoid the lives lost, the money wasted, and the natural capital depleted because of decision-making that did not take into account the larger ramifications of sectoral actions, an IWRM approach aims to ensure that water is developed and managed equitably and that the diverse water needs of women and the poor are addressed. Water must be used to advance a country’s social and economic development goals in ways that do not compromise the

sustainability of vital ecosystems or jeopardize the ability of future generations to meet their water needs.

Water is a critical element in sustainable development. As discussed in depth in the framework paper for Theme #2, it is a key ingredient in generating rural livelihoods, growing food, producing energy, encouraging industrial and service sector growth, and ensuring the integrity of ecosystems and the goods and services they provide. Water also poses its own development challenges—floods, droughts, and water-related diseases can have a huge impact on communities and indeed on national economies. So how can countries overcome these challenges and meet the water needs of people, industries, and ecosystems? How each country chooses to answer this question depends on its situation and development priorities, but in order to optimize the contribution of water to sustainable development, any answer needs to consider:

- The numerous and complex links between activities that influence and are influenced by how water is developed and managed
- How to encourage more efficient use of water as a limited resource.

Defining the “Integrated” in IWRM

An Integrated Water Resources Management approach promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land, and related resources, in order to maximize the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems.¹

This includes more coordinated development and management of:

- land and water,
- surface water and groundwater,
- the river basin and its adjacent coastal and marine environment, and
- upstream and downstream interests.

But IWRM is not just about managing physical resources, it is also about reforming human systems to enable people—men and women—to benefit from those resources.

For policy-making and planning, taking an IWRM approach requires that:

- policies and priorities take water resources implications into account, including the two-way relationship between macro-economic policies and water development, management, and use,
- there is cross-sectoral integration in policy development,
- stakeholders are given a voice in water planning and management, with particular attention to securing the participation of women and the poor.
- water-related decisions made at local and river basin levels are in-line with, or at least do not conflict with, the achievement of broader national objectives, and

¹ Global Water Partnership Technical Advisory Committee, *TEC Background Paper No. 4: Integrated Water Resources Management* (Stockholm: Global Water Partnership, 2000), p. 22.

- water planning and strategies are integrated into broader social, economic, and environmental goals.

In practice, this means giving water an appropriate place on the national agenda; creating greater “water awareness” among decision-makers responsible for economic policy and policy in water-related sectors; creating more effective channels for communication and shared decision-making between government agencies, organizations, interest groups and communities; and encouraging people to think “outside the box” of traditional sectoral definitions.

Advantages of an IWRM approach

Solving problems: Many countries are experiencing water-related problems that are proving intractable to conventional, single-sector approaches. Some possible examples: drought, flooding, groundwater overdraft, water-borne diseases, land and water degradation, on-going damage to ecosystems, chronic poverty in rural areas, and escalating conflicts over water. The solutions to such problems may fall outside of the normal purview of the agencies tasked with addressing them, and usually require cooperation from multiple sectors. In such cases, an IWRM approach makes identifying and implementing effective solutions much easier. It also avoids the all too common situation where solving one problem creates another.

Avoiding poor investments and expensive mistakes: Decision-making based on a short-term, sectoral view is rarely effective in the long-haul and can result in some very expensive mistakes—in terms of unsustainable gains, unforeseen consequences, and lost opportunities.

Investment decisions need to be based on an evaluation of costs and benefits that is both wide-ranging and long-term. They need to consider the economic implications of infrastructure maintenance, water services and potential for cost-recovery, and both short- and long-term environmental impacts. Decision makers also need to consider the prevailing macroeconomic environment, and the way in which macroeconomic policies such as interest and exchange rates affect the insertion of water into development and the sustainability of water utilities. Chile is a good example of how sound macroeconomic policies foster the incorporation of water into developmental processes and the affordability of water utility services.

In short-sighted or sectoral thinking, it is often the environment that comes out the loser—with negative consequences for both social and economic development. For example, in the Aral Sea disaster, where irrigation development resulted in the loss of valuable fisheries, regional climate change, and on-going problems due to the drying up of the sea. An IWRM approach promotes considering environmental impacts from the outset. This avoids the losses associated with unsustainable development and the high costs of undoing the damage later.

Getting the most value for money from investments in infrastructure: Planning, designing and finally managing infrastructure using an IWRM approach ensures maximum returns—both social and economic—on investments. Infrastructure development on its own has limited payoffs; often other ingredients are needed for people to benefit. To take

a very simple example, imagine the situation of one of the growing numbers of female farmers in sub-Saharan Africa, trying to produce food for her children and a basic income from the family plot. She can take advantage of the opportunity provided by irrigation infrastructure only if she and her family are in good health, she is able to enforce her rights to water and reliable irrigation service, and she has access to agricultural inputs, knowledge, markets, credit, and the means to plough, harvest and transport her crops. Integrating water development into larger development planning processes helps insure that investments work together synergistically, producing greater returns than possible through a single-sector approach.

An IWRM approach in designing and managing infrastructure also makes it possible to capitalize on potential synergies. For example, combining fisheries and irrigation systems or developing water supply schemes that provide people with water for domestic *and* productive uses.

Allocating water strategically: Many countries upon examining their current approach to water have found: 1) that they have not been considering allocation strategically enough, in the light of national goals, 2) that water allocation, while left to the lowest appropriate level, needs to be guided by a framework that is conceived at the river basin or national level; and 3) that the links between allocation decisions and national development and economic planning processes are weak or missing.

Strategic allocation requires subordinating the needs of individual sectors and user groups to the larger goals of the society. An IWRM approach frees countries to look at allocation in the context of the “big picture” of sustainable development goals.

Strategic allocation is rarely accomplished through administrative fiat. More commonly it is achieved indirectly—often through gains in water efficiency—using tools such water pricing and tariffs, the introduction of appropriate incentives and subsidies, and the removal of ill-considered incentives and subsidies both inside and outside the water sector. In northern China, the government was able to transfer water out of agriculture to meet the needs of growing cities and industries through an integrated program of water pricing, incentives, and the introduction of technological innovation. Making effective use of the range of “indirect” reallocation tools requires cooperation across sectors.

The role of water efficiency

Improving efficiency in the use of water and related resources (including financial resources) is another way to maximize *the economic and social welfare* derived from such scarce resources, and is an integral part of an IWRM approach. Before simply “providing more water” (often implying construction of new and expensive infrastructure) the first step should be to look for opportunities to improve efficiency. In northern France when cities and industries found their water supply endangered by rapidly dropping water tables due to over abstraction of groundwater, they proposed supply-side solutions—either building a dam on a river 30 miles away and piping water in, or building a desalination plant. The cost? The equivalent of one billion USD for the French taxpayer. But policymakers chose a demand-side solution instead: They imposed a small tax on each cubic meter of water pumped from the aquifer. Confronted with this

tax, industry operators and cities found that they could after all reduce their water consumption, and as a result groundwater use in the area is now sustainable.

The WSSD action target highlights two different aspects of efficiency: one dealing with technical *efficiency* in the use of water; the second dealing with *allocative efficiency*, i.e. the efficiency with which society allocates water and related resources for sustainable social and economic development. The first calls for demand management interventions; the second involves strategic water allocation (as touched on in the preceding section). From an IWRM perspective, both technical and allocative efficiency require recognizing the social and environmental as well as the economic value of water.

Aspects of improving technical efficiency:

User efficiency: User efficiency is often achieved through changes in the behaviour of the users -- for instance through information campaigns, economic incentives and technological means (e.g. metering and retrofitting), generally referred to as “demand management”. In the French example above, efficiency improved as a result of the tax imposed per cubic meter of water taken from the aquifer. In Chile, agricultural water users are motivated to increase their efficiency, not by the cost of water, which is minimal, but by the high value of their crops on the international market. More efficient water use means they are able to irrigate a larger area, thereby increasing production and hence profits.

Water recycling and reuse: Recycling and reuse are already prevalent in most water-scarce basins. For example, in Egypt and North China, it is common practice for farmers to place small pumps in drainage ditches to reuse water. The irrigation agency supports this reuse strategy by blending drainage water with freshwater to increase the useable supplies. The main water management challenges associated with recycling and reuse are controlling pollution, preventing soil and water salinization, and, especially in relation to wastewater reuse, eliminating health risks.

Supply efficiency: Supply efficiency relates to the efficient functioning of irrigation systems, urban water supply schemes and other water infrastructure. Possible interventions to improve supply efficiency include fixing leaks in urban water systems, rehabilitating irrigation systems, and introducing innovations such as drip irrigation and dry sewerage. When implementing interventions to increase supply efficiency in irrigated areas, it is important to keep two things in mind: 1) Because of the prevalence of water recycling and reuse in irrigated systems, efforts to improve supply efficiency need to be considered within an integrated basin context—water that seeps from irrigation canals and fields may in fact be recharging groundwater or supporting ecosystems, and 2) measures to improve supply efficiency need to be accompanied by policies to ensure that the water saved goes to other beneficial uses.

Aspects of improving allocative efficiency:

Allocative efficiency is achieved through a range of measures to ensure allocation of water to the highest value uses -- for example, through water markets, water rights systems or other economic or regulative allocation mechanisms -- as well as through adequate and realistic cost benefit assessment.

Importantly, from an IWRM perspective the determination of the “highest value uses” must take into account social and environmental as well as economic considerations; likewise, costs and benefits need to be assessed in social and environmental as well as economic terms. This means, for example, focusing on the productive and biodiversity values of terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems though ensuring adequate environmental flows through economic or regulatory means. In low-income countries, it also implies a focus on poverty reduction, i.e. how does a society best contribute to increasing access to resources and income-generating opportunities for men and women through water development and management.

IWRM as a tool for change

An IWRM approach requires positive change—in the enabling environment, in institutional roles, and in management instruments. Fundamentally, it is about change in water governance, i.e., the range of political, social, economic and administrative systems that are in place to develop and manage water resources and deliver water services, at different levels of society.

It would be easy for policy makers and practitioners faced with the prospect of wholesale governance change to conclude that it is all too complex with too many difficult trade-offs and choices to make. But adopting IWRM needn't mean throwing everything away and starting over. More often it means adapting and building on existing institutions and planning procedures to achieve a more integrated approach.

Most countries that have honestly evaluated their current water situation have chosen to move towards an IWRM approach. They found that sectoral approaches were in fact failing to deliver in a number of key areas. In Malaysia, sectoral approaches proved unable to effectively allocate scarce water, control flooding or pollution, and protect the environment. In Costa Rica, they were failing to address conflicts in water use, environmental issues, and flooding. In Yemen, they were unable to stop severe groundwater mining or to help revitalize a stagnating economy.

These countries, and others, have recognized that effectively addressing such issues is essential for the welfare of the people and the prosperity of the country. A more integrated holistic approach that considers water strategically in the context of different institutional systems; different, often competing uses, and the scarcity of resources lies at the heart of sustainable development.

DEVELOPING AN IWRM STRATEGY TO SPARK AND GUIDE CHANGE

Creating an IWRM strategy is an opportunity for countries to take a coherent, as opposed to an ad hoc, approach to improving how they develop, manage and use water resources to further sustainable development goals.

Some countries may choose to begin by considering the various ways in which water resources development and management have the potential to advance or hinder

development goals. Others may choose a more targeted approach and focus on specific water-related problems that are hampering the achievement of goals.

Countries may choose to create new strategies from scratch, build on existing IWRM or water plans, or incorporate water into current national development strategies.

Regardless of the initial approach, strategies should go beyond the actions needed to solve current problems or to achieve immediate objectives. They should aim at nothing less than institutionalizing changes that will promote more strategic and coordinated decision-making on an on-going basis.

Key messages from the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) action target

Article 26 of the WSSD Plan of Implementation, in addition to calling for the development of IWRM and water efficiency strategies by 2005, also includes a number of specific recommendations on the issues such strategies should address and to some extent how they should be addressed. Countries have to evaluate which recommendations are useful to them and which are irrelevant or low-priority. Some generic messages derived from Article 26 that are useful in developing a strategy include:

- Strategies should help countries and regions move towards integrated water management and more efficient use of water resources—employing the full range of policy instruments.
- Strategies should cover institutional, financial and technological change and promote action at all levels.
- The river (or water) basin should be used as the basic unit for integrating management.
- Strategies should give priority to meeting basic human needs, and take extra care to ensure access for the poor.
- Strategies should address the challenge of balancing the need to restore and protect ecosystems with the needs of other water users (see Box 4: Meeting the water for environment challenge).
- Stakeholder participation, capacity-building, monitoring performance, and improving accountability of public institutions and private companies are all elements of an effective strategy.
- Strategies should respect and be adapted to local conditions.

Choosing an entry point

In theory, a comprehensive approach that seeks to optimize water's contribution to sustainable development across the board should have a greater impact. In practice, starting with concrete issues can yield better results. Being too ambitious at the outset—ignoring the political, social and capacity problems that must be solved for effective implementation—can result in a strategy that looks great on paper but doesn't translate

into doable actions. Experience suggests that major initial reforms are not essential to catalyzing change—first steps that can easily be implemented are often enough to begin the process of moving towards more sustainable water development and management.

According to an informal GWP survey, countries that have made the most progress towards more integrated and sustainable approaches to water have often started by focusing on specific water challenges associated with development goals. South Africa developed one of the most progressive approaches to water in the world, by focusing first on the challenge of providing every citizen with access to good quality drinking water.

This type of “problem-based” approach more readily leads to an action strategy based on tangible and immediate issues and can help win broad public support. However, it can also lead to a dead-end or to the same kind of myopic decision-making found in more sectoral approaches. The keys to avoiding these dangers are to ensure that the strategy is firmly linked to larger sustainable development goals and that the objective is not simply to solve a particular problem but to take the opportunity to put into place processes that will facilitate better water development and management decisions on an on-going basis.

Some possible entry points:

- Countries concentrating on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals might take the need to harmonize water resource development and management to achieve this overall set of goals and targets as their entry point.
- Other countries might wish to focus on remedying a recurrent water-related problem hampering national development—such as reducing vulnerability to droughts and floods by enhancing coping strategies, both structural and non-structural.
- Industrialized countries may focus first on ways to remedy unsustainable situations and to mitigate environmental costs of past policies.
- Countries sharing transboundary rivers—particularly those located downstream of powerful neighbours—might focus initially on the challenges relating to sharing water resources (see Box 6), not just as an added level of integration but as a potential catalyst to more efficient and effective national decision-making.
- Small Island Developing States may choose to focus on coastal zone management—developing management links between freshwater and coastal resources.

In countries lacking the broad political support needed to get the process of creating a IWRM strategy off the ground, it may be effective to define a geographic entry point—focusing on one or two areas where water problems are particularly acute and using them as pilot cases to demonstrate IWRM’s effectiveness.

Defining issues and setting priorities

Once an entry point has been agreed upon, the key substantive issues radiating out from that point need to be identified. It is particularly important to consider the possible role of other resources—such as land, energy, fisheries, forests, livestock—and other sectors—

such as agriculture, tourism, transportation, environment, health, education, finance, industry—in addressing the problem or issue.

STEPS TOWARDS INTEGRATION

Once a country, region or city has determined where it wants to go—in terms of goals, objectives and priorities—the next step is to figure out how to get there along the specific IWRM change areas. What changes in policies, institutions, and practices are needed to make integrated solutions, sustainable management, and better decision-making a reality? This means looking at the enabling environment, institutional roles and management instruments.

While the specific changes needed will vary from place to place depending on the current governance framework and the goals to be achieved, there are two fundamental questions that need to be addressed: 1) how to promote more coordinated decision-making across sectors and 2) how to improve communication between levels of decision-making, from the water user to local water management organizations to basin and national decision-making structures.

Creating links across scales

Moving towards a more integrated management of water resources will require vigorous work at many levels, from household/community to regional/global levels. Importantly, actions at one level will need to be reinforced by actions at other levels. Local actions are and will always be necessary, but may often not be sufficient. National policies, for example, will clearly be needed to provide the appropriate enabling environment for initiatives at the municipal level. While the Dublin Principles properly stress that decisions should always be taken at the lowest appropriate level, it is important to recognize that the lowest appropriate level may vary significantly from case to case – in transboundary water basins, for example, the appropriate level for many decisions will need to be international. All this highlights the importance of creating links across scales – i.e., integrating vertically -- to achieve lasting results.

Creating links across sectors

Many organisations whose primary function is not water management are responsible for sectors where the impact of, and on water resources can be enormous—agriculture, industry, trade, and energy are examples. Similarly water resources organisations need to consider issues, such as environment or tourism, that lie within the domain of other agencies.

Institutional structures vary from country to country, but whatever the specific structure, it is essential to have mechanisms for dialogue and co-ordination to ensure some measure of integration. A balance has to be met between providing a fully integrated approach where specific issues may get lost due to lack of expertise or interest, and a sectoral

approach where different policies are followed without any heed to needs and impacts in other sectors.

To some extent, the very process of creating a strategy should bring water-related sectors together and begin the process of cementing more formal ties. But it is important that the strategy formulate clear links between decision-making processes in water-related sectors. In terms of generating support, it is helpful if the strategy can demonstrate how changes can contribute to key objectives in water-related sectors.

In some cases governments have created new organizations, or significantly changed the mandate of existing ones as part of IWRM reform—apex bodies and river basin (or catchment) organizations are the most common examples. Reasons for establishing such bodies include: encouraging coordinated action on water and related issues, such as land management, across sectors and/or decision-making levels and encouraging more participatory management of resources.

However, experience shows that the formation of apex or river basin organizations alone will not guarantee an IWRM approach—they must also be supported by appropriate policies, legislation and capacity building. Nor is the formation of such bodies essential to ensure an IWRM approach. Other options include strengthening coordination on water issues between existing sector-based agencies or placing water under the purview of an agency with a broad natural resources mandate. For example, in Vietnam, water falls under the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment.

This section focuses on organizations to transfer information and coordinate activities. However, it should be noted that another type of institution, namely the market, can also provide information to users and affect their behaviour; pricing, subsidies and marketable rights can also play a role.

Apex bodies:

Apex bodies consist of a range of entities such as high-level steering groups within national governments, inter-agency task forces (for specific purposes, e.g. water pollution control), and international consortia for the management of water resources. . In Mexico, the formation of the National Water Commission (CAN) under the Ministry of Environment has proved to be one of the keys to dealing with the country's unsustainable groundwater use. Without the power to transcend state boundaries and independence from the powerful farmer voting block, the CNA would not have been able to implement many of the needed groundwater reforms

Lessons in establishing apex bodies from the GWP ToolBox:

- Successful experience to date in establishing robust and respected apex bodies is limited.
- Establishment of a successful apex or coordinating body can be a slow process, since it takes time for a new body to achieve legitimacy
- The effectiveness of an apex body is linked to the specific political and historical context.

- For an apex body to function effectively, all the stakeholders who are involved in the functions under its jurisdiction need to develop commitment to it and ensure it has appropriate powers. Conflict management and awareness raising techniques are important here.

River basin organizations:

River basin organisations (RBOs) deal with the water resource management issues in a river basin, a lake basin, or across an important aquifer. They can be useful in transcending administrative divisions within countries as well as national boundaries. River basin organisations provide a mechanism for ensuring that land use and needs are reflected in water management—and vice versa. Their functions range from water allocation, resource management and planning; to education of basin communities; to developing natural resources management strategies and programs of remediation of degraded lands and waterways. They may also play a role in consensus building, facilitation, and conflict management

The Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) is one of the best known examples of a successful river basin organization. The TVA is responsible for a range of water-related activities—minimizing flood risk, maintaining navigation, providing recreational opportunities, protecting water quality, and generating power—within the Tennessee river basin, a 106,000 km² area encompassing parts of seven states.

ENSURING EFFECTIVE IMPLEMENTATION

In the end, success or failure depends on the ability to catalyze change. This is what matters—not the specific process, not the form of the strategy, but whether or not positive action results.

Avoiding non-action

In 1995, Nicaragua began the preparation of an National Water Action Plan which would address the challenges of integrated water management within the existing institutional, legislative, economic, political and technical framework of the country. At the end of 29 months, the project issued its final reports, consisting of 13 volumes dealing with, inter alia, policy, legislation, institutional aspects, economic instruments, technical issues and the Action Plan recommendations themselves.

Subsequent follow-up to Plan has been minimal, despite the active participation of relevant institutions in the execution of the project activities the preparation of project reports. So why has the action plan not resulted in any action? One of the factors identified by the project implementers was failure to establish effective follow-up mechanisms needed to ensure that momentum is not lost after project closure. Another possible reason is that the Action Plan was approached as a “project” the output of which was a written plan rather than actual action.

Defining a transition strategy to move from the current situation to the future desired scenarios in terms of the specific IWRM change areas with milestones and timeframes, is another important component for guaranteeing action. This should include the way in which existing approaches will be modified to bring them in line with the desired new approach, indicators to measure impacts, and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of the transition.

Linking to other national plans and strategies is another way to encourage action and guarantee the relevance of the strategy. Examples of relevant plans and strategies an IWRM strategy should link to include:

- National Five Year Plans or Sustainable Development Strategies,
- National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans,
- National Plans to Combat Desertification,
- Country poverty reduction strategy papers (PRSPs), and
- National Plans on women's development and empowerment
- National strategies to meet Millennium Development Goals.

Enacting reforms

Change can be painful and is often resisted as it makes people feel insecure even if they understand the need. Often good laws or revised procedures can fail as they are not understood or accepted by officials or citizens. Institutional reform needs to be done with a participatory and consultative approach, involving the formal and informal sectors, to develop understanding and ownership of the change process. Reforming policies and practices for water management is highly political and involves making difficult trade-offs. Some stakeholders will win and other will lose.

While each country must decide how to enact reform—depending on its current situation and what it wants to achieve in the future, experience collected in the IWRM ToolBox provides some basic lessons:

- Reforms should be done in a coherent and integrative way and suit the broader social and political policies of the country.
- Trying to enact too many reforms too quickly can provoke resistance. A more effective approach is to decide on priorities and a measured sequence of actions to suit those priorities.
- Avoid unrealistic reforms that are not politically or socially acceptable.
- Raising awareness, sharing information and meaningful participatory debate are key elements of any reform process.
- Reform is a dynamic, iterative process and the only certainty is change itself.

- Vested interests and special interest groups should be included in debates but decision-makers should avoid being ‘captured’ by special interest groups.
- In any reform, regulation of service providers, both public and private, is a key element and regulators must be independent and strong.
- Reforms should avoid confusing the roles of resource management (government responsibility) and service provision (public or privately operated utilities)
- Water governance reforms must not be limited to the water sector, but must take into account other sectors that impact and are impacted by water decision-making.

PROMOTING GLOBAL LEARNING AND SHARING RESULTS THROUGH THE WWF-4 PROCESS

Implementing IWRM strategies is a process of trial and error. There are no universal blueprints or prescriptions. However, countries and communities can draw on existing tools and learn from each other’s experiences—thereby increasing their chances of success.

The World Water Forum can play a key role in this process of global learning. To initiate this process, the GWP proposes that all countries should share their strategies at the Fourth World Water Forum in Mexico. This Forum could thus serve as a “repository” of the efforts of the global community to meet the directive of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation. In addition, subsequent volumes of the World Water Development Report (starting with the third volume, to be initiated in 2006) should address the implementation of these strategies. In this way, the WWDR could serve as a mechanism to help monitor the progress that countries make along the road towards more integrated approaches to the management of resources to meet their national development goals.

In particular, the Forum should seek to advance efforts to move towards more integrated approaches at the community, national and international levels:

- At the community level, fostering work with communities to design and implement measures to reach the communities' own integrated strategies. Documenting the experiences of these initiatives will be an important contribution to the Forum.
- At the national level, fostering multi-stakeholder efforts to develop national IWRM and Water Efficiency Strategies, and documenting these experiences so that lessons learned from these experiences can be utilized elsewhere. These efforts, like the ones described in the previous bullet, strongly support the Forum’s main focus on “Local Actions for a Global Challenge.”
- At the global level, the 4th World Water Forum and its preparatory process can provide a springboard for promoting efforts to catalyze change among key water sector actors – from Ministers to community groups.

The Forum should use the preparatory process towards these ends, by promoting the following events:

- Working with local stakeholders to organize local workshops around the key actions needed to catalyze the preparation of integrated community level approaches
- Using the opportunities presented by the Forum process to ensure that Ministers are aware of the Johannesburg Plan of Implementation action target, through meetings, workshops and panel discussions.
- Working with Regional Multi-Stakeholder Committees to discuss the preparation of IWRM strategies at the regional level with a view to developing regional strategies and actions.
- Increasing awareness of region-specific challenges and building regional multi-stakeholder coalitions for accelerated action.

The meeting itself might include the following types of events:

- Workshops to share lessons from community level initiatives, and showcasing of local projects amenable to rapid scaling-up
- Discussions of lessons and experience that could be transferred between and among industrialized and developing countries – i.e., south-south, north-north, south – north & north – south
- Presentation or workshop at the ministerial conference on the challenges that have emerged in the preparatory process as most salient.