

## **MINUTES OF THE FINAL ISDC MEETING**

Jouy-le-Moutier, France  
Veolia Environment Campus

**ISDC ATTENDEES:** Imane Abdel Al, Maureen Ballestero, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Axel Dourojeanni, Carlo Galli, John Langford, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer, Hao Xin

**Secretariat:** Lisa Wajnorowski Downes, Alexis Morgan, Rodger O'Connell, Adrian Sym, Nicole Tanner

**ISDC APOLOGIES:** Shahid Ahmad, Peter Cookey, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Jiseon Park

### **MINUTES:**

#### **Update on AWS Verification System**

- Will use 3<sup>rd</sup> party to ensure rigor.
- Will also be a limited time where sites can self-report - to enable quicker uptake of system
- It will be a 3 year certificate with a full audit in year one and then annual surveillance audits after. This may be made more frequent based on the "risk" of the site or based on the risk assessed in the initial audit.
  - "Risk" will be a combination of several factors, still to be determined: risk of corruption, familiarity with audits, physical water risk, major stakeholder concerns, etc
- Hoping to work with an accreditation body that will monitor the quality of certification bodies/auditors.
- Will allow for group certification with a combination of full system based audits, and smaller sampling.
- Still discussing how corporate claims will relate to the AWS Standard certifications
- Traceability: no end product will be certified or have claims attached.
  - But in future it is possible with short supply chain
- Expect to have draft of the Verification System in February. Then AWS will trial run in a couple of situations allowing it to become operational in Q3 or Q4 of 2014.
  - Still need to finalize metrics for collecting and measuring data over time. This ties into the AWS M&E Impacts work.
- Equivalency-AWS is working with EWS on how and where the two systems are equivalent.
  - Note that there is concern the international standard could be made "weaker" in equivalency efforts
  - Note that ISDC has the final say over what is in the Standard, nothing can be made weaker without ISDC approval.

#### **Brief update on AWS training and membership**

- Training program is being developed for launch in April 2014
- Membership will open in April 2014

#### **Discussion on Terms of Reference-SEE FLIP CHART (0, 1, 2 needs attention etc)**

- For Small/Medium Enterprises in Lesser Developed and More Developed Countries

- Note that making the Standard work for SMEs might make it too easy on larger companies.
- How could we link stewardship to the amount of resources available?
- How can we link stewardship to the kind of resources that may be available (i.e. a large company in a resource deficient area)
  - This issue of data poor areas will be discussed later as well

## Discussion of Stakeholder Feedback

High-level discussion on what needs more attention during this meeting:

- Would like to discuss how a collective approach to water stewardship may have better results than working alone. Those that don't see an immediate need to work on water stewardship may discover the urgency once engaged. We must make it relevant for them (for all). Guidance on how and what different type of sites can do is essential.
- Would like to place a higher emphasis and value on a site's coordination and outreach efforts in the watershed.
- Would like to discuss what is enough-expectations for achievements
- Some criteria are seen as static. This needs to be addressed in order to allow for continuous improvement.
- There is some confusion over what is required and what is guidance
- Would like more information or case studies that speak to municipalities
- The language used should apply to/resonate with the public sector
- Much more information is needed to explain what a company is expected to do, and then how we define appropriate stakeholder engagement.
  - It is a narrow definition right now.
  - It should be incorporated earlier in the steps (into step 2)
  - Who can be defined as a stakeholder based on site's perspective (i.e. may not consider local government or civil society as stakeholders etc)
- Impact, how a company classifies their impact and how the public perceives impact may not align, give more guidance.
- More guidance on IWRAs
- More guidance on how to define the catchment
- Need to better articulate the economic benefits of water stewardship
- Consider mentioning monitoring earlier in the steps to facilitate budgeting
- Provide clarity on 'strong performance'
- Provide more guidance on risk and impact
- Consider if it's necessary to get the CEO level commitment in step 1, it may hinder participation for minimal gain
- Guidance (expectations and "sufficiency");
- IWRAs
- Emphasis on continuous improvement (vs. static)
- Disclosure – confidence in reported information
- Need success and proof of concept via pilot tests (to ensure willingness to engage) ☑ AWS
- Foreign standards and uptake within certain countries

- Mentioning shared information platforms
- Gathering and sharing information and data burden on first sites in a catchment
- Challenges of transboundary catchments
- Level of effort to “do” the standard (not content, but amount of time/work)
- Difficulty defining boundaries (guidance on defining scope)
- Social issues: limitation to water issues (not general gender, health, etc. issues). Need for guidance on “water-related” issues
- Water quality & balance: testing methodology and temporal aspects need rigour
- Do we re-visit a new step around analysis (Criterion 2.9)
- WASH & public health
- Indirect water use
- Stakeholder engagement (transparency of identifying and engaging actors) – how, who and when in Standard (guidance)
- Definition of risk
- Economic contribution and valuation
- Supporting (vs. re-inventing) public sector policy & influencing governance
- Focus on infrastructure
- Language for all sectors
- Monitoring earlier in steps
- Vague concepts “strong performance”

## CONTENT AREA DISCUSSIONS

### “water-related” social issues

Commenters have asked what we consider “water-related” social issues, how to define them and to increase their presence in the Standard.

#### ISDC discussion

- These issues should be determined by the local context through stakeholder engagement and should be in the guidance for auditors to make sure stakeholder engagement has been included in the stewardship effort.
- Keep in mind that an international standard will be more successful if less prescriptive, but align with other existing programs (WBCSD, etc)
- There are different kinds of organizations, where issues like WASH are integral to their business (i.e. water service providers)
  - Should there be a special part of the standard just for these organizations?
  - These businesses shouldn’t receive advanced credit for these activities
- At a minimum, site should understand how the local community has access to water services (safe water and sanitation). Would like to see the standard drive access to improved water services.
- Should we get prescriptive on what water-related social issues include? Or should we let it come from stakeholder engagement?
- Note that these issues go beyond WASH, i.e. untreated waste’s effect on public health
  - Indigenous water rights
  - Access to water in the catchment
  - All included in 2.2/2.5 and guidance – change standard to speak more to social issues?
    - Will it limit uptake if it’s in standard?
    - What about the Human Right to water and sanitation?
- Social issues are not limited to “disadvantaged peoples”
  - Suggest in guidance-people look at social economic impact and then the site should engage with groups that are less equipped to deal with these issues themselves.
    - Look at all the impact on all these groups that you are causing.
      - Negative example: displacement
      - Positive example: supportive of creating new sources of income, or employment.
- **Proposal:**
  - **In Core Criteria-WASH should be included at the site level-to your employees/workers-this is the responsibility of company as an employer.**
    - Use WBCSD language.
  - **Advanced-provision of WASH beyond site.**
  - **Guidance-add guidance to qualify what this type of engagement looks like, and for certain sectors like water service providers what expectations are.**

## Higher levels of performance

Commenters are wondering how we will incentivize sites to move to higher levels of performance.

ISDC discussion:

- There may be a perceived expectation that the Standard must be achieved perfectly right away. However, it was always intended to facilitate the stewardship journey. The site's plan should help them gradually become a good water steward. And the audit should not penalize the site for step wise water stewardship performance.
- **Proposal: no change needed in Standard. Clarify in scope and plan guidance**

## Stakeholder Engagement

Commenters and beta sites ask for more guidance on who to engage and how. Also, how much engagement is enough? General consensus is that stakeholder engagement criteria and related indicators should show up earlier in the steps.

ISDC discussion:

BASIC PROCESS:

- Identify stakeholders
- Analyze them-do I influence them, influenced by
- 'engage' them/introductions if necessary, and introduce the topic (water stewardship plan and activities)
- Understand stakeholder concerns
- Incorporate stakeholder's ideas/**concerns** into the stewardship plan
  - Performance indicator: Is the implementer addressing the concerns of the stakeholders (not ignoring)

PURPOSE:

- To bridge gap of actions and meeting stakeholder concerns
  - Do you have a procedure to deliver the purpose of stakeholder engagement?

OUTSTANDING QUESTIONS:

- how is it phrased in the standard that a site is actually taking into considerations the concerns of stakeholders?
- What is material/must be included in stewardship plan?
- What are the suggested methods?
- How do we ensure engagement is specific/relevant to water stewardship?
- In 3.2 should we make sure the targets are agreed on by stakeholders or ecologically driven?

LANGUAGE

- Core:
  - Expect to contact stakeholders, inform them of issues, consult/dialogue with stakeholders.

- Decision making remains with site.
- Key words “dialoguing with” “identifying” “informing” “contacting”.
- “Consult” is only for use with FPIC
- Advanced level:
  - consensus

**Proposal:**

- **2.2 Guidance**
  - Word change “easiest” to “suggested” method
- **3.2 Standard**
  - Add bullet:
    - “A narrative that speaks to stakeholder concerns and how your plan will address those concerns”
- **3.2.1 Standard**
  - “Available plan that meets all component requirements and addresses stakeholder concerns”
- **4 and 4.3 Guidance**
  - Clarify that these actions can be done individually and/or done in a collective way with other stakeholders
- **4.2, 4.3, 4.4 Standard**
  - Edit typo to reference 3.2 (instead of 3.1)
- **5.6 is linked to 3.5 Standard and Guidance**
  - Use same language
    - Currently written, 5.6 is not about giving more power to stakeholders or reaching a consensus. It’s about the additional effort into stakeholder interaction.
    - **Propose:**
      - In guidance 5.6 is the plan will be re-evaluated on information from 3.5 (continuous improvement).
      - Eliminate ‘advanced’ and ‘particularly strong’
      - This should be used to get more formal evaluation on your plan, to feed into 3.5 re-evaluation of your plan. Engagement in 5.6 is more robust with the types of stakeholders and on specific topics within your water stewardship plan. Intent: removes misunderstanding and links to 3.5, speaks the same language (and not built from ground 0)
- **Stakeholder Engagement Guidance at beginning of Guidance section**
  - examples of what stakeholder concerns look like
  - more on who is a stakeholder and what their roles are (particularly important in regions not as familiar with stakeholder engagement)
  - how to address stakeholder concerns (do not have to duplicate activities)
  - examples of processes, procedures
  - add ‘ladder of participation’ diagram
- **SECRETARIAT WILL DRAFT CHANGES AND CIRCULATE FOR ADDITIONAL INPUT**

## Risk

Commenters and beta sites noted the need to link/prioritize water stewardship activities to the level of risk they face **and requested more guidance on how to prioritize.**

### ISDC discussion

- Reorganize step 2 to more accurately address risk
- Note: understand how this change might affect compliance.
  - What if the site performs “poor” on catchment quality etc, but ok on other requirements? Will the meet that criteria or have partial non-compliance? It was clearer in the previous version. We just need to have messaging on how it will work with this new step 2 format.
- Shared risk: there are different reasons to work on shared risk. Doesn’t necessarily mean you engage share risk issues at the same level you would for those at a site level financial risk.
- Risk (risk that the site is exposed to; risk that the site creates for others)
  - Site description
  - Stakeholder engagement & agreement
- Definitions: water risk, risk (+ explain concepts of shared water risk & contributed water risk) NOTE: Revisit “risk” go back to International standard; - ISO 31000 (Risk Management) internal vs. external; physical/reputational/regulatory.
- Measurement guidance
  - Identify
  - Measure (hazard, probability, impact) – guidance on quantification of impact
  - List out generic types of risk (drought, floods, infrastructure breakdown, social license, health, cultural infringement, drinking water – WHO guidelines and risk mgmt)
  - Priority setting of risk mitigation (matrix)
- Clarity on 3.2 & 3.5 (template in 3.2) – re-order?
- Cross cutting guidance? (stakeholder engagement, risk management, )
- Re-structuring step 2
  - 2.9 is inward looking; 2.10 is shared risk
- To discuss: disclosure & creation of reputational risk
- Stakeholder conflict as a form of risk
- Shared risk (may have different motivations & impacts on the issues); define in guidance; people may engage differently in addressing shared risk (your contribution may look different); existing definitions of shared water risk.

### Proposal:

- **Update glossary definition of Risk from ISO 31000**
- **Reorganize Step 2 to better account for risk**
- **Add guidance on quantification of impact**
- **Update template in 3.2 to better link to risk**
- **Add guidance on shared risk implications.**

## Performance

- Stakeholder engagement as primary “firewall” to maintain performance requirements/thresholds.
- Concerns around reference to no further growth/use of water if water scarcity/pollution is too great. Can we require certain actions in such cases (e.g., no net increase of water consumption within catchment)?
- Guidance: in cases where stakeholders do not provide a “reasonable” cross-check (“anti-corporate”/belligerent”), sites have the option to demonstrate performance in terms of benchmarking & context.
- How to reward going “above and beyond basic compliance/performance”? → change “strong” to “best in class” (site must prove; points according to performance percentile). Leshia flagged concern?
- Allow replenish as advanced criterion? Yes, possibly, but use rigorous checks on such exercises such as Gold Standard WBC.
- Offsets- ‘no net-increases’
- Concerned with “best in class” terminology
  - Making use of other and better technologies etc might be better

### Proposal:

- **Modify guidance: Remove reference to no further growth/use of water if water scarcity/pollution is too great, BUT require certain actions in such cases (e.g., no net increase of water consumption within catchment)**
- **Modify guidance: Stress primary (stakeholder) and secondary (best in class) mechanisms for performance.**

## Advocacy

Commenters and beta sites have asked whether or not advocacy as written in the Beta Standard is feasible for sites, especially small and medium sized-enterprises. It was also asked whether or not it is appropriate for sites to engage in that kind of advocacy in all political environments, and therefore belongs in advanced level criterion.

### ISDC discussion:

- What do we mean when we say ‘advocacy’?
  - More to it than advocacy (to supporting public policy)
    - Promote advocacy on public policy that is linked to water stewardship
    - Maybe this is in the next iteration of standard when we learn more from implementation
- Should there be a requirement in core to ‘collaborate’ instead of engage in ‘advocacy’?
  - This might be more achievable for SMEs
- Should the requirement be to demonstrate awareness and appreciation with the public sector?
- Can the sites work with stakeholders to change the law?
  - Is this at advanced level?
- Should we support advocacy for things that aren’t in regulation but maybe should be?
  - i.e. water reallocation permitting, or a cap on water use
- Does this stay within the remit of AWS membership and not in the Standard?
- What about advocacy’s role in promoting actions that are not mandatory (i.e. monitoring).
  - I’m doing this not only for my benefit but because it will lead to improvement in government requirements?
- Should link to other public policy initiatives
- What about in scenarios where there is well-written and respected water act, but capacity to enact the law is lacking?
  - Is this different from coordination/collaboration?
- Some core water stewardship actions are considered by the public sector. There is a gap between why private sector is doing water stewardship and what the public sector is doing.
  - Invite government to sit at the table to see how the issue is important-stakeholder engagement
- Could collective action be strengthened in 4.5?
- Note that adding more requirements may burden smaller sites too much
- 

### Proposal:

- **Advocacy on “public sector”-not in standard.**
- **Advocacy on water stewardship-should be in standard**
  - **Can be addressed by clarification and examples in the guidance**
  - **Issues are identified as a risk, but there isn’t a governance mechanism to address should be addressed collectively with other stakeholders**
- **Examples to include in guidance: cap/water saved, LAC water footprinting (from Axel) (note in EU, water footprinting is not a policy tool)**
- **Add to 4.1 a requirement for the site to report *back to the governing authority* what their experience was implementing the regulations/policies, what if any constraints they experienced**

- Intent is to allow for learning in policy/regulation process
  - “I’m complying with this regulation, but please here what constraints we are facing while complying”
- 4.10 should include advocacy
- For core, stick with language: comply, report, advise, propose/lobby
- Advocate-bilateral, lobby in congress, appeal to local groups, advocate on specific topics, disclosure
- Already have criteria 4.10, 4.15, 4.16
  - Add to guidance so that it is clear this is an important part of making water stewardship work. Help sites understand how it fits in with site’s work.
- Guidance-examples of what would satisfy criteria
- Would like words of public policy added to guidance
- More guidance on what is good water stewardship in general
- *Should be taken up by AWS too, membership of AWS*

Quick issues

| Issue                                   | Proposal/recommendation   |
|---|---|
| Water-related social issues             | Define a list in guidance to consider (stakeholder criteria as disadvantaged groups; flag under new 2.2/2.5- impacts)<br>WASH Criteria added.   |
| Explicit ties to catchment goals        | Covered in updated Step 2 + 3.2   |
| Economic contribution                   | Include in new Criterion 2.5B; Disclosure? AWS?   |
| Efficiency/water recycling              | Include in guidance (3.2)?  |
| Groundwater                             | Include in catchment boundary definition; include in guidance where relevant  |
| Transboundary catchments                | Include in guidance where relevant (note under 2.1 Scope – for cases where boundaries cross borders) + stakeholder engagement, governance, etc. + AWS? Update distinction of Sphere of Influence (vs. impact/impacted)  |
| Issue                                   | Proposal/recommendation   |
| Worker health                           | Covered in WASH criterion . Guidance on OHAS /Food Safety/Indigenous Rights/ Landuse/Chemicals/Water quality within 2.5 (“water-related risk; legislation”). Flag within guidance of verification (catch cases where water-related issues are being ignored). |
| Benefit & opportunity                   | Covered in updated/new Criterion 2.5A/B   |
| Vague language (“strong”/“significant”, | See discussion on Performance (“best in class”). To be continued (note Lesh’s concerns). Link to ISO 14001 (paraphrase and reference, but add   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| “adequate”)  | stakeholder IMPACT); link adequate to regulatory standards + stakeholders.   |
| Infrastructure                                       | Include in Step 2 as risk factor in list (water related; natural & built)  |
| Definition of impact                                 | Defer to the Secretariat to handle in glossary + updated Step 2 guidance (how & stakeholder)   |
| IWRA   | Guidance & examples: legally defined; stakeholder engagement; ecosystem services (natural infrastructure); write out everywhere to not confused with IWRM  |
| Indirect Water Use                                   | Consider AWS recommendation  |
| Specific testing/ methods around quant/quality/IWRAs | Standard: “per time unit” to “per month at a minimum” (“adequately reflects the variability”)<br>Standard?/Guidance: “credible water quality testing methods” e.g., ISO standards for water quality testing? |
| Disclosure   | 6.2 Plan → performance; 6.3 Opps/Risk/mitigation → focus on catchment mitigation actions from 3.2  |
| Advanced Level Criteria                              | Review with ISDC to add/delete/modify  |

Explicit ties to catchment goals

- **Updated step 2 and 3.2 will cover this.**

- 

Economic Contribution

- **Part of risk evaluation**
- **Some in disclosure**
- **2.5**

- 

Efficiency and Water Recycling

- Usually companies have performance targets on this
- Should it be included in the scope of the standard?
- Does it make sense to introduce an indicator on this?
  - Total amount of water is focus
  - Site choose recycling, efficiency etc as their metric (
- **Proposal: it is a method of addressing water balance and including would be too prescriptive**
- **Include in guidance**

Groundwater and transboundary

- We need to make it clear that groundwater is fundamental part of water use and therefore is mandatory to include. While global groundwater information is not always available, I would argue that in my sites I know more about this than catchment info
- Should change in the standard

- Old 2.13 and 2.14 or in step 4 only talk about flow and surface water. Recommend to try and come up with an indicator here that says 'show possibility of replenishment' or some sort of recharge of groundwater aquifers.
- Will be added as an AND but TBD 'later' with other changes in the standard
- **Proposal for Groundwater:**
  - **Link to definition of catchment boundary- groundwater is included**
  - **Be sure to include in scope definition process**
  - **Change glossary definition of catchment**
  - **Note to include in Guidance: catchment authority may be different than groundwater management authority** (from AD, might be regional guidance but needs to be noted)
- Need to flag issue of transboundary catchments
  - As guidance issues w/in boundary definitions
  - Transboundary catchments are not just cross-national borders. But also in countries that are organized in federal states or those that have defined views on catchment boundaries. Because there are political connotations then it is important to make clear what the issue is for the standard. To note governance and stakeholder issues. But might make easier to get measurements.
  - Note that depending on a site's scope and sphere of influence boundaries, transboundary issues might not be apply
- **Proposal for transboundary issues**
  - **Add transboundary to guidance where it may cause issues**
    - **In scope, boundary, stakeholders and governance, catchment engagement**
  -

#### Worker Health

- occupational health and safety issues?
- be more defined as water stewardship-related
- nuance /caution in guidance. Water stewardship-related regs. But DON'T want to say WHY they don't do ALL of the other laws.
- Note: auditor needs to know the laws that MAY apply and then should do a gap analysis
  - Obvious laws that may have IMPLICATIONS but not directly related:
    - Examples of legislation to be considered: food safety, indigenous rights, forestry and REDD, land use, chemicals, occupational health and safety, water quality.
- **Proposal**
  - **Handled with new WASH and other social issues section**
  - **Provide examples in guidance**

#### Vague language

- Strong performance, significant, adequate
- **Proposal**
  - **Change to:**
    - **Best in class/close language TBD**
    - **Adequate-based on benchmarking**
      - **Adequacy**
        - **Stakeholder verified (?)**
          - **Naivasha permit example**

- **Significant-benchmarking industry expectations (secondary), stakeholder verified (primary)**
  - Who determines that is contextual-primary is stakeholder, secondary is industry benchmark
  - Reference 14001, use definition from ISO
    - Include stakeholder component

#### Infrastructure

- **Proposal**
  - To be noted in step 2 and then check if 'adequate'
  - Include in guidance - a list of things to be considered
    - Built and natural infrastructure
    - All infrastructure should be water related

#### Definition of Impact

- Should we add stakeholder approach like we've done on 'adequate'?
- **Proposal**
  - Step 2-translate risk into impact
  - For secretariat to do then discuss with a sub-sect of the ISDC, then confirm with the whole group
  - No additional change to standard required

#### IWRA

Comments received -on term itself, how to identify, are they pre-defined, how much stakeholders are involved etc.

- **Proposal**
  - Include examples and explicit in guidance
  - Suggest keep term
    - Legally define, identify it through stakeholder engagement, areas that perform ecosystem services/services to ecosystems (including important drinking water areas)
  - Note:
    - Must write out each time, people are confusing it with IWRM

#### Indirect water

- Site's ability to address indirect water must be taken into consideration
  - There could be many inputs for a site's primary goods/services, do you have to do analyze it all?
  - If you don't look at all of the indirect water, are you offsetting your impact?
- The standard can't cover everything. But maybe part of AWS's remit is to evaluate certification applications with other related issues-are you using child labor, are you dumping waste etc.
- Suggest a change in step 2 that addresses the contextual impact of indirect water (that purchasing /disposal can have on a land area/people)-something that gets to output issues and links stronger through Supply Chain.
- Need to think about how to encourage innovation (Levi's consumer washing example).

- Add to guidance-how water stewardship can be promoted with product downstream –advance level criteria-to influence behavior downstream
- **Proposal**
  - **To make the Standard attainable at core level, we need to restrict the scope. That restriction will be within the catchment or to what is clearly under control of site (can influence it)**
  - **Change definition: to include output**
  - **Need output definition-product for recycling or discharge?**
    - **Outsourcing things out that requires water (recycling, laundry)**
  - **Add definition of direct water use-note we have definition for water use, cross reference**

#### **Specific Testing/Methods around quantity quality:**

- Should we modify the Standard to specify per month at a minimum
  - site define the process and time, then justify it so it is auditable
  - the standard controls the implementer in terms of setting a frequency, the auditor checks if it has been carried out
  - “meaningful” time unit – allow auditor jurisdiction
- Standard/Guidance –language should reflect temporal variability of water variability within the catchment
  - determined by the catchment you are discharging into
  - strong discomfort on being too prescriptive on methodology here
- Adequacy in time and methodology
  - Use “credible testing methods” to provide check against casual testing.
- **Proposal**
  - **Monitoring will be done in relation to the characteristics of the surrounding ecosystem**

#### **Disclosure**

##### ISDC Discussion

- How much do you have to disclose about your risk exposure?
- Often, information is aggregated from site level to corporate level
  - Aggregated info is useless-must be at site level
  - But for disclosure, is this aggregated info ok?
- 6.2 disclosure of water stewardship plan change to actions/performance (combine w/6.3)
- 6.3 change from risk to disclose actions/performance to address common concerns
  - 2.3, reference 2.6
  - Not the company
  - But the site and its efforts to address the concerns of those around the site
- How would the other stakeholders be able to access the choices the site has made to self risk and shared risk? Must be something to allow others to decide if those choices the site made are valid. Crucial to note actions instead of just performance.
  - Normally sites don’t disclose unless they have a result/outcome. So actions/efforts along the way will let stakeholders feel part of the process, know what’s coming down the road.
- We have to be careful because this could CAUSE reputational risk in some areas
- We could write it so that stakeholders understand why you made your decision to act on which piece
  - Where is that SHARED risk overlap?

- new step 2.3 might address that
  - new2.6 and new2.7 are nuanced to show how the site is contributing to data
  - Changed new 2.6 to address shared risk?
- ‘shared risk’ in water stewardship should focus on those things in the catchment that affect everyone. Not just the internal site issues that may affect stakeholders.
- Should we use another term besides “risk”? Is there another word that will get the same result but enable people to respond?
  - ‘Concerns’ will be more acceptable
  - Common concern

**PROPOSAL**

- **Keep disclosure within the site’s scope**
- **There will be a catchment element**
- **Note the fact that a site can’t operate alone and it needs to work in conjunction with others.**
- **How you interpret your risks will be on an organization by organization basis**
  - **Not how you calculate risks**
  - **But what you agree to do with others in catchment, publish**
- **How you act, not what you plan**
  - **6.2-leave it (it is 3.2 published)**
  - **6.3 site challenges and opportunities and how to address them in 4 (with stakeholder engagement)**
    - **Adapt to stakeholder concerns at catchment level.**
    - **Risk is not used, and not in the indicator.**
    - **Shared concerns that are of material nature and the actions that the site is taking to correct them (probably overlap w/6.2 a bit)**
  - **6.4 legally required disclosure of compliance**

**Step 2 rework**

Step 2 received the most comments. In general, it was suggested that the gathering of information could be streamlined and the Standard must more explicitly describe how this information is to be analyzed. A risk framework is suggested.

|     |   |
|-----|---|
| 2.1 | Identify scope (physical & sphere of influence) NOTE: Sol was later shifted into a separate criterion.  |
| 2.2 | Measure catchment status (legal/governance/plan, balance, quality, IWRAs)   |
| 2.3 | Measure site status (legal/governance, balance, quality, IWRAs)   |
| 2.4 | Measure Indirect water use status   |
| 2.5 | Understand risks & opportunities<br>A) shared catchment risk & opportunities for collective action (impacts – Soc/Econ/Env.);<br>B) risk/opportunities to site + site contribution to catchment risk (operational affects – Phys/Rep/Reg. risk) |
| 2.6 | Prioritize water-related issues   |

- AJM notes
- Reorganized data gathering into site information and catchment information
- 2.9 becomes more about analyzing site and catchment risk that lead to prioritized water stewardship actions to be included in the plan.

#### Proposal

- **For future issues, put details in criteria and definitions rather than indicators**
- **Will reconcile text in beta version to the final version**

#### Data poor catchment/first implementer burden

It was noted in several cases that the first mover in any given catchment will have a dis-proportionate burden for data gathering (intensive resources required), especially in a data poor environment.

#### ISDC discussion:

- To help ease the burden
  - We have criteria that says the site must engage with the catchment or try to create a governing body etc. should this be expanded – helping start gathering and sharing data?
    - Not sure we should reward a site for doing what is required within the standard
  - Note that in step 6, we give advanced points if the site discloses the data-is this an incentive for gathering it no matter what?
- Is this an issue for AWS?
  - give extra recognition for whoever is doing this type of effort?
- Nuance the requirement to say that if the data isn't available, then the site should gather the best available and then contribute to others efforts?
- **Proposal**
  - **First movers: more of an issue for AWS.**
  - **Add to guidance of step 2, tackle for small site, data deficient environment. Expectations in data rich environment and data poor environments are different and need to outlined in guidance.**
    - Note that there are some indicators in the standard that are dependent on whether data is available or not.
  - **Data: contribution that everyone can add to collection of data, reward as appropriate. At advance level sites that are engaging/initiating that should be rewarded. Can insert collective action in advanced criteria and disclosure into advance criteria.**

#### Next steps:

##### Timeline

- Launch April 8<sup>th</sup> Lima Peru, 5-7 pm local time
- March 3<sup>rd</sup>-needs to be ready for publication

Jan 20-24-free week for ISDC, secretariat will be making edits to standard, begin edits to guidance, will email to ISDC updated standard/without guidance, secretariat to update ISDC members NOT in France, public conclusions to ISDC for review

Jan 27-31 – ISDC to review updated standard, secretariat edit guidance, PUBLIC CONCLUSIONS for circulation

Feb 3 and 4 – 2 calls to get feedback on updated standard, secretariat finish edits to guidance

Feb 7- secretariat email updated guidance

Feb 10-14 – ISDC review guidance and send sec comments

Feb 17-21 – 2 calls on guidance to get feedback on updated guidance, secretariat sends semi-finalized standard and guidance

Feb 24-28 – formal sign off by ISDC

Feb 28 – formal AWS approval

**Outstanding questions and suggestions**

- Clarify role of 'ISDC' in rollout of standard. What is the ISDC role going forward?
- Urge AWS Board to facilitate institutional knowledge retention and knowledge management.