

**WATER ROUNDTABLE**  
**Minutes of the 5th meeting of the International Standard Development Committee**  
**October 22-24, 2012**

*Dubai, United Arab Emirates*

**Attendance**

**ISDC Members:** Imane Abdel El, Carlo Galli, John Langford, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Matilda Park, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer, Hao Xin

**Other:** Lisa Downes (AWS-NARI), Il-Pyo Hong (Korea), Alexis Morgan (AWS), Rodger O’Connell (Level Headed), Adrian Sym (AWS), Nicole Tanner (AWS)

**Apologies:** Maureen Ballesterro, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Axel Dourojeanni, Peter Coockey

	<b>Session</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Agreement/Actions</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Introductions</b>		
1.1	ISDC Attendance	10 ISDC members in attendance: Imane Abdel El, Carlo Galli, John Langford, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Matilda Park, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer, Hao Xin	<b>Quorum in attendance.</b>
1.2	Apologies	Maureen Ballesterro, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Peter Coockey, Axel Dourojeanni	
1.3	Open position	Ahmed Riaz Khan stepped down from ISDC. Now there is an open position. Ideally to be found in Public Sector from South Asia, Central and Western Asia, or North Asia.	
1.4	Agenda		<b>Approved</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>AWS Update</b>		
2.1	AWS Update	AS gave update on AWS including: new governance structure for next iteration of AWS, definition of water stewardship, upcoming field tests.  Discussion: ISDC would like to make sure the spirit of the new definition is reflected in the Standard and especially in the criteria. ISDC would also like to advise Board to make sure the definition is easily	

		translatable.	
3.0	<b>Breakout groups</b>		
3.1	Top Down/Bottom Up	<p>ISDC broke into small groups to build on discussions from Mexico City ISDC meeting. Top Down/Bottom up group: Ed Pinero, John Langford, Jiseon Park (non-ISDC members: Nicole Tanner and Il-Pyo Hong).</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Two possible situations: 1) Catchment-level plan exists; 2) Catchment-level plan doesn't exist or is inadequate.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site's Water Stewardship plan must align or adapt to the catchment level plan if it exists. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Site should review: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Nature of the plan-what's in it?</li> <li>ii. What are the related regulations-specifically the environmental and water-related regulations</li> <li>iii. What are the specific risks to that water source?</li> </ol> </li> <li>b. At higher levels of certification: site may help inform the plan/provide additional input.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. There isn't a catchment-level plan or it is inadequate <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Ultimate goal should be to create an authority at the catchment level (the authority should create a catchment level plan)</li> <li>b. Each: identify the key risks to this water source to create catchment level improvement targets <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Including timing, amount, quality</li> </ol> </li> <li>c. This would serve as the basis for new catchment level planning</li> <li>d. Site would take maybe one catchment level target to deliver upon. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Plans will be on all 4 principles but may primarily focus attention on delivering on highest risk to basin (at basic level...quality, over abstraction etc).</li> </ol> </li> <li>e. Site certification should not be contingent on whether or not the larger catchment can organize to create holistic plan.</li> <li>f. Basic level-site required to engage at some level.</li> <li>g. all different sites in basin should be communicating on their plan</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>Catchment level plan: Must include water sources, related regulations</p> <p>Site WS plan must align/adopt existing catchment level plan</p> <p>If there isn't a catchment level plan: Site WS plan must still deliver/take into account catchment level needs AND work in existing stakeholder forum, or reach out to neighbors to engage collectively to reduce a catchment level risk.</p>

		<p>regardless of certification or catchment level plans--gets to measuring impacts</p> <p>h. stimulates formation of plan</p> <p>AWS might consider programs that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Help keep track of other entities that are seeking certification where there isn't a catchment-level plan to reduce redundant efforts</li> <li>• Link these efforts to the importance of promoters and their ability to coordinate/facilitate these discussions (especially NGOs with basin sized programs)</li> <li>• Facilitate group certification to increase capacity and interest of SMEs to engage in these issues</li> <li>• Promote or recognize collaborative work outside certification-this could be a good mechanism for sharing possible solutions (one may have the solution to another's problem)</li> </ul>	
3.2	Promoter Program	<p>ISDC small group members: Marco, Adrian, Hao, Imane</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (Anything else from Adrian/Marco on this?)</li> <li>• There is not a promoter program to date.</li> <li>• Group still thinks the promoters do not belong in the IWSS as it's focused now.</li> <li>• Sees two options 1) promoter certifies whole supply chain; 2) there is a promoter program</li> <li>• Some specific components that fall under this heading: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SMEs</li> <li>○ Policy players</li> <li>○ Group certification</li> <li>○ Driving up-take and their associated costs and benefits.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	ISDC would like to discuss this issue with the AWS Board-combo of teleconference and face-to-face.
3.3	IWRA	<p>Small group discussion</p> <p><b>Methodology for IWRAs:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do a desktop study reviewing legally recognized protected areas (which may be incomplete and/or out of date, and may not require adequate legal</li> </ul>	One pager stands. Additional notes on methodology and data sets here to be included in

		<p>protections).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Invite stakeholders to participate in definition of IWRAs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is there a stakeholder process already?</li> <li>○ Stakeholders can make the case for why they are a stakeholder</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Interview stakeholders regarding social, economic, environmental importance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ stakeholders should make the case for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1.) why the area is an IWRA and</li> <li>▪ 2.) What the impacts associated with the water use would be (are there impacts?)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Can you prove that impacts are from the business use?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should also consider IWAs where the water user is receiving a benefit, potentially upstream (in addition to the ones they may impact)</li> <li>• If there are impacts, water user should develop a mitigation strategy</li> <li>• User must consult with stakeholders as to acceptability of the mitigation strategy</li> <li>• Outstanding issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Need to keep cost and complexity in check. How do we convince factory facility managers to go and do this? Is this even feasible? .</li> <li>○ Need to discuss what actions are required for what levels of the standard. Identification alone of stakeholders should not be enough for core. Must have at least some interaction with stakeholders to make sure you have the right stakeholders identified.</li> <li>○ How do we determine radius/sphere of influence?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Data Sets for IWRAs</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• protected planet site—but doesn’t explain why they are important areas</li> <li>• legally recognized sites under national law (i.e. Kenya)</li> <li>• Others?</li> </ul> <p><b>Definition:</b> Agree with definition on one pager.</p>	<p>guidance document.</p>
3.4	Nexus issues	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we maximize/minimize water use, we run the risk of impacting carbon, food, energy, etc.</li> <li>• There are additional health and social issues associated with these trade offs</li> </ul>	<p>Nexus issues to be addressed at plan level (and corresponding parts of step 2) of IWSS-see proposal</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How will nexus issues be taken into account in the Standard?</li> <li>• “When site develops a plan, consideration is given to trade-offs (impacts) that may occur...”             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Consider it (step 2 with measuring) then incorporate into plan (step 3)?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Perhaps only at Gold/Platinum levels?</li> </ul> <p>Proposal:</p> <p>3.2 Site Water Stewardship Action Plan (OLD 1.8): The Implementer develops an internally-available water stewardship plan for the site that must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Targets for continuous improvement (targets should be SMART specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound);</li> <li>• Evidence for, and reasoning behind, choices made in relation to the impact of the proposed measures on food security and energy use;</li> <li>• Allocation of appropriate capacity (including internal financial and physical resources, defined roles and responsibilities);</li> <li>• Specific measures for managing extreme events such as droughts, floods and climate change, and;</li> <li>• A cost-benefit analysis.</li> </ul> <p>This action plan must be site-specific, take context into account, address stakeholder concerns and explicitly describe how the site will achieve Step 4.</p>	<p>here.</p>
3.5	<p>Extreme or rare events/including Climate Change</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Add a base criteria reference to climate change for data collection and planning steps (Steps 2 and 3) looking at existing projections and incorporate them into your long-term planning) (current 2<sup>nd</sup> draft leaves it all for platinum).             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Don’t need to do own modelling for base level but look at existing modelling.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Note farmers are unlikely to customize existing models</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ For each level, only have to use existing models to various degrees, site will not have to recalculate models.</li> <li>○ May need to clarify existing language in standard.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Incorporate resiliency into the guidance.</li> <li>• How will climate change projections be considered in regular long-term planning?</li> </ul>	<p>Terminology “rare events” will be used. Additional definitions will be given and guidance for determining/incorporating them into the site’s plan.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Guidance documents: Peter R. has some links to share re: N.A. modelling, sector-specific modelling.</li> <li>• Terminology: Prefer ‘rare events’ that have an impact             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Include extreme versions of non-rare events?</li> <li>○ Rare and extreme?</li> <li>○ Rare implies statistical likelihood and may be too limited?</li> <li>○ Link to Nexus conversation and be consistent (cross reference rare, extreme, emergency in IWSS and guidance)</li> <li>○ Qualify what a rare event is (may not be related to climate change)</li> <li>○ Eliminate references to emergency incidents.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Include language in guidance as to how to find materials. Also have more accessible language (i.e. have you changed your responses in response to weather changes, drought, etc.)</li> </ul>	
3.6	Sphere of Influence (SOI) / Hydrologic Impact Area (HIA)	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determining the SOI/HIA is a precursor to implementing rest of the standard</li> <li>• Where would discussions (to determine them and engage within them) stop-how much does site have to engage within HIA and SOI-what is ‘acceptable level’?</li> <li>• HIA             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Existing guidance is good with suggestions from public comments</li> <li>○ A fixed distance is not feasible</li> <li>○ Further consultation with parties to see if there is more guidance (EWP has guidance on this within EU)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• SOI-within watershed and always water-related             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Site needs to map their network of direct relationships                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Workers, local authority, those directly involved in site (including suppliers within the watershed)</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Map those that site has an indirect relationship with                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Those that use the same water as the site and</li> <li>▪ Those that affect and are affected by the site’s water use</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Should the IWSS include major suppliers that are outside the watershed at gold/platinum levels?</li> <li>• Note that SocioEcon parts of the SOI and HIA can be outside of a watershed too.</li> </ul>	<p>Boundaries for HIA and SOI are not fixed without stakeholder engagement. Guidance for how to determine will be included along with existing examples of how they have been determined by others.</p>

<p>3.7</p>	<p>Indirect Water Use</p>	<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Could the IWSS address indirect water through a threshold boundary (IWSS can only be applied if 60% of supply chain is included)?</li> <li>• Perhaps at different levels of involvement? At basic level-not a requirement, indirect water coming into your process becomes direct</li> <li>• IWSS should be flexible and reward efforts, not necessarily for proven results. For small implementers-improvement are just as important as reaching ultimate goals.</li> <li>• Should there be materiality questions at beginning?-requirements in the IWSS change depending on answers i.e. SME must address indirect water by doing this, but larger implementers must address indirect water by doing this?</li> <li>• Perhaps at a minimum companies use indirect water use data to start raising awareness. The AWS program beyond the Standard will be what builds momentum to address watershed issues beyond the site's control.</li> <li>• It will be very important to communicate what this Standard is hoping to deliver on (expectations) and the rationale behind these hopes. The standard can't do everything but may be expanded in future.</li> <li>• The definition needs editing (i.e. change site to implementer).</li> </ul> <p>Conclusion:  <b>One pager generally captures concerns of feedback and addresses it.</b></p> <p>To add/clarify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note the 2 extremes, clarify expectations with communications, include example from those that would not be included and those that will be. Communicate reasoning. Note that you may need other methods to engage small players.</li> <li>• Look at rationale in one-pager. Add clarification that it is addressed in gold and platinum levels as well. Explain entry point/theory of change for the standard system (i.e. move the middle, not just targeting the low hanging fruit).</li> <li>• For whole standard may not be applicable to individual farmers-but will be applicable in group certification context.</li> <li>• Include in one pager where indirect water use is addressed in v2.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Step 2-require indirect water supplier in HIA, gold work with</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>One pager re-confirmed with a few clarifications noted here.</p>
------------	---------------------------	---	---

		<p>suppliers within the Sol. Where is raising awareness? Could be core? Add to 6.6. Move to working outside Sol?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In one pager-make very clear how indirect water use ties to Sol as a direct relationship.</li> </ul>	
3.8	Process vs. performance	<p>How should the Standard address the balance of process and performance requirements? What should the indicators be for each? What is the performance level the standard is trying to achieve?</p> <p>Discussion on performance requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Base-line starting point: here is current status, the site must improve upon it or perform better from this starting point.</li> <li>• Industry benchmark starting point: here is what is acceptable in a given industry, the site must perform at this level or better</li> <li>• Want to make sure the IWSS avoids punishing good actors even if they are unable to increase their performance levels (i.e. they are already as efficient as they can be).</li> <li>• Want to make sure the IWSS doesn't set a level that will not work locally.</li> <li>• How will the IWSS recognize or reward what an implementer has done before their certification efforts before there was a standard? In this case, benchmarking would be preferable.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Is there a difference between whether an implementer's actions are progressive against an industry benchmark AND performance within any given watershed?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Add to 3.2: guidance on how to set targets</li> <li>• Add to 3.2: linking water stewardship plan and watershed level targets (see top down/bottom up discussion)</li> <li>• IWSS should include process step (linked to performance) that outlines the measures an implementer took and whether or not they are sustainable across economic, social and environmental areas. Because, if the desired impact is not apparent in one of the areas, a different action may need to be taken. This may be a qualitative step. Can you show the actions you took are delivering on your original commitment? Documenting choices and rationale are necessary.</li> <li>• IWSS should be careful with absolute performance levels for agriculture. I.e. in agriculture, efficiency often leads to expansion. Perhaps, strive target setting-</li> </ul>	Additional guidance is needed for how to set targets and how those targets are linked to catchment-level targets.

		<p>against efficiency (product/M3), catchment level expectations and stakeholder expectations</p>	
3.9	Certification Levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See AM flip chart-How to certify against them, avoid perverse incentives, avoid moving up ladder</li> </ul> <p>Discussion of certification level options:</p> <p>1) pre certification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is outside the scope of IWSS to deal with pre -certification issues. This would be for AWS.</li> <li>• How should those that are “trying” or taking steps to be certified be encouraged to keep going for certification? Does there need to be a claim here or is it part of a promoter program?</li> <li>• Conclusion: right now, pre certification is not necessary-if at all, reduce the number of core criteria. If this is necessary in the future, it is for AWS to determine.</li> </ul> <p>2) all criteria are required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unrealistic but appealing because of its simplicity</li> </ul> <p>3) X number of criteria to reach gold/ X number more to reach platinum</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We don’t want to favor the implementer to choose criteria that may be less robust or intensive etc. Activities should not be a pay to play recognition.</li> <li>• If we assign points to the criteria, they should be assigned to show incremental improvements to the watershed.</li> <li>• What about ‘core’ criteria at each level and then the remaining criteria are extra and a set number of them would also be required at each level?</li> <li>• Industry may favor something more straight forward-these X are core, these x are gold, these x are platinum.</li> <li>• Even if something more straight forward would be easier for industry, we must keep in mind the different context locally that the IWSS will be implemented in-the end goal is to have improvement at the basin level—levels should promote innovation and achievable goals within a local context.</li> <li>• Conclusion:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Hybrid of ‘core’ criteria at each certification level plus a point system will be designed.</li> <li>○ Core criteria for each level to be discussed by small groups and</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Hybrid (#3) of ‘core’ criteria at each certification level plus a point system will be designed.</p>

		<p>reflected in excel version of IWSS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ISDC to provide guidance on what is included on ‘desirable’ criteria</li> <li>○ Each criteria above AWS core will be 1 point-same value. For now.</li> <li>○ Flexibility and incentives are important.</li> <li>○ Need to look through criteria, what’s the additional scope and performance associated with implementation of those, core is core at base level, didn’t talk about how scoring will be done</li> <li>○</li> </ul> <p>Proposal: Sec complete edits on steps (clean up) then groups to ‘finish’ the review of steps/levels—flip chart—stay in same groups</p> <p>Note for AWS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Even if pre-certification is off the table, keep in mind points for a pre-filter of those that apply for certification. Specifically those entities that are good on water but horrible in other areas (severe deforestation etc).</li> </ul>	
3.10	Language / Terminology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Principles will be <b>Outcomes</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Secretariat will figure out detailed language, check against translatability</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Water stewardship “principles” should not be included in standard next as it will be confusing.</li> <li>● The terms for shared risk, stakeholder engagement etc will need to be developed.</li> <li>● <b>Criteria</b> will stay—will check with interpreter re: requirement vs. criteria</li> <li>● Intent for criteria and steps will be included in guidance only</li> <li>● Translation options: French, Spanish, Portuguese, Chinese, Russian, Arabic, Turkish, Swahili, Hindi</li> <li>● Will note that the English version is formal and ultimate version.</li> </ul>	Outcomes, Criteria and Indicators
4.0	<b>Scheduling</b>		
4.1	Next steps	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● November 15: ISDC review of excel version to be completed, initial guidance document filled out</li> <li>● December 15: IWSS word doc out to ISDC for general review</li> <li>● January 1-15: all stakeholder feedback broken into stakeholder groups and reviewed by corresponding ISDC groupings</li> </ul>	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• January 19-22: BETA draft consolidated</li> <li>• February 6-8: ISDC meeting in Europe</li> <li>• Conversation with AWS Board as necessary               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ISDC to draft letter to Board-LW, MM, PR on concerns that the Board should be aware of/want to discuss with the Board.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
4.2	Next ISDC meeting	February 6-8 <sup>th</sup> , 2013 Europe (location TBD) TBD level of AWS Board participation/interaction at ISDC meeting	February 6-8 <sup>th</sup> , 2013 Europe (location TBD)
4.3	Public message content	Good progress meeting in Dubai. Here are the fact sheets we've made-link to website (Re publish one-pagers from Mexico with slight edits from Dubai meeting) Message that second draft comes in March 2013	
<b>CLOSE OF ISDC MEETING</b>			