

WATER ROUNDTABLE
Minutes of the 3rd meeting of the International Standard Development Committee
January 30-February 1, 2012

Melbourne, Victoria, Australia

Attendance

ISDC Members: Imane Abdel Al, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Ma Jun, John Langford, Matilda Park, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Leshia Witmer

Other: Ricardo Monsivais (via phone, AWS-LAC), Alexis Morgan (AWS), Rodger O’Connell (Level Headed), Adrian Sym (AWS), Nicole Tanner (AWS), Phil Duncan (Chair, 1st Peoples Water Congress), Michael Spencer (WSA)

Apologies: Maureen Ballesterio Vargas (via phone Tuesday am), Riaz Ahmad Khan

Monday January 30-Wednesday February 1, 2012			
	Session	Discussion	Agreement/Actions
1	Introductions		
1.1	ISDC Attendance	12 ISDC members in attendance: Imane Abdel Al, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Ma Jun, John Langford, Matilda Park, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Leshia Witmer	Quorum in attendance.
1.2	Apologies	Maureen Ballesterio Vargas (via phone Tuesday am), Riaz Ahmad Khan	
1.3	Open ISDC positions	1 position open-Pedro Jacobi stepped down due to time commitment restraints in his new position.	
1.4	Agenda	No amendments	Approved
2	Review Efforts to Date	Session #1	
2.1	Ultimate Goal of Meeting	Ultimate goal of this meeting is to get to a place where we are comfortable letting the public comment on the IWSS. The ISDC does not need to create a perfect standard, but make key decisions and solicit feedback on potential solutions	
2.2	AWS Update	Adrian Sym provided update on IWSS pertinent-AWS activities since last ISDC meeting. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional work 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ North Asia-January 2012 meeting in China where IWSS and Stewardship were highlighted-audience was positively receptive and seemed keen on seeing/commenting on the first draft. ○ LAC-2nd Regional Forum (see minutes later)-good energetic meeting of diverse stakeholders of a diverse region ○ Europe-EWP launched their European Water Stewardship Program in November 2011-basically the 'going live' of the European Standard. ○ Asia Pacific-WSA holding stakeholder engagement meeting in Melbourne in conjunction with ISDC meeting (February 1-2) to start revision of draft 00 standard. ● Internal Organization work of AWS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ AWS is in the process of determining the membership structure of the future AWS ○ Website will be ready to handle online feedback on draft of IWSS ● Relationship between ISDC and AWS Board <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ As promised, Adrian has been in touch with the AWS Board to confirm if they feel the terms of reference are being met. The Board gives their accolades to the ISDC for the great progress and work done to date. However, they have a few concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are only 3 principles-none of which focus entirely on biodiversity/ecosystems ▪ Entry levels-will the entry level requirements really prove the implementer to be a 'good water steward' ▪ Will the standard be verifiable in its current form? ▪ How are indirect impacts being addressed? ▪ How is the ISDC defining watershed/scope of influence? ▪ Is there an adequate balance between process and performance criteria? ● Adrian reaffirms request for support with regional contacts from ISDC members 	
2.3	ISDC questions to Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● What will the role of the ISDC be during/after the launch of the draft IWSS? Please clarify in what capacity the ISDC can act on behalf of 	

		<p>the IWSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How fundamentally different does the Board believe quantity/quality are apart from ecological considerations? Is it sufficient for ecological aspects to be a thread within all principles? 	
2.4	Update from LAC	<p>Ricardo Monsivais and Maureen Ballesteros gave update on LAC 2nd Regional Forum. <i>Refer to unofficial report of 2nd Regional Forum-final report to be translated to English and circulated</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public institution response to the development of the standard has been good. They seem confident that this is complementary to regulations and there will be enough tools to check compliance. They are concerned about its future interaction with legislation. Ricardo believes this fear will be addressed when they see the standard and they have a chance to give their opinions. You will see there are special criteria for utilities-participants called this out in the 2nd forum. The majority of participants came from the utility sector and there are several aspects that are unique to their sector. In LAC, public utilities play a different role in water management than other participants 	<p>The Summary Report of the 2nd Regional Forum in LAC is a summary of thoughts/suggestions for inclusion in the IWSS from the participants.</p>
3.0	General-Discussion of IWSS		
3.1	Indirect use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> IWSS needs to address indirect use amongst those the implementer has influence with (its partners-buyers-suppliers), especially within the same watershed IWSS needs to ensure outsourcing to a 3rd party does not let you bypass responsibility of stewardship (i.e. outsourcing for effluent waste treatment-implementer must make sure the effluent IS being treated) The site has the greatest link to impacts Certifying the site allows big companies to participate Certifying the site (and not the company) prevents the company from making broad claims Indirect impacts could be accounted for in higher level certification Indirect is supply chain outside of watershed. If it's within a 	<p>AWS needs to revisit/review the recognition of promoters</p> <p>AWS needs to define what they mean by indirect use</p>

		watershed, this is within the sphere of influence	
3.2	Sphere of Influence/Scope of Influence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supply chains are complicated and costly to evaluate • The site level manager cannot control his/her supply chain easily • How do you interpret accountability outside fenceline operations? • To decide the size of the watershed, solicit promoters: what do you think is a reasonable expectation for scope? • Does the sphere of influence need to speak to the impact the implementer has or the level of stakeholder engagement the implementer is capable of achieving? • Build into Step 2 of the Standard <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Include the second step as a situation assessment (self-assessment with guidance); verified by stakeholders with a list – DETERMINE AREA OF INFLUENCE, and when doing so, take into account relative withdrawals, governance, etc. (the latter are guidance). ○ In the Rotterdam convention there is a definition for scope of influence and 1.1 in ISO 14001 ○ Watershed authority as someone who defines reasonableness ○ Publicize the activity in media, etc. ○ Stakeholders – must be in the spirit of the text. ○ Stakeholder engagement is going to vary considerably by region, however the identification process might be the same. ○ Stakeholders should self-identify ○ Transparency must be central 	Build “determine your scope of influence” into Step 2 of the IWSS-situation assessment (self-assessment with guidance)-to be verified by stakeholders
4	Discussion on Principles and Criteria		
4.1	Quantity:		
4.1.1	Principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add “strive to achieve and maintain” instead of just “achieve and maintain” 	
4.1.2	Criteria discussion notes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add an engagement requirement: specifically if implementer is providing water directly to others. • How should the Standard deal with the creation of new water volumes (i.e. through water harvesting)? 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Maybe as a bonus? ○ Especially in water scarce regions ● Criterion 1.6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Typo in intent to be corrected ○ Add efficient use ○ Add capture of additional sources of water ○ Break into internal and external ● Add criteria on contingency planning (short and long term) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See EWP 4.5.5 ○ Perhaps this goes under Governance principle? ● How will the IWSS address impervious surfaces* and urban areas? ● Suggest to merge 1.4 into 1.3 as it's a challenging issue and needs to be rewarded <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ With the expectation that it will be within the boundary ○ Additional bonus points for transboundary efforts ● Eliminate "open and transparent" in favour of "monitor and report" <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The process of uncovering information and disclosing it draws attention to it, thus creating local concerns and defeating the purpose of doing so. ● Potential bonus area: benchmarking within internal efficiency ● Possible area of concern: criterion 1.5-language related to HCV and its consistent use in the document. ● Add language about withdrawal, consumption, storage and recycling ● Note to add women/gender issues when discussing customary law 	
4.2	Quality		
4.2.1	Principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Quality to meet designated uses-different by user and region and sector ● What laws would apply to this water source (to be defined during "steps") ● What about dead rivers? 	<p><i>Water Stewards shall contribute to the maintenance of good water quality status (define) in terms of chemical, physical and biological characteristics to maintain ecosystems and ensure adequate water quality for all users within the</i></p>

			<i>defined scope (repeat definition)</i>
4.2.2	Proposed new criterion 2.1	Old 2.4 “know your water system”	<i>Current and desired water quality levels shall be determined, monitored and documented by receiving water body, and disclosed-CORE</i>
4.2.3	Proposed criterion 2.2	Same/previous 2.2 “know your contribution to quality of water system”	<i>The total effluent* discharge quality from the facility shall be determined, monitored, and documented by receiving water body, along with the identification of main pollutants of concern, and disclosed-CORE</i>
4.2.4	Proposed new criterion 2.3	Previous 2.1 “know the law and meet it”	<i>Effluent discharge shall meet legal compliance (quality, source, time, etc)- CORE</i>
4.2.5	Proposed new criterion 2.4	Previous 2.3 “know the impact of your contribution to the quality of receiving water body” Bonus point-go beyond requirements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include users here (downstream consumers)-has to relate to health and food security impacts. • May necessitate separate core criteria-if you are providing water for the local communities, must meet a certain quality level 	<i>The impacts of changes in water quality to the receiving water body (including sensitive areas downstream) shall be described and evaluated in context, and disclosed-CORE</i>
4.2.6	Proposed criterion 2.5	Same/previous 2.5 “Actions you take to address your impacts” Bonus points-you improve the quality of receiving body	<i>Actions to improve water quality/effluent within the facility and mitigate actual and potential impacts outside the facility resulting from this effluent shall be documented and disclosed, along with a</i>

			<i>commitment for continual improvement-CORE</i>
4.2.7	Proposed new criterion 2.6	<p>Previous 2.7 “Biological and Social Conservation Values” Bonus points- you are assisting in others adverse impacts, or helping restore damaged areas</p> <p>Define effluent-all water that comes out of facility to include recycled water, desalinated water etc</p>	<i>Areas with high ecological or social conservation values (define and include in guidance: means special values, HCVs etc) within the watershed or are critical to the watershed shall be identified. The impact of the facility to these areas shall be established. Your operations should not cause adverse impacts on these areas” - CORE</i>
4.2.8	Proposed new criterion 2.7	<p>Previous 2.9 “Knowledge on water quality is updated regularly and embedded in organization” CORE Bonus point-improve internal knowledge Bonus point-improved capacity in basin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training, learning and instruction • Demonstrate capacity internally or capacity to do this externally • Must ensure knowledge on water quality is updated regularly and embedded in organization. Demonstrate competency of staff. 	<i>The water steward’s knowledge on water quality is updated regularly and embedded in organization” - CORE</i>
4.2.9	Proposed criterion 2.8	<p>Discussion not completed: Same/previous 2.8 –indirect</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Move to governance? • A system to manage indirect effluent of supply chain? • Term indirect is confusing...there are different elements in the supply chain • Refer to EWP re: outsourcing • Do we need to address the impact of your activities on receiving water bodies via another entity within the same watershed? Is there a difference if your impact is felt in another watershed? 	
4.2.10	Proposed criteria 2.9	Bonus criterion kept-previous 2.6	<i>Identify all the water stressors</i>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bonus if you help with the identification and analysis (i.e. monitoring and assessment) • Bonus if you take measurement that will improve quality in whole basin 	<i>that will impact the overall needs of water quality in basin-limitations of quality to achieve all uses and take actions that you can to resolve them. - BONUS</i>
4.3	Governance		
4.3.1	Principle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to define ‘governance’ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Look to Water Integrity Network ○ GWP ○ UN Water ○ Waterpartner.org • Internal vs. External <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ See EWP • Require analysis of applicable regulations • Require plans for corrective action and time lines along with it • Stakeholder engagement aspect here: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Internal-identify and engage ○ External-key stakeholders to engage with are those who are directly impacted-must be engaged ○ External-other external stakeholders=bonus points 	<i>Water Stewards shall strive to achieve equitable and transparent water governance * for all user categories within the defined scope **</i>
4.3.2	Criteria 3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Refer to ISO 14000 clause on this-plus ‘stewardship aspects’ • Show which laws implementer is abiding by and explain why they are NOT complying with others • Do we need to highlight “zero tolerance” issues? There are some laws that everyone must adhere to especially? 	<i>Water steward shall identify legal requirements, including customary laws, applicable within the defined scope, and will take measure for compliance</i>
4.3.3	Criterion 3.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CORE • Add commitment that plan demonstrates the intention to carry out-look to EWP examples? • Require this to be disclosed? Perhaps gradually? • Move climate change adaptation to risk management criteria? • No bonus points here 	<i>The Water Steward has a written and implemented water stewardship policy/strategy/management plan that includes specific time-bound targets and cost-benefit analysis of relevant</i>

			<i>investment</i>
4.3.4	Criterion 3.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doesn't speak to performance the way it's currently written Propose EWP's wording of 4.5.3.i (not 4.5.3.ii) Core for key stakeholders-those directly impacted Bonus for all stakeholders "The water steward shall disclose to key stakeholders**" 	
4.3.5	Proposed new criterion 3.4	<p>Add EWP 4.5.2 as CORE</p> <p>"Internal transparency: Sustainable water management is disseminated within the operation.</p> <p>For internal communication the water steward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishes a communication on Water Stewardship and distributes it to all persons working for it or on its behalf. Identifies training needs regarding the implementation of its Water Stewardship scheme. Provides training or takes other action to meet these needs, and maintains associated records. Describes sanctions in case of non-compliance, or awards schemes to further sustainable water management. 	<i>Internal transparency: Sustainable water management is disseminated within the operation.</i>
4.3.6	Proposed new criterion 3.5	<p>Previous 3.6 CORE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Define engagement-see Rio principles from 1992 (#10, #23) In stakeholder group identification (in 'steps') make sure bring into consideration gender balance etc 	<i>The water steward engages in open transparent engagement* with the defined stakeholders to develop and implement the water strategy and governance</i>
4.3.7	Proposed new criterion 3.6	<p>Add EWP 4.5.5 "management of incidents-contingency plans"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add to 4.5.5.2 "...are described or established within meaningful and timely fashion" people have to understand what you're telling them and have time to react Add to 4.5.5.2 "...regional population and communities and key stakeholders..." 	<i>The impacts of such an occurrence to the employees, the regional population, communities and key stakeholders are described or estimated within meaningful and timely fashion.</i>
4.3.8	Proposed new criterion 3.7	Previous 3.5	<i>The water steward is engaged with policy makers to raise awareness and/or strengthen</i>

			<i>river basin, regional, national and international water stewardship legislation/policy</i>
4.3.9	Proposed new criterion 3.8	Previous Criterion 3.4	<i>The water user evaluates the performance of its water supplier and wastewater treatment provider in terms of Sustainable Water Management</i>
4.3.10	Proposed new criterion 3.9	Previous 3.11-capacity & communication of information/transparency <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementer must build capacity internally to engage with outside agencies and interact with outside agencies to build their capacity. 1. Internal capacity-CORE 2. External capacity-CORE at higher levels 3. External capacity-CORE where it is integral to implementer's work 4. CSR aspects-BONUS 5. Transparency-CORE to make public but BONUS if implementer actively engages in outreach 	
4.3.11	Other criteria	There were additional governance criteria included in draft but were not discussed in detail	
5	Gaps/Important Sites		
5.1		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential 4th principle? • are there sites within the watershed that don't have literally have water in them, that are integral to water management? • i.e. quality of incoming water (to be stewarded by protecting headwaters) that is not already covered under current quality principals • Having this fourth area captures the spatial element of water, shifts the HCV / cultural sites into this principle, and allows us to be consistent with the other regional standards as well. 	Secretariat will draft for consideration-then ISDC will debate and decide what the "title" will be "gaps list" will be readdressed as a separate document to be discussed by ISDC and then decided if it will be released in Marseille
6	Language		
6.1	Principle and Criteria		Continue using P&C-define in glossary

			Provide language/discussion in introduction section for Marseille, to explain our intent
6.2	Indirect water use	Asks Board-define what you mean by indirect water use-how far does this extend?	
6.3	Levels		3 levels: AWS Certified AWS Certified Gold AWS Certified Platinum
6.4	Need definitions/terms of concern	<p>The following terms need definitions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Risk • Risk assessment • Ambient • Indirect water • Disclosure • Transparency • Areas/scope/sphere of influence • Facility/site • 'shall be made available' • Governance • Source water • Pro-poor • Value chain • Supply chain • Effluent/discharge • Virtual water • Principle • Health • Watershed/catchment • 'water-related' • Good water status (LW has suggestions) • Methodology for quantification (water storage etc) 	Secretariat to define and circulate for discussion

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HCV/special sites 	
7	Scheduling		
7.1	Upcoming Meetings -	<p>Location and date of next meeting has 2 options:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July 9-11 in Nairobi • June 25-27 in LAC (Costa Rica perhaps) <p>Fall meeting will be October 22-24</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location options: Dubai, LAC, other? 	Secretariat will send out more information on options by Feb 20 th
7.2	Process for Launch in Marseille	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AM will circulate revised draft Friday Feb 10th • ISDC send feedback by Tuesday Feb 14th • AM will send out again, immediately on Tuesday Feb 14th • Feb 20th(Vancouver, British Colombia time)-2 calls-ISDC will attend one of them <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Final points of feedback ○ Any show stoppers/red flags ○ Asking for sign off in principle • ISDC to send feedback/edits via TRACK CHANGE in word format • AM to send consolidated feedback to ISDC • Agreed upon document to be sent for translation • Draft IWSS will be “embargoed” until Launch on March 13th in Marseille • Then ISDC is free to share, discuss, promote etc with all 	
7.3	Marseille session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AWS is co-organizing a session-topic is stewardship and footprinting. Will indicate the IWSS is being released and open for public comment. • Communications – will rely on AWS board organizations and ask ISDC if their organizations would also like to help with communications (press release dissemination, common messaging, instructions on how to provide feedback/receive feedback, specific areas needing feedback etc) 	
7.4	Public Meeting Conclusions	<p>The ISDC decided to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Add a 4th principle: “important water sites” which will be added to water quantity, quality, and governance. 	

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Keep a site-focus (vs. organizational-focus) which means that indirect water use aspects will be limited (since a site typically does not exert procurement decisions on the larger organization). However, the ISDC did note the importance of supply chains and indirect water use and encouraged AWS to consider this issue through other aspects of the AWS Program. 3. Have the focus of the standard address both salty and fresh water. Water is water - in all its forms. 4. Develop a sphere (or area) of influence exercise that occurs in advance of application of the Principles to determine the scope. This will be a stakeholder-influenced process with guidance to assist. 5. Have the Standard concentrate on what is 'water-related' when it comes to other issues (such as legal matters or social issues). 6. Have the Standard provide explicit internal (within the fencelines) and external (beyond the fencelines) components to stewardship 7. Note that Water Governance is an overarching principle: Stewardship is more than management (which is internally focused) – it involves governance at many levels beyond the fenceline. 8. suggest to AWS that the three levels of achievement within the Standard be termed: AWS Certified, AWS Gold Certified, and AWS Platinum Certified. 	
CLOSE OF ISDC MEETING			