

WATER ROUNDTABLE
Minutes of the 4th meeting of the International Standard Development Committee
June 25-27, 2012

Mexico City, Mexico

Attendance

ISDC Members: Maureen Ballestero, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Axel Dourojeanni, John Langford, Matilda Park, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Gerphas Opondo, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer, Hao Xing

Other: Sarah Davidson (AWS), Lisa Downes (AWS-NARI), Ricardo Monsivais (AWS-LAC), Alexis Morgan (AWS), Rodger O’Connell (Level Headed), Nicole Tanner (AWS)

Apologies: Imane Abdel El, Riaz Ahmad Khan, Marco Mensink, Ed Pinero

Monday January 30-Wednesday February 1, 2012			
	Session	Discussion	Agreement/Actions
1	Introductions		
1.1	ISDC Attendance	11 ISDC members in attendance: Maureen Ballestero, Sanjib Bezbaroa, Axel Dourojeanni, John Langford, Matilda Park, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Gerphas Opondo, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer, Hao Xing	Quorum in attendance.
1.2	Apologies	Imane Abdel El, Riaz Ahmad Khan, Marco Mensink, Ed Pinero	
1.3	New to ISDC	Hao Xing from China , CSO stakeholder group Axel Dourojeanni from Chile, CSO stakeholder group	
1.4	Agenda		Approved
2	ToR Review	Session #1	
2.1	AWS concerns against ToR	The AWS standards board committee (a sub-portion of the AWS Board) noted a few areas that are potential ‘red flags’ for compliance with the WRT/ISDC ToR. These potential red flags, within the current draft of the IWSS, include: 1) Indirect Water Use 2) SME applicability in LDC and MDCs 3) Linking with other initiatives All topics were echoed by public comments and will be addressed during meeting.	

3.0	Review of Feedback	<p>The ISDC reviewed the submitted feedback by:</p> <p>A) summarizing and discussing the feedback from the ISDC’s point of view</p> <p>B) Deciding if the draft IWSS needs adjustment</p> <p>C) Consensus</p>	
3.1	ISDC reaction to feedback	<p>General observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 	
3.2	Feedback Issue #1: “Top down, bottom up” organization	<p>A. Summary and Discussion of feedback received from ISDC perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be a difference in starting point. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Main goal either good water status (ecological status) or good water management (which includes water status)? • We’ve said the IWSS should address social, economic and environmental aspects • We’ve said it should be a water management tool • Keep in mind who (within a company and watershed) is responsible for what • Individual actions NEED to be in context of what is needed at basin level • Is it the role of an implementer to determine what the “basin level context” is? What if the data is (or isn’t) available? • Is this tied to area of influence and level of certification? • If there is a lack of information, the site should contribute to building the information base and governance-but only place part of the burden on the site. • Australian standard might have ideas on how to contribute to catchment level goals. • What about continuous improvement? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher levels of certification require improvement /increased basin level policy? • We are more concerned about when data doesn’t exist. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In certain parts of the world there is not good data, then start at site and generate data for basin • Can logically look at a site without looking at context of river basin, regardless of what information is available? Without the data, you don’t know what the key management issues are <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i.e. over abstractions etc. In other words, the site manager needs to understand what his actions impact at the river basin scale. They should find out what is going on first before determining their actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus-if there are objectives set by policy (at basin “top” level), then those should be drawn upon. If they don’t, then there is some requirement to add to it/help build it. If it’s a transboundary watershed then there is a requirement to contribute to policy. • John will write one pager

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depends on size of enterprise? Small enterprise does not care about standard. <p>B. ISDC Response</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest all these issues are already in standard and will be clearer when we restructure. • Stay at site level • This idea links to and can be supported by sphere of influence, implementer/promoter, feasibility discussions and clarity <p>C. Consensus-if there are objectives set by policy (at basin “top” level), then those should be drawn upon. If they don’t, then there is some requirement to add to it/help build it. If it’s a transboundary watershed then there is a requirement to contribute to policy.</p> <p>D. John will write one pager</p>	
3.3	Feedback Issue #2: Area of Influence	<p>A. Summary and Discussion of feedback received from ISDC perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What we heard from feedback: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No one understands this concept. • Related to issue of feasibility. • ISDC discussion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We’ve said the Area of Influence (Aoi) could be site, basin, supply chain (all within scope within the catchment) • We’re focused on outcomes, so keep in mind this acts as a filter. Cannot achieve outcomes everywhere and can grow over a period time. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initially you should draw the Aoi boundary where you can achieve an outcome. • What is the focus of the Area of influence? Influence on what- Pollution, 	<p>Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change Aoi to Sphere of Influence (Sol). Sphere of Influence is broader and can include geographic aspects but others as well. • Split Sol into two sections-technical and socio-economic • Opondo will draft 1 pager

		<p>etc? What is end goal of this concept?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the costs associated to build knowledge to determine the Aol? • There are different types of Aol-political (for policy), physical (which may be larger than actual location of facility) <p>B. There seems to be two levels of influence: Socio-economic influence, technical influence-one has to do with impact/hydrological regime, the other is who can I influence in terms of behavior and policy? Each has different criteria to determine/measure these areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Direct impact-basic level of certification. Indirect contributes primarily to higher levels of certification. ○ Scope-political and economic influence (governance and important water areas) ○ Aol for balance and quality is a much more localized and technical issue ○ Need to create metrics for governance/important water areas Aol <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Governance metrics-responsibility-can I, as a site, measure and influence what is going to happen? If no-can I influence the decision? ○ there is an overlap. i.e. If you have a pump that is drawing water away from a community's water-then draw a line for Aol that includes the site's interactions with the community. It's a direct impact on the socio-economic aspect. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Socio-economic aspects can be quantified i.e. health and sanitation metrics under governance etc. not sure if we have measures for balance and quality Aol ○ if you are a large scale withdrawer of water, do you have more responsibility and a larger area of influence? There is a relationship between scale and responsibility <p>C. Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change Aol to Sphere of Influence (Sol). Area of influence implies a geographic boundary and seems to leave a lot out (even conceptually). Sphere of Influence is broader and can include geographic aspects but others as well. • Split Sol into two sections-technical and socio-economic 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Sol (balance/quality) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Refers to balance/quality primarily-these are technical issues that you can determine relatively easily. A site's balance and quality impact can be geographically bound and measured. ○ There are existing methodologies for this • Socio-econ Sol <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Refers to everything else-all social and economic aspect that an implementer may have interactions with/influence with/responsibility to. ○ Still looking for measures/metrics for these. Methodologies exist for this too (for example-SEIA) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Possible metrics? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. % of withdrawal-how large area your Sol should be (aquifer area to be defined) b. Distance downstream adding pollutants c. Local economy/jobs creating as measure of influence politically d. Number of customers for politically e. Keep in mind these indicators are fundamentally linked to how big the watershed is/where you draw the watershed boundary f. Scale and perception of influence • Metrics drive expectations re: your Sol outside your site boundary <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How much they are required to influence then it is based on their impact <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Difficult to measure. Need to assimilate a practical example-how difficult is it how much money does it take? (CG) – Don't discount that the site may need to go outside/outsource to answer this question-linked to guidance...can decide themselves or spend lots of money to determine Sol – Area denotes geographical aspects, Sphere integrates non-geographic areas (including political) 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still to do/expand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Clarify which aspects of ‘water’ Sol includes (nuance language)- keep bundled but will differ in two realms (tech and socio/econ) as well as within scale based on impact. ○ Illustrated with examples ○ Metrics will be helpful for guiding but impacts need to drive what the sphere is defined as ○ Implementer needs to take into account stakeholder perspectives and justify their rationale for how they defined Sol ○ Sol may differ by principle (technical vs socio-economic) <p>D. Opondo will draft 1 pager</p>	
3.4	Feedback Issue #3: Implementer vs. Promoter	<p>A. Summary and Discussion of feedback received from ISDC perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stick to implementers. • Possibly add additional section on promoters. • Need more guidance on how to address supply chain. • On promoters-it is useful to have a section in the guidance on promoters- on what the ISDC considers a promoter and what is expected of them (to engage people in certification process) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Perhaps even some sort of formal recognition • Possibly take information on promoters out of standard doc entirely and put only in guidance • There is general confusion on the terms-and the outreach to promoters: educating that group belongs to AWS/secretariat. <p>ISDC recollection and discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There seems to be a class of promoters that we should include -example of dairy and their feed/irrigator supply chain-all within the catchment. • Keep in mind indirect water use is different from promoters • For this class of promoters that may wish to have formal recognition-we said that this is out of scope for the ISDC but should be addressed by AWS • Worried that by focusing on implementers only, we are not addressing those that WANT to address/engage their supply chain more. <p>B. Anything to change in the Standard?</p>	<p>Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep Standard for site and implementer. • Any reference to promoter comes out of the Standard and out of Guidance doc. There may be some language that allows us to identify implementers that use their sphere of influence locally (advocate) • For implementers that have significant supply chain water use there will be requirements on advocacy. • Role of promoter is vital and must be taken up by AWS and they may provide program that formally promotes the

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Take out anything that’s not site-specific? • If we stay really strict to the site-then we may be violating ToR’s requirement for indirect water use. • Perhaps IWSS should require an implementer to take a look where their water impacts are happening and then target those areas • Remember-Promoters are not applying the Standard. They are just spreading word. This is something we expect of implementers later on in the Standard-probably have a big role in AWS. • Will keep implementer that promotes (but is not a promoter) • There seems to be 2 classes of ‘promoters’” Big P promoter, little p promoter- • There is an expectation that and implementer acts as advocate (little p promoter) <p>C. Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep Standard for site and implementer. • Any reference to promoter comes out of the Standard and out of Guidance doc. There may be some language that allows us to identify implementers that use their sphere of influence locally (advocate) • For implementers that have significant supply chain water use there will be requirements on advocacy. • Role of promoter is vital and must be taken up by AWS and they may provide program that formally promotes the Standard. <p>D. Peter R will write one pager</p>	<p>Standard.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peter R will write one pager
3.5	Feedback Issue #4: Indirect Water Use	<p>A. Summary and Discussion of feedback received from ISDC perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New Definition of “Indirect Water Use”- Water embedded in products/services that are not directly managed by the site and are used in the production of the site’s primary products/services. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ *guidance needed on what constitutes “used in the production of site’s primary...” percentage or some other metric needed (i.e. packaging is used in production-does that mean it is included in “indirect water use”) ○ *guidance needed on third water supply/treatment engagement ○ *guidance needed on water that is ‘imported’ in from another watershed-trucked, piped etc. 	<p>Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect water use will be included at base level certification. Where the bar is set is still up for debate. • Add revised 1.6-4.6 <p>E. Carlo, John and Alexis to write one pager</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ *guidance that storm water disposal counts as a site’s direct water ○ *water imported to site become direct water (whether under direct control or not) ● What we’ve heard from feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Indirect water use and supply chain comments are used interchangeably <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – ISDC doesn’t think this is true and should be treated somewhat differently. ○ The standard should say more about indirect water use, especially in higher levels of certification. ○ Even though something more needs to be said on indirect water use, this should not be a large part of the Standard. ○ There are many types of indirect water use: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 1. Indirect water supply for site use. – 2. A site outsourced waste water treatment / other outsourced water needs – 3. Virtual water-supply chain, water for products (i.e. agricultural inputs) ○ It is unclear what is meant by ‘indirect water’ in the Standard. It is also unclear how it could be measured/audited. ○ Requiring just a list of indirect water users in your defined area of influence is insufficient-should require implementer to do something with them. ○ Indirect water “use” and “supply” are different. ● ISDC response and discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We need as many entities to get certified as possible and therefore should emphasize continuous improvement. To require action on indirect water use at base level you will not get people to get certified ○ This issue is tied to Sphere of Influence discussion. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – It can get really expensive to do this analysis. Especially if the indirect water use in question is out of the watershed. Keep it basic and require action at higher levels of certification. – Big difference between small companies with little influence over the practices of their suppliers, and big buyers that can add requirements in their procurement tools (big influence). 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Try not to make this too much of an academic exercise. Even if you quantify your indirect water use, what does it mean? How does this implementer influence supply chain within the sphere of influence to practice good water stewardship? ○ Should basic certification include indirect water use? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Yes JL because of agriculture – Yes GO but within Sphere of Influence – Yes AD because agriculture – Yes PR tiered approach that can address the difficulties – Yes MB – SB-GRI reporting-make commitment and then have to make actions to implement. Would prefer to get companies on board, then ratchet up promises – Yes HX – Yes LW but linked to Sphere of Influence in favor making into steps-define input in Sphere of Influence (implementer will try to do XYZ...). Possibly include in second phase of standard-after final goes out. – Yes PC-keep as practical as possible <p>B. Discussion consensus: yes, indirect water use components should be included even at lowest levels to some extent, but if it is a barrier to uptake, then it's a major issue.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Process and management perspective-if implementer engages with supply chain, you don't need to start calculations-but look at technologies used and then you can improve practice. ○ What about the Sphere of Influence that you have and the impact you have on other basins. May not have to do anything directly, but an implementer can "know" or "be aware of" the situation in other areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – This would be within the Sphere of Influence ○ "Systems approach"-systems follow all inputs and all outputs-what you are doing about all of these parts-to influence along the "system" <p>C. Consensus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indirect water use will be included at base level certification. Where the bar is set is still up for debate. 	
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make sure it's in there and people are rewarded for taking more and more action for indirect water use. ○ These things are in the Standard-step 6. We just need to allocate extra credits to core areas. ○ 1.6 should be about understanding the direct vs indirect water use-rather than identifying all supply chain actors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Potential indicator: ratio, proportion of indirect:direct water use ○ Step 6-not management only <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Need to be clear on response to indirect/direct numbers - especially if the number is an aggregation of many small indirect or direct values. The expectations are to focus on what to do with them – one large area vs many small ones might have different expectations ○ Will not have indirect water use in all parts of supply chain. Those parts that do not have indirect water, should not have to be part of 2.6 estimates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Edit 1.6- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New 1.6: “The implementer identifies their indirect water uses within their Sphere of Influence.” ○ Sphere of Influence does not dictate whether or not you take action, just the amount or what kind of action you are expected to take. (PR) ● Add 2.6 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New 2.6: “The implementer estimates their direct/indirect water consumption as a proportion within their Sphere of Influence.” ○ Key-RE: estimation of direct/indirect consumption proportion ○ Extra credits-risk and impact identification ○ Suggest to add risk for water stressed areas (terminology is to be determined) — but it might help mitigate costs. ● Add 3.6 – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ New 3.6a: “The implementer estimates their indirect/direct water pollution within their Sphere of Influence.” ○ Key-RE: estimation of indirect/direct water pollution (pollutants of importance?) 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ What about waste water? Should it be the estimate of implications (on important water areas) of discharge from indirect water users (to raise awareness and understand and then they will have the opportunity to have an impact.) ● <i>Add 4.6-affect on indirect water on IWA?-to be visited in IWA discussion.</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Discussion was inconclusive-see new definition:</i> <p>Important Water-related Areas: The specific ecological, socio-cultural, and economic areas of a watershed that, if impaired or lost, would significantly or disproportionately impact the water-related environmental, social, cultural or economic benefits derived from the watershed.</p> <p>This includes water-related areas that are legally protected or under a conservation agreement, areas that have been identified as having cultural, spiritual or recreational importance to local or indigenous communities and areas that are recognized as important ecosystem services. Important water areas cannot be defined solely by the implementer.</p> <p>FYI to change: *all water areas will be termed water-related areas -how indigenous peoples is defined is unclear (should refer to RIO '92) -modify footnote #13: To specify FPIC is for indigenous peoples "... negotiated agreements with recognized indigenous peoples for any compensations..."</p> <p>D. Carlo, John and Alexis to write one pager</p>	
3.6	Feedback Issue #5: Important Water Areas	<p>A. Summary and Discussion of feedback received from ISDC perspective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● People want to know what criteria the ISDC is using to determine IWA. And to what extent they apply/relate to the watershed. ● Does it refer to ecosystems more than anything else? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Important area for the environment ○ Or for recreation etc? ● Maybe IWA is a goal and belongs amongst all three principles and not 	<p>Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Keep IWA as a principle. ● Use new definition ● May be altered for translation and auditing needs ● Peter C will write one

		<p>separate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don't allow people to define their own IWA, needs to be verified by 3rd party. • There are two definitions in the glossary that are contradictory • Needs more guidance based on science • What about using the terms cultural assets, environmental assets instead of IWAs? • What does "area" mean? Area for recharge etc...? • FPIC guidance-when is it appropriate to apply concept (only with indigenous groups?) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The notions are important but not sure belong as separate principle <p>B. Yes change is required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should we make it a separate principle? Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Don't lose content, just incorporate ○ Goal of IWSS is to protect water and related aspects. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Bit weird to make the goal of IWSS a separate principle. – Appropriate quantity and quality for ecosystem areas are covered in principles 2 and 3 – 'non water' quality and quantity belong as part of good governance – Not a consistent notion-lumps lots of separate issues together – Initially the AWS Board asked to make it separate-to make IWSS not so ecosystem focused <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Just need to clarify if ISDC MUST keep separate – We must get clarity on what the function of this is. We've heard and agree that it is key-we now need to find way to explain to make clear-GO ○ What do we mean by "area"? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Refer to water body, or area of catchment? (AD) – Don't need to change definition of area but provide list of examples. <p>C. NEW Definition:</p> <p>Important Water-related Areas: The specific ecological, socio-cultural, and economic</p>	<p>pager</p>
--	--	---	--------------

		<p>areas of a watershed that, if impaired or lost, would significantly or disproportionately impact the water-related environmental, social, cultural or economic benefits derived from the watershed.</p> <p>This includes water-related areas that are legally protected or under a conservation agreement, areas that have been identified as having cultural, spiritual or recreational importance to local or indigenous communities and areas that are recognized as important ecosystem services. Important water areas cannot be defined solely by the implementer.</p> <p>FYI to change: *all water areas will be termed water-related areas -how indigenous peoples is defined is unclear (should refer to RIO '92) -modify footnote #13: To specify FPIC is for indigenous peoples "... negotiated agreements with recognized indigenous peoples for any compensations..."</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water-related does not translate! • Options for translation (this is still under discussion): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Water area is translated into water body in Chinese version. These are different. ○ Specially protected water areas? Korean ○ Critical areas? In LAC ○ Critical water-related areas? <p>D. Peter C will write one pager</p>	
3.7	Feedback Issue #6: Structure	<p>A. What we heard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too many steps • Wrong order of steps • Duplications • Use of headers-group into like items • Details are with wrong steps <p>B. What we're thinking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Condense and reorganize the IWSS steps. • ISDC considered 4 options and agreed upon: 	<p>Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reorganize/clean up into new format (6 steps presented 2 ways and emphasizing the 4 principles in each step) • For each step, will add intent component • Write preamble for

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Commit ○ Data ○ Plan/response ○ Act/enable ○ Evaluate ○ Disclose/communicate • For situations where an implementer may ask “how do I measure? Direct me to the right places.”, would like to use the following steps in guidance document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ws commitments ○ Measure site’s use ○ Measure area of influence ○ Measure status ○ Measure status ○ Measure impacts/risks ○ Indirect use ○ Improve impact • Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Should reflect the philosophy of water stewardship: ○ Fundamental intent of water stewardship is captured in these four principles. What is before the principle? No clear definition of water stewardship. ○ Should explain in preamble how standard has been built etc. and that this is the first of its kind and welcome comments. And part on how to read the standard. ○ Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Take a look at what we’ve re-jiggered. Then decided if we need to look at new principles <p>C. Consensus</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reorganize/clean up into new format (6 steps presented 2 ways and emphasizing the 4 principles in each step) • For each step, will add intent component-why we added and what it’s about • Small groups of ISDC to review one small chunk of new structure-email and calls (couple of bounce backs) then send edited version to whole group after 	<p>Standard-revisit need for new principles after steps have been rewritten</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small groups of ISDC to review one small chunk of new structure • Sanjib to write one pager ▪ SB also offers to put a doc together that may make this operational...from a different point of view
--	--	--	--

		<p>all bits have been initially reviewed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yes did this reflect spirit of what we've talked about ○ Problems we come across or what has been added that was not discussed in June, does it make sense-let us bounce if off of a small group-proposals from small group to AM/NT ○ Secretariat will divide up ● Indicators will be put in later this summer (August at earliest) ● A preamble will be drafted for the IWSS and will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ How the Standard has been built ○ First of its kind, welcome comments ○ How to "read" the standard ○ Definition of water stewardship ● The following are the new 6 steps (with what should be included as bullet points underneath) ● New steps: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) COMMIT to being a water steward (can be done in parallel and are in no particular order) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Leadership (old 1) ● Legal compliance and water rights (old 9) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ commitment and compliance are different ● Continual improvement ● Commitment to stakeholder engagement and transparency 2) GATHER AND PROCESS INFORMATION (in no particular order) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Risks/Status of watershed ● Site's direct use/ Impacts ● Indirect use ● Stakeholder Identification ● Sphere of Influence Identification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Determine geographic boundaries? ○ Determine non-geographic attributes? 3) DEVELOP WATER STEWARDSHIP PLAN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Need a clear vision of what we want to get with the "plan" etc steps. 	
--	--	--	--

		<p>That speaks to the quality and purpose of the information you are gathering. This is a starting point for each step-may require a longer intro paragraph. From current situation to desired situation-in commitment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water stewardship plan to include monitoring plan • To include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site water management ○ Indirect water advocacy (word smith?) ○ Response to high impact incidents (including response planning) ○ Capacity development/building (and assessment at site and basin level?) ○ Resources-financial ○ Target setting and timelines ○ Vision/scenarios (gold) (step 1: commit) ○ Goals (SMART) for G, WB, WQ, IWA ○ Action Plan for G, WB, WQ, IWA (built via participation method) ○ Responsibilities (tied to capacity development) ○ Risk management (“high impact incidents”, basic CC impacts→Core, advanced CC modeling→platinum) ○ Resources ○ Capacity development (linked to responsibilities) ○ B) Awareness of Plan <p>4) IMPLEMENT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do what you planned in #3 • Implement WS plan and monitor along the way (if things are getting done/meeting task along the way-facilitate auditing)-plan translates into goals <p>5) MONITOR AND EVALUATE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New status assessment/evaluate if you have met your operational targets. (propose “performance evaluation” against impacts too) 	
--	--	---	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6) PUBLICLY DISCLOSE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communications • Still have concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Are the measures needed for continual performance built into this new structure? ○ Under planning step D. Sanjib to write one pager <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SB also offers to put a doc together that may make this operational...from a different point of view • Small Groups organized by step and time zone: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Commitment - Maureen, Axel, Peter R, Ed (this group will do #1 and #3) 2. Gathering Info- Sanjib, Lesha, Khan, Opondo 3. WS Planning - Maureen, Axel, Peter R, Ed (this group will do #1 and #3) 4. Implement - Matilda, John, Hao 5. Planning evaluation - Imane, Marco, Carlo, Peter C. 6. Disclosure - Sanjib, Lesha, Khan, Opondo 	
4.0	Scheduling		
4.1	Timeline for content	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • July <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ one pagers, conclusions from this meeting, minutes, organizing comments into categories-links to one pagers, restructuring draft, finalizing field testing process ○ One pagers-response to the major areas of feedback and explanation of ISDC's decision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Turn around in 2 weeks- Circulate to discuss on July 26th call ○ No more than 250 words (one page). ○ Go into spreadsheets that have related content-factor into your one pager. ○ To be released in August-so this back and forth is to ensure the ISDC is comfortable with what they say. 	One pagers are immediate next steps for content

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ content refining, reviewing all areas of feedback, developing guidance, indicators • September <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ field tests being set up ○ initial draft, work on guidance, reviews on cost, auditability etc ○ Description of Oct meeting-polish the draft, sort disagreements-not major content areas that might be missing • October <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ meeting and edits First part of October-draft to ISDC for review • November <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ editing, translation, publication ○ Second draft-out to public by end of November (early December) to get the translations right. • After release-minimum 6 months of testing. • ISDC meeting spring 2013-march/april <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ visit and experience field sites, discuss feedback at that point • ISDC Summer 2013 meeting-TBD 	
4.2	Next Call dates	<p>To rotate 6 hours starting midnight July 26th, Vancouver, British Colombia time July 26th 00:00 hrs PST (Vancouver, BC, Canada) August 23rd 06:00 hrs PST September 20th 12:00 hrs PST</p>	<p>Next Calls: July 26th 00:00 hrs PST (Vancouver, BC, Canada) August 23rd 06:00 hrs PST September 20th 12:00 hrs PST</p>
4.3	Next ISDC meeting	October 22-24, Location TBD	October 22-24, Location TBD
4.4	Public message content	<p>Public message:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spent 3 days going over comments and will go away to think about and revise accordingly • Thanks for the feedback • Working on proposal • Date to get back to them • Listing topics we're doing one pagers on: structure (vague-just that we 	Secretariat to Draft

		<p>worked on it), IWA, Sol, Indirect Water, etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Repeat now who are members of the ISDC-old ToR is on website. • Timing for when they will get responses to feedback • Thank you for Mexico and Latin America for hosting us-extensive feedback in addition to what we've received through the website. 	
<p>CLOSE OF ISDC MEETING</p>			