

WATER ROUNDTABLE
Minutes of the 2nd meeting of the International Standard Development Committee
October 26th-28th, 2011

Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

Attendance

ISDC Members: Maureen Ballestero Vargas, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Riaz Ahmad Khan, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer

Other: Lisa Downes (AWS-NARI), Karin Krchnak (AWS), Ruth Mathews (WFN-Friday morning), Ricardo Monsivais (AWS-LAC), Alexis Morgan (AWS), Rodger O’Connell (Level Headed), Adrian Sym (AWS), Nicole Tanner (AWS)

Apologies: Imane Abdel Al, Pedro Roberto Jacobi, Ma Jun, John Langford, Matilda Park

Monday, July 11th, 2011 – Wednesday, July 13th, 2011			
	Session	Discussion	Agreement/Actions
1	Introductions		
1.1	ISDC Attendance	9 ISDC members in attendance: Maureen Ballestero Vargas, Peter Coockey, Carlo Galli, Riaz Ahmad Khan, Marco Mensink, Gerphas Opondo, Ed Pinero, Peter Ruffier, Lesha Witmer	Quorum in attendance.
	Apologies	Imane Abdel Al, Pedro Roberto Jacobi, Ma Jun, John Langford, Matilda Park	
1.2	Open ISDC positions	1 position still to be confirmed-Sanjib Bezbaroa (India).	
1.3	Agenda	No amendments	Approved
2	Reaffirmation of Meeting 1 and Vision of Success	Session #1	
2.1	Overview of materials and key documents	Alexis Morgan gave overview of changes since last meeting to the IP agreement and ISDC Terms of Reference-Seeking signature of both. While there were no objections in principle to the documents, there needs to be a few clarifications/changes before final: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 2Aii-Original material brought to ISDC will not belong to AWS, but AWS will (with permission) incorporate it into the IWSS. 	Secretariat to make changes and reprint for signing.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 3-obligation from AWS and ISDC to inform each other ahead of time (if possible) for termination reasons. • ISDC and Secretariat will clearly decide and mark what is confidential and what is not. • Section 4-add language that includes un-wilful means of departure (illness etc), preferably with an advance notice to the group, and reference WRT Terms of Reference document that notes similar circumstances. 	
2.2	Thoughts from NARI public session on 10/25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RIs will circulate notes/results from public meeting to ISDC for consideration 	The Secretariat will gather input from sectors and regions to present to ISDC before scheduled meetings
2.3	Update on AWS Business Model	<p>Adrian presented current thinking on AWS Business model-focusing on ensuring the compatibility between AWS organizational development and standard development including regional outreach and involvement.</p> <p>ISDC notes that both the IWSS and AWS should not focus initially on ‘low hanging fruit’ only, but to include concerted effort in the regions that need better water stewardship the most.</p>	
3.0	Confirming the Scope of the Standard	Session #2:	
3.1	Scope- Defining the ‘User’ of the Standard	<p>The ISDC agrees that the IWSS could be used by all and should be organized into ‘promoters’ and ‘implementers’ where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementers are legal or recognized entities that use water within a watershed, leading to certification. • Promoters are not seeking certification but expect others to implement the standard and enforce it. <p>There are also other stakeholders:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders are those parties who are impacted by, or can impact, the activities of implementing the IWSS. 	The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS
3.2	Scope- Point of Application	The ISDC agrees that the IWSS should be applied at the site or facility level and take into account the watershed in which it’s located.	The Secretariat will include this thinking in

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is an expectation that making improvements at a site level will lead to improvements at the basin level. • The site or facility level is the most manageable level of application. <p>The ISDC notes that the boundaries of the watershed need to be manageable-for future discussion. The watershed will not be certified, but many sites within the watershed could seek certification.</p> <p>The ISDC notes that the IWSS should not require supply chain certification. However, if a company wishes to seek certification along its supply chain, the IWSS should be implemented at the sites along the chain-as in group certification—for future discussion.</p>	<p>first draft of IWSS</p>
3.3	Scope- Performance Levels	<p>The ISDC agrees that there should be ‘levels of compliance’ after a base or entry level of requirements are met. This base level will at least require legal compliance with local and national laws. The Standard will have three levels of achievement. External engagement will lead to a higher achievement level. However, the core requirements will be set and must all be met before the levels come into play.</p> <p>The ISDC discussed the merits/weaknesses of B2B (Business to Business) focused claims versus B2C (Business to Consumer-labels) claims as well as the difference between a ‘good product’ versus ‘a product produced in a certified facility’.</p>	<p>The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS</p>
4	Confirmation of the Draft Framework	<p><i>Session #3</i></p>	
4.1	Draft Framework	<p>The ISDC discussed the evolving framework as organized by the Secretariat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Standard will be structured around Water Quantity, Quality and Governance criteria. • The Standard will address the capacity of management needed to meet the Standard. • The Standard will address Economic, Environmental and Social aspects. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measure of conformity with the Standard will relate to the actions within the control of the entity seeking to apply the Standard, as well as their efforts to engage with stakeholders at the watershed level. • The Standard must include both performance- and process-based aspects and should acknowledge and reward effort (process) as well as achievement (performance). <p>The below sections will outline the discussion per Framework issue.</p>	
4.2	Framework Issues-Quantity	<p>The ISDC explored how the issue of ‘quantity’ could be addressed by the standard. Below is a summary of the discussion. This will be taken forward by the Secretariat for use in developing the Draft IWSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Manage water sustainably, aiming to ensure adequate availability for all uses (environmental, social and economic)” • The IWSS would address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Base level/Entry point = Source(s) legal compliance (volume/area/time)/water allocation rights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Source=point of water withdrawal</i> ○ Policy framework (strategy, operational targets, BPs) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Including choice of sources-what kind of water is the site going to use?</i> ○ Water source(s) monitoring (Ground water levels, flow rates, ...) ○ Water source(s) sustainability assessment (internal monitoring and 3rd party hydro assessment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>E-flows mentioned under monitoring</i> ▪ <i>State of water sources-your use against availability/scarcity index</i> ○ Water efficiency management (water management plan, contingency plan, KPIs, tracking x withdrawals, % of reuse water, investments x process, ...) ○ Mitigation of impacts for other uses (env, soc, econ, uses in site’s zone of influence), present and future (climate change) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>perhaps broken into mitigation of impacts individually for env, soc and econ</i> 	<p>The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS</p>

4.3	Framework Issue- Quality	<p>The ISDC explored how the issue of ‘quality’ could be addressed by the standard. Below is a summary of the discussion. This will be taken forward by the Secretariat for use in developing the Draft IWSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The standard requires actions to result in the maintenance of physical, chemical and biological water quality to ensure the sustainable viable economic, ecosystem and social-cultural needs of the watershed and its users” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Establish the water quality levels necessary to meet the needs of all users <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water quality characteristics (necessary to meet Eco/Env/Soc needs) are identified and levels are set (by regulations or stakeholder engagement) ▪ <i>Stakeholders here would mean other water suppliers and users within the watershed (i.e. could be other implementers and promoters that have a link to the site in question)</i> ○ Document the actions being taken to manage water quality ○ Measure the impacts of the actions on water quality relevant to those levels <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess the capacity of the system to absorb/assimilate pollutants ▪ Measure and monitor water quality input/output (timing/scale/location) ▪ <i>Quality of intake, use and discharge</i> ○ Report water quality against impact of pollutant 	<p>The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS</p>
4.4	Framework Issue- Governance	<p>The ISDC explored how the issue of ‘governance’ could be addressed by the standard. Below is a summary of the discussion. This will be taken forward by the Secretariat for use in developing the Draft IWSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “The Standard requires organization governance that leads to sustainable water resource stewardship” 	<p>The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Equity (at principle level?)</i> ▪ <i>No Harm/ Precautionary Principle</i> ○ Criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Legal & Policies’ Compliance ▪ Transparency & Accountability ▪ Community Participation & Stakeholder Involvement ▪ Continuous Improvement ▪ Integrated Approach ○ Potential additional criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Management System “Approach”(procedures and internal policies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Notes that some aspects of this would be included in above</i> ▪ Contingency Plan 	
4.5	Framework Issue-Capacity	<p>The ISDC explored how the issue of ‘capacity’ could be addressed by the standard. Below is a summary of the discussion. This will be taken forward by the Secretariat for use in developing the Draft IWSS.</p> <p>The ISDC notes that each other issue has related capacity aspects. “Capacity” as an issue may or may not be a separate area, it may or may not be addressed as a specific part of the other issues.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are adequate skills and resources are in place for sound environmental management; • There are efficient and financially sound and transparent management practices (productivity, efficiency-including environmental accounting); • And there are relevant, appropriate skills to enhance stakeholder involvement and show socially responsible activities in a transparent and accountable manner <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Do you have a responsible officer to assess whether you comply with environmental and water resource management strategy/aspects? 	<p>The Secretariat will include this thinking in first draft of IWSS</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Not necessarily a set number of people</i> ▪ <i>Must be able to show how these issues (other Framework issues) are addressed/who is responsible</i> ▪ <i>i.e. ISO 9001 for text</i> ○ Do you have a competent person to implement the standard? ○ Can you show you have the experience and knowledge to carry out the tasks (economic, social, and environmental for all domains in standard)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>And financial resources? Financial sustainability?</i> ▪ <i>Does not require diplomas-but experience/competency i.e. indigenous knowledge</i> ▪ <i>Could be difficult to set indicators that capture qualifications</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>RENFIL-term and tool for assessing competencies acquired through formal and informal learning (UNESCO)</i> • <i>Maybe required to take "AWS" training course</i> ○ Do you have training and evaluation process in place (short and long term) to ensure the capacity of your staff stays current? ○ Is there a manual or procedure in place (understandable for all) to follow financial process-how to do it? ○ Assess the skill, competence, knowledge, and experience level of individual staff (audit tool for skills and competencies) that results in gap analysis and measures to take. ○ Communication skills for information accumulation and dissemination-policies in place (stakeholder outreach/involvement etc) ○ Can you show that your organization encourages 1. Equity and equal participation 2. Good human resource policy and local capacity ○ Is there a department/person identified to carry out health and safety or danger risk management? 	
--	--	--	--

5	Questions and Points for Drafting and AWS's Consideration		
5.1	Structure	<p>The ISDC notes there seems to be a logical sequence in which to structure the criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Logical sequence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Know -would include criteria that gets data/know context- what is happening and what is needed-know your stakeholders ○ Analyse -connect the data to the watershed and entity's operations ○ Engage-engage with external parties (stakeholders, policy etc) ○ Manage/Monitor- water stewardship actions ○ Report-transparency/feedback loop of previous <p>The ISDC also notes that the social, environmental and economic domains of each issue should be considered and addressed.</p>	Secretariat will bring questions and notes to AWS Board
5.2	Continuous Improvement	<p>The ISDC wonders what should be involved if the idea of 'continual improvement' is included in the IWSS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should continual improvement within a level (for some indicators) be required? • Should it not be required between compliance levels? • If improvement is not possible, should you be required to explain why? • What is the incentive to improve? • Will it create a problem for AWS if an organization does not improve from level to level? • How often will auditing/monitoring be required? • What would happen if an organization 'lost their level'? 	Secretariat will bring questions and notes to AWS Board

		<p>The ISDC notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That the Standard should come under review of itself (continual improvement for the IWSS itself) • It may be possible for an organization to remain at a level indefinitely as long as it is not creating major concerns for local stakeholders and is maintaining 'good' stewardship. • Organizations can move up or down within compliance levels • There should be a level of monitoring frequency. Perhaps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Annual spot check / update report, plus detailed audit every 3-5 years unless something drastic changes. ○ A mechanism to trigger a review if something major changes or a request for an upgrade • That the AWS should be careful not to encourage laggards with too much time between audits 	
6.0	Drafting the IWSS		
6.1	Plan for Writing the First Draft IWSS	<p>The Secretariat will write the first Draft IWSS.</p> <p>Timeline:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • January 2012 ISDC Meeting -completed first Draft for ISDC review. • February and March 2012-ISDC detailed review for public release • March 2012-Release First Draft IWSS for public review (60 day period) during World Water Forum in Marseille, France. <p>Format:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short and to the point with guidance if necessary • Regional and sectoral input before release (as much as possible) • Will use existing standards as a base point. <p>ISDC and Secretariat interaction before January:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A small volunteer ISDC group will be available for questions. And all ISDC available on specific questions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Carlo on quantity ○ Ed for all ○ Peter for all ○ Lesha on governance 	Secretariat will write first draft IWSS for January 2012 ISDC meeting

7.2	Public Meeting Conclusions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Standard will be global and as inclusive as possible. 2. The Standard will be designed to be implemented by legal or recognized entities that use water within a watershed, leading to certification. 3. The Standard will be made freely available in order to promote good water stewardship, even if not pursuing certification. 4. The Standard will be applied at site/facility level and take into account the watershed in which it's located. 5. The Standard will not certify at the level of supply chain. 6. The Standard will have three levels of achievement. External engagement will lead to a higher achievement level. 7. The ISDC drafted a first inventory of principles and criteria. 8. The Standard will be structured around Water Quantity, Quality and Governance criteria. 9. The Standard will address the capacity of management needed to meet the Standard. 10. The Standard will address Economic, Environmental and Social aspects. 11. Measure of conformity with the Standard will relate to the actions within the control of the entity seeking to apply the Standard, as well as their efforts to engage with stakeholders at the watershed level. 12. The Standard must include both performance- and process-based aspects and should acknowledge and reward effort (process) as well as achievement (performance). 	
CLOSE OF ISDC MEETING			