SDG Indicator 6.5.1: Survey

Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation

Reporting year: **2023**

Country	**(name of country here)**

You are invited to insert here the logo(s) of the government authority(ies) responsible for coordinating the survey completion process

Submission Form	
Date of submission	
National SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point information	
Name, Job title	Ida Nagyné Sós, Deputy Head of Department
Organisation	Ministry of Interior
Are you the national Focal Point for any other SDG indicator (apart from 6.5.1)? **If yes, please insert 'X' for all that apply:** __6.1.1 __6.2.1 __6.3.1 __6.3.2 __6.4.1 __6.4.2 __6.5.2 __6.6.1 __6.a.1 __6.b.1 __Other SDG indicator(s) (please specify here):	
SDG 6.5.1 in-country data collection and reporting process overview	
Were other institutions/stakeholders involved and consulted in the reporting process for this indicator? X Yes __No *(Please provide further details on the consultation process in Annex C)*	
If yes, please indicate the mode(s) of consultation (please provide further details in Annex C): __Phone calls _X_Email exchanges __In-person meetings __Dedicated stakeholder workshop(s) _X_Other (please specify): published on the web	
Contact person regarding further questions/clarifications relating to this submission	
_X_SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point listed above __Other (please specify contact details here):	

Part 1 – Introduction

This is the official survey for country reporting on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 6.5.1: "Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation". The indicator is measured on a scale of 0 – 100, calculated based on scores from approximately 30 questions in this survey, covering different aspects of IWRM. Indicator 6.5.1 measures progress towards target 6.5: "By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate". The target supports the equitable and efficient use of water resources, which is essential for social and economic development, as well as environmental sustainability. The actions to achieve target 6.5 directly underpin the other water-related targets within SDG-6: "Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all". Further guidance on completing this survey is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide. Both this Survey and the Monitoring Guide are available in six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and Portuguese, available on the IWRM Data Portal.

About the survey

The primary purpose of the survey is global monitoring and reporting on indicator 6.5.1. It has been designed to also be useful as a simple diagnostic tool for countries to identify strengths and weaknesses of different aspects of IWRM implementation.

The survey contains four sections, each covering a key dimension of IWRM (see definition in Annex A: Glossary):

1. **Enabling environment:** Policies, laws and plans to support IWRM implementation.
2. **Institutions and participation:** The range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions and other stakeholder groups that help to support implementation.
3. **Management instruments:** The tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.
4. **Financing:** Budgeting and financing for water resources development and management.

Each section has two sub-sections covering the "National" and "Other" levels. "Other" levels include sub-national, basin, local and transboundary (see Annex A - Glossary). For most "other level" questions, the score should reflect the situation in most of the basins/aquifers/jurisdictions, unless specified otherwise. For the transboundary level questions, the score should reflect the situation in the 'most important' transboundary basins / aquifers, which should ideally be coordinated with reporting under SDG indicator 6.5.2 on transboundary cooperation. It is recognised that water resources management in federal countries may be more complex due to responsibilities at different administrative levels. You may further explain any specific circumstances relating to the level of decentralization of water resources management and responsibility in your country (e.g. federal countries and other large countries) in the free text responses (see next section).

How to complete the survey

Scoring: For each question, enter a score between 0 and 100, in increments of 10.. It is not possible to omit questions[1]. The score selection is guided by descriptive text for six thresholds, which are specific to each question. If a country judges the degree of implementation to be between two thresholds, the increment of 10 between the two thresholds may be selected. The potential scores that may be given for each question are: 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100.

The thresholds for each question are defined sequentially. This means that the criteria for all lower levels of implementation must be met for a country to respond that it has reached a specific level of implementation for each question. **Bold** text in the thresholds helps the reader differentiate between thresholds.

The thresholds are indicative and are meant to guide countries in choosing the most appropriate responses, i.e. selected responses should be a reasonable match, but do not have to be a perfect match, as each country is unique.

Instructions on how to calculate the overall indicator 6.5.1 score are provided in section 5.

Narrative responses: for each question, there are two free-text fields: "Status and progress" and "Way forward". The type of information that countries may find useful to consider includes:

Status and progress: e.g. refer to relevant activities/initiatives/laws/policies/plans/strategies or similar; comment on the degree of implementation as it relates to the threshold descriptions; barriers/enablers; and reflect on progress (e.g. between reporting rounds: baseline in 2017, 2nd round in 2020, and current round in 2023). Where possible, provide a brief explanation of why the score is different to the previous round, including reflecting on recent rates of implementation of relevant activities.

Way forward: e.g. already planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of that aspect of IWRM, including identifying barriers and enablers. Include draft interim target-setting for each question where appropriate (e.g. consider actions or recommendations for making progress). Any actions or recommendations provided in this field are neither binding nor comprehensive, but may be used as inputs to country planning processes.

Specific additional guidance is provided in each field for each question. Experience from previous reporting shows that the free-text responses to each question are important, as they: increase the robustness, transparency and objectivity of the indicator scores; facilitate stakeholder consensus on each question score; help countries track progress between reporting periods; and help countries to analyse what is required to reach the next threshold.

In each field, enter the narrative response by replacing "xxx". It is recommended that the guidance text is left in the free-text fields during the stakeholder consultation process, but that this guidance text is deleted before final submission.

[1] If the country judges the question to be 'not applicable', you can enter 'n/a'. However, the survey has been designed to be relevant to all countries, and an 'n/a' response is unlikely.

Climate change considerations: For five questions (1.1c, 2.1b, 2.1e, 3.1e, and 4.1b), there is an additional free text field to provide information on how relevant aspects of water resources management and climate change adaptation/mitigation are coordinated. Recognising that climate change cuts across all aspects of water resources management, considerations of climate change are also encouraged in the free text fields of all questions.

Progress and differences since previous reporting rounds

172 countries established a baseline for indicator 6.5.1 in 2017/18, with 171 countries reporting in the second round in 2020. This is the third round of data collection. Where available, countries should refer to the previous survey responses, available here: http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/country-reports. Countries are encouraged to consider progress, or lack of progress, since previous rounds, in the 'Status and progress' fields, and give reasoning for differences in scores. Countries are welcome to use and update free text responses used in previous surveys. For Word versions of previous surveys, please contact the **IWRM Help Desk: iwrmsdg651@un.org**.

The current survey version is highly comparable, though not identical, to previous versions. Some minor amendments have been made following a review process, and noteworthy changes are described in footnotes for relevant questions. A summary of changes is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide.

Data collection and submission

A broad stakeholder engagement process is encouraged to complete the survey. This helps to increase stakeholder participation and ownership of water management and decision-making processes, and makes the completed survey a more robust and useful diagnostic tool for further discussions and planning. SDG 6.5.1 Focal Points are asked to fill in the Reporting Process Form in Annex C to increase transparency and stakeholder confidence in the results at all levels. The extent and mode of stakeholder engagement is up to each country, and further guidance is provided in the Monitoring Guide. Coordination with Focal Points for other SDG indicators is encouraged where feasible and relevant.[2]

The Focal Point is responsible for the Quality Assurance and formal submission of the completed survey to the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), as described in section 6 of the Monitoring Guide.

Upon request, the SDG 6.5.1 IWRM Help Desk, hosted by UNEP (iwrmsdg651@un.org) will provide support to Focal Points and colleagues on matters such as interpretation of questions and thresholds, the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement in countries, and submitting the final indicator scores.

[2] Monitoring of 6.5.1 is being done as part of the UN-Water initiative on integrated monitoring of SDG 6 (IMI-SDG6). Support is provided in collaboration with UN-Water members and partners. For a list of questions that relate to other SDG indicators (mainly in section 3), please see Annex 3 of the Monitoring Guide.

Part 2 – The survey

1 Enabling environment

This section covers the enabling environment, which is about creating the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM. It includes the most typical policy, legal and planning tools for IWRM[3]. Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation. **Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds**.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

1. Enabling Environment							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
1.1 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) at the national level?							
a. National water resources **policy,** or similar.		Development **not started** or not progressing.	**Exists**, but not based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by government and starting to be used by authorities to guide work.	Based on IWRM, being **used** by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.	Policy objectives consistently **achieved.**	Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Score	80						
Status and progress: National Water Strategy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) was adopted in 2017. National Water Strategy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) implementation under operational programmes is in progress. The implementation of the Plan is monitored.Implementation of the EU water policy according to 2000/60/EC Water Framework Directive since 22/12/2000 (http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html). According to the WFD River Basin Management Plan has done in 2009, 2015 and 2022 The second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan is finished. The implementation of the Program of Measures and the status of waters are monitored.							
Way forward: The progress in implementation of the 3nd River Basin Management Plan and improvement in status of water are not as fast as it was expected. The consequences of climate change (especially the prolonged drought) are hampering the achievement of the goals.							
b. National water resources **law(s)**.		Development **not started** or not progressing**.**	**Exists**, but not based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by government and starting to be applied by authorities.	Based on IWRM, **being applied** by the majority of relevant authorities**.**	Based on IWRM and all laws are being **applied** across the country.	Based on IWRM and all laws are **enforced** across the country, and all people and organizations are held accountable.
Score	90						
Status and progress: The Water Act was adopted in 1995 (http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/getdoc2.cgi?dbnum=1&docid=99500057.TV) but the first law was enforced in 1886. The Act has been amended several times.							
Way forward: The Act amendments were focusing on development of electronic administration (e-Governance) in water sector and simplifying irrigation and geothermal water use permitting.							

[3] For examples of good practices of policies, laws and plans, please see the tools, case studies, and resources in the Global Water Partnership (GWP) IWRM ToolBox.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. National integrated water resources management (IWRM) **plans**, or similar.	Development **not started** or not progressing**.**	**Being prepared**, but not approved by government.	**Approved** by government and starting to be implemented by authorities.	Being **implemented** by the majority of relevant authorities.	Plan objectives consistently **achieved**.	Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Score 80						
Status and progress The implementation of the National Water Strategy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) under operational programmes is in progress. The implementation of the Plan is monitored. The WFD River Basin Management Plan was developed in 2009, 2015 and 2021. This includes the progress since 2010 (adaptation of the 1st RBMP) (https:// vizeink.hu). The implementation of the Program of Measures and the status of waters are monitored.						
Climate change considerations: Climate change poses a challenge in solving water management issues, therefore climate change adaptation strategies and plans are coordinated with water management plans.						
Way forward: The progress in implementation of the 3nd River Basin Management Plan and improvement in status of water are not as fast as it was expected. The consequences of climate change (especially the prolonged drought) are hampering the achievement of the goals.						

1.2 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support IWRM at other levels?						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Sub-national[4] water resources **policies** or similar.	Development **not started** or delayed in most sub-national jurisdictions.	**Exist** in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by the majority of authorities and starting to be used to guide work.	Based on IWRM, being **used** by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.	Based on IWRM and policy objectives consistently **achieved** by a majority of authorities.	Based on IWRM and objectives consistently achieved by all authorities, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Score 70						
Status and progress: The Integrated Tisza River Basin Management Plan was drafted with involvement and joint efforts of the five countries that share the Tisza River Basin — Hungary, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine. This plan includes the primary aspects of the EU Floods Directive (2007/60/EC, https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/flood_risk/index.htm) as well. The 2nd River Basin Management Plans (according to WFD) were elaborated to 4 sub-basins and 42 subunits to enforce implementation of WFD on sub-national level. It also includes the program of measures.						
Way forward: The progress in implementation of the 3 River Basin Management Plans at sub-national levels and improvement in status of water are not as fast as it was expected. The consequences of climate change (especially the prolonged drought) are hampering the achievement of the goals.						

[4] Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national policies, please answer this question by considering how national policies are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response.

b. Basin/aquifer management plans[5] or similar, **based on IWRM**. Score 70	Development **not started** or delayed in most basins/aquifers of national importance.	**Being prepared** for most basins/aquifers.	**Approved** in the majority of basins/aquifers and starting to be used by authorities.	Being **implemented** in the majority of basins/aquifers.	Plan objectives consistently **achieved** in majority of basins/aquifers.	Objectives consistently achieved in all basins/aquifers, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Status and progress: See above (1.2 RBMP). Further, Regional Water Resource Management Plan were prepared in 2017 on the Great Plain of Hungary to support irrigation development program. These plans include significant part of Tisza and Danube basins and porous aquifers in this regions. Some plans were reviewed in 2019 and a Regional Water Resource Management Plan was prepared for Small Plain of Hungary to support irrigation development program in this region, too.						
Way forward: The Government approved a proposal on irrigation development in Hungary and Elaboration of a drought management plan is in progress.						

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Arrangements for transboundary water management.[6] Score 90	Development **not started** or not progressing.	**Being prepared** or negotiated.	Arrangements are **adopted**.	Arrangements' provisions are **partly implemented**.	Arrangements' provisions are **mostly implemented**.	The arrangements' provisions are **fully implemented**.
Status and progress: Convention on cooperation for the Protection and Sustainable Use of the Danube river - Danube River Protection Convention was signed on June 29 1994 in Sofia (https://www.icpdr.org/). Tisza Declaration to facilitate the constitution among the basin's countries; Drava Declaration concerning common approaches to water management, flood protection, hydropower utilization and nature and biodiversity conservation in the Drava River Basin was adopted by Participants at the "Drava River Vision Symposium" in 2008. (https://www.icpdr.org/main/publications/new-drava-declaration-signed) Bilateral Transboundary Agreements with the 7 neighbouring countries were signed on different dates.						
Way forward: EU Strategy for the Danube Region (EUSDR) as a macro-regional strategy adopted by the European Commission in December 2010 and endorsed by the European Council in 2011 is a Strategy which was jointly developed by the Commission, together with the Danube Region countries and stakeholders, in order to address common challenges together. The Strategy seeks to create synergies and coordination between existing policies and initiatives taking place across the Danube Region including transnational water management problems. Further cooperation in the field of the implementation of the Danube Protection Convention. Implementation of the decisions of the committees established to implement integrated transboundary water management						

[5] At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or other reasons. This question only refers to these basins/aquifers. These basins/aquifers are likely to cross administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 1.2c refers specifically to transboundary arrangements for basins/aquifers shared by countries.

[6] For 'transboundary' definition, see Annex A. All transboundary level questions should reflect the situation in most of the 'most important' transboundary basins/aquifers, which should be listed in the 'status and progress' field. An 'arrangement' should be a formal commitment, and may be referred to as a bilateral or multilateral agreement, treaty, convention, protocol, joint declaration, memorandum of understanding, or other arrangement between riparian countries on the management of a transboundary basin/aquifer. Arrangements may be interstate, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial, interagency or between regional authorities. They may also be entered into by sub-national entities.

d. Sub-national water resources **regulations**[7] (laws, decrees, ordinances or similar).[8]		Development **not started** or delayed in most sub-national jurisdictions.	**Exist** in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM**.**	Based on IWRM, **approved** in most jurisdictions, and starting to be applied by authorities in some jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM, **some** regulations **being applied** in the majority of jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM and **all regulations being applied** in the majority of jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM and all regulations being applied and **enforced** in all jurisdictions, and all people and organizations are held accountable.
Score	n/a						
Status and progress: There are no sub-national regulations. Implementation of water management and water protection regulations are primarily the responsibility of the 12 regional water authorities, operational tasks are carried out by the 12 water directorates (authorities and directorates have a watershed based jurisdiction covering the territory of the whole country); special water related responsibilities of local relevance are assigned to municipalities (e. g. licensing of domestic wells)							
Way forward:							

[7] Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national regulations, please answer this question by considering how national regulations are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response.

[8] This question has replaced question 1.2d from the baseline survey instrument, which was for federal countries only.

2 Institutions and participation

This section is about the range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions that support the implementation of IWRM. It includes institutional capacity and effectiveness, cross-sector coordination, stakeholder participation and gender mainstreaming. The 2030 Agenda stresses the importance of partnerships that will require public participation and creating synergies with the private sector.

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds. Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

2. Institutions and Participation							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
2.1 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at the national level?							
a. National **government authorities**[9] for leading IWRM implementation.		**No** dedicated government authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear roles and responsibilities to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[10] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Score	80						
Status and progress: Main national government authorities are the Ministry of Interior (http://www.kormany.hu/en/ministry-of-interior), the General Directorate of Water Management (www.ovf.hu) and regional water directorates, the National Directorate for Disaster Management and its regional directorates (https://www.katasztrofavedelem.hu/130/vzgyi-s-vzvdelemi-hatsgi-tevkenysg). Not all areas of expertise are integrated into these governmental authorities thus to manage IWRM inter-ministerial coordination is needed (for example Ministry of Energy is responsible for water utilities and climate change mitigation and adaptation).							
Way forward: The Climate and Nature Protection Action Plan was adopted in 2020 which pays special attention to protecting Hungary's natural waters as part of adaptation to climate change. The Sustainable Hungary Programme has launched in 2020 to shift gradually Hungary to a rotational economy. Ministry of Agriculture announced in 2019 that changed climate conditions make in necessary to change the tradition of Hungarian water management. Instead of water drainage, the goal now is water retention, and in addition to state incentives, science, education and research have a key role in the paradigm shift.							

[9] 'Government authorities' could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.

[10] 'Capacity' in this context is that the responsible authorities should have the required knowledge and technical skills, including planning, rule-making, project management, finance, budgeting, data collection and monitoring, risk/conflict management and evaluation. Beyond having the technical capacity, authorities should also have the financial capacity to actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. Coordination between national government authorities representing **different sectors**[11] on water resources policy, planning and management. Score 80	**No information** shared between different government sectors on water policy, planning and management.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available between different sectors.	**Communication:** Information, experiences and opinions on water resources, policy, planning and management are **shared between** different sectors.	**Consultation:** Opportunities for different sectors to **take part** in water resources policy, planning and management processes.	**Collaboration:** Formal **arrangements** between different government sectors with the objective of agreeing on collective decisions on important issues and activities relating to water resources planning and management.	**Co-decisions and co-production:** Coordination through jointly agreed upon processes and power is shared between different sectors on joint policy, planning and management activities.
Status and progress: Inter-ministerial coordination is part of the governance mechanism. To align the operations of agriculture and water management an authority (so called "Irrigation Agency") was established at 01/01/2020 Representatives of government authorities representing different sectors are members of the National Water Council (NWC). The Ministry of Interior is the governing body. At sub-basin level there are 4 Sub-basin Water Councils, and at regional level 12 Regional Water Councils. "Water and Health" intersectorial expert group of representatives from government organisations was established mainly for coordination of the UN ECE Water and Health Protocol related tasks some years ago, but from a health point of view, there is a need for closer inter-ministerial cooperation on water and health in the future, especially at the expert level.						
Climate change considerations: Climate change poses new challenges to water management, to which we can only find appropriate answers with the close cooperation of the national government authorities representing different sectors. [						
Way forward: Water Councils have coordination role in sub-basins to support inter-sectorial communication. "Irrigation Agency" will support cooperation between agriculture and water management						
c. Public participation[12] in water resources policy, planning and management at national level. Score **90**	**No information** shared between government and the public on policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to the public.	**Communication:** Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public in relation to policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly **use** information, experiences and opinions of the public in relation to policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[13] established, and regularly used, for the public to take part in relevant water resources policy, planning and management processes.	**Representation:** Formal representation of the public in government processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities in relation to water resources.
Status and progress: The National Water Council has the role consulting water issues at national level. Representatives of stakeholder groups are members of the water councils, including stakeholder organizations, scientific institutions, civil societies. Individuals can attend on convocations or initiate disputation of any water related issues. The development of River Basin Management plan contains public participation,						
Way forward: As the second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan the other strategies and plans contain public participation.						

[11] Relates to coordination between the government authorities responsible for water management and those responsible for other sectors (such as agriculture, aquaculture, energy, climate, water supply and sanitation, tourism, municipal use, mining and industry, environment etc.) that are dependent on water, or impact on water (including surface water / groundwater considerations).

[12] 'The public' includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is addressed separately in the next question, and vulnerable groups are addressed separately in question 2.2c.

[13] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
d. Private sector[14] **participation** in water resources development, management and use. Score 90	**No information** shared between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Information** made available between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Communication** between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly involve the private sector in water resources development, management and use activities.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[15] are established, ~~and~~ regularly used, and rooted in the transparent and accountable involvement and partnership of the private sector.	**Representation:** Effective private sector involvement in water resources development, management and use is established in a transparent way and with proper accountability mechanisms[16] in place.
Status and progress: Representatives of business are members of water councils and they have the opportunity to launch any water related issues through ministries as well.						
Way forward: As the second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan the other strategies and plans contain public participation.						

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Developing IWRM capacity.[17] Score 70	**No** capacity development specific to water resources management.	**Occasional** water resources management capacity development, generally limited to **short-term** / ad-hoc activities.	**Some long-term** capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, but geographic and stakeholder coverage is **limited**.	**Long-term** capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **adequate**.	Long-term capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, with **effective** outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **very good**.	Long-term capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented with **highly effective** outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **excellent.**
Status and progress According to the National Water Strategy a long-term capacity development program was launched in Hungary in 2018. Special rules applicable to civil servants employed by water administrations were established which include enhancement of competence, management and professionalism of water administration.						

[14] Private sector includes for-profit businesses and groups. Private sector actors may include water users (from across sectors, e.g. agriculture, food and beverage, energy, manufacturing, mining, etc.); water and sanitation service operators; water-related technology providers; and the financial providers participating through investments in water initiatives (definition adapted from Sustainable Water Partnership (2017)). It does not include government, civil society or public academic institutions. While this question is mainly focused at the national level, please respond at the level that is most relevant in the country context. Please explain this, including differences between implementation at different levels, in the 'Status and progress field.

[15] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for private sector participation.

[16] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

[17] IWRM capacity development: refers to the enhancement of skills, instruments, resources and incentives for people and institutions at all levels, to improve IWRM implementation. Capacity needs assessments are essential for effective and cost-effective capacity development. Capacity development programmes should consider gender balance and disadvantaged/minority groups in terms of participation and awareness. Capacity development is relevant for many groups, including: local and central government, water professionals in all areas - both public and private water organisations, civil society, and in regulatory organisations. In this instance, capacity development may also include primary, secondary and tertiary education, and academic research concerning IWRM.

Climate change considerations: The close cooperation of the national government authorities representing different sectors.
Way forward: IWRM related subjects has included into training programmes.

2.2 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at other levels?						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Basin/aquifer level[18] **organizations**[19] for leading implementation of IWRM. Score 70	**No** dedicated basin authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[20] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Status and progress: 12 regional water directorates are responsible to manage water resources and 12 water authorities for official licensing and control activities related to waters but despite the development, their capacities are still insufficient for leading formulation of plan or implementation of IWRM. The Government Offices are also important part of the process. VIZEK project has developed information technology at water administration since 2018 to establish e-Government in water sector (not yet finished).						
Way forward: Information technology developments will continue.						
b. Public participation[21] in water resources policy, planning and management at the **local level.**[22] Score 90	**No information** shared between government and the public on policy, planning and management at the local level.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to the public at the local level.	**Communication:** Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public**.**	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly **use** local level information, experiences and opinions of the public.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[23] established, and regularly used, for the public at the local level to take part in relevant policy, planning and management processes.	**Representation:** Formal representation of the public in local authority processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities, as appropriate.
Status and progress: 4 regional and 12 sub-regional water councils have the role consulting water issues. Representatives of stakeholder groups are members of the water councils, including organizations, scientific institutions, civil societies. Individuals can attend on convocations or initiate disputation of any water related issues. National information resources can be used by local stakeholders like www.vizeink.hu, www.hydroinfo.hu						

[18] At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or for other reasons. These basins/aquifers likely cross-administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 2.2e refers specifically to transboundary management of basins/aquifers shared by countries.

[19] Could be organization, committee, inter-ministerial mechanism or other means of collaboration for managing water resources at the basin level.

[20] For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 13. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

[21] 'The public' includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is dealt with separately in question 2.1d.

[22] Examples of 'local level' include municipal level (e.g. cities, towns and villages), community level, basin/tributary/aquifer/delta level, and water user associations.

[23] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

Way forward: Information technology developments will continue.

		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Participation of vulnerable groups in water resources planning and management.[24]		Participation of vulnerable groups **not explicitly addressed** in laws, policies, or plans.	Vulnerable groups **partially addressed,** but no explicit procedures in place.[25]	**Some procedures in place**, but limited budget and human capacity for implementation.	Transparent procedures in place, with **moderate participation** of vulnerable groups (moderate budget and human capacity).	**Regular participation** of vulnerable groups (sufficient budget and human capacity, and participation is monitored through accountability mechanisms[26]).	**Meaningful[27] and regular participation** of vulnerable groups, as appropriate, and participation is monitored through accountability mechanisms.
Score	80						

Status and progress: In the interest to ensure the effective, coherent and most comprehensive protection of fundamental rights (including protection of vulnerable groups) and in order to implement the Fundamental Law of Hungary Act CXI of 2011 on the Commissioner for Fundamental Rights was adopted in 2011 (https://www.ajbh.hu/en/web/ajbh-en/main_page).

The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights pays special attention to the protection of the rights of children, nationalities living in Hungary, the most vulnerable social groups, and the values determined as 'the interests of future generations'. The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights gives an opinion on the draft rules of law affecting his/her tasks and competences; on long-term development and land management plans and concepts, and on plans and concepts otherwise directly affecting the quality of life of future generations; and he/she may make proposals for the amendment or making of rules of law affecting fundamental rights and/or the recognition of the binding nature of an international treaty. The Commissioner surveys and analyses the situation of fundamental rights in Hungary, and prepares statistics on those infringements of rights in Hungary which are related to fundamental rights. Therefore, the Commissioner submits his/her annual report to the Parliament, in which he/she gives information on his/her fundamental rights activities and gives recommendations and proposals for regulations or any amendments. The Parliament shall debate the report during the year of its submission. In the course of his/her activities, the Commissioner cooperates with organisations aiming at the promotion of the protection fundamental rights. The Commissioner for Fundamental Rights may initiate the review of rules of law at the Constitutional Court as to their conformity with the Fundamental Law. Furthermore, the Commissioner participates in the preparation of national reports based on international treaties relating to his/her tasks and competences, and monitors and evaluates the enforcement of these treaties under Hungarian jurisdiction.
The institutional participation of vulnerable groups in decision-making processes, could be further improved

The Ministry of Interior coordinates the new public employment system in Hungary since 2011 which includes public employment in water sector. The most important task of the public employment system is to activate long term unemployed people and to prevent permanent job seekers from getting out of the working life. There are the people of working age, with low education and no professional skills that are the most difficult to involve in employment.

Way forward: The public employment system will proceed

[24] Vulnerable groups: groups of people that face economic, political, or social exclusion or marginalisation. They can include, but are not limited to: indigenous groups, ethnic minorities, migrants (refugees, internally displaced people, asylum seekers), remote communities, subsistence farmers, people living in poverty, people living in slums and informal settlements. Also referred to as 'marginalised' or 'disadvantaged' groups. While women are often included in definitions of 'vulnerable groups', in this survey gender issues are addressed separately in question 2.2d. The score given for this question should reflect the situation for the majority of the vulnerable groups. This question has been added since the baseline to capture an element of stakeholder participation which is important in the context of 'leave no-one behind' – one of the key principles of Agenda 2030.

[25] 'Procedures' can include operational processes to, for example, raise awareness, reduce language barriers, and facilitate interaction with specific vulnerable groups.

[26] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

[27] 'Meaningful' implies voices of vulnerable groups are heard, contribute to decision-making, and influence outcomes. It follows the UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation which provides for "Participation and Inclusion: … all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realized."

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
d. Gender mainstreaming in water resources management.[28] Score 70	No gender mainstreaming in water resources management.	Gender mainstreaming mechanisms and practices in water resources management **being developed**	Gender mainstreaming mechanisms **exist** (but limited implementation, budget or monitoring)**.**	Gender mainstreaming **objectives**[29] **partly achieved** (activities implemented and partially monitored and funded).	Gender mainstreaming objectives **mostly achieved** (activities adequately monitored and funded).	Gender mainstreaming objectives **consistently achieved** and effectively address gender issues (activities and outcomes reviewed and revised and based on relevant accountability mechanisms[30]).
Status and progress: Constitution addresses gender objectives. There is law on Equal treatment and the promotion of gender opportunities http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A0300125.TV#lbj1id82c2.						
Way forward: Compliance with the above-mentioned right and regulations						

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Organizational framework for transboundary water management.[31] Score 90	**No** organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management.	Organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management **being developed**.	Organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management **established**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **partly fulfilled**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **mostly fulfilled**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **fully fulfilled**.

[28] Gender mainstreaming is about fully integrating gender perspectives in water planning, management, and decision-making, in a cross-cutting manner. Gender mainstreaming mechanisms can include frameworks, practices and tools aimed at achieving gender objectives related to women's participation, voice and influence in water resources management. See "Gender mainstreaming" in Annex A (Glossary), which contains links to the Gender Checklist (to support discussion on this topic), and a report on gender mainstreaming in water resources management. Gender mainstreaming mechanisms may originate within the water sector or at a higher level, but if they are primarily addressed at a higher level, then there should be evidence of gender mainstreaming within the water sector to achieve scores in this question. Any differences between implementation at national, local or transboundary levels can be explained in the 'Status and progress' field.

[29] Gender mainstreaming objectives ultimately refer to equal participation and influence in water resources management at all levels. Ways of monitoring this include (please identify any of these or similar in the 'Status and progress' field): 1) Presence of Gender Focal Point responsible for gender policy and gender concerns in authorities that deal with water resources; 2) Gender parity in decision-making processes at all levels (e.g. in meetings or board members/committee members); 3) Presence of gender-specific objectives and commitments in strategies, plans and laws related water policy; 4) Presence and role of local women's groups/organizations receiving technical and/or financial support from government/non-government organizations involved in water resources management activities; 5) Budget allocation, and procedures for collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data of local populations, when planning for water-related programmes / projects, including infrastructure; 6) Presence of measures for improving gender parity and equity in human resources (HR) policies of authorities. Source: adapted from UNESCO WWAP Toolkit on Sex-disaggregated Water Data, 2019.

[30] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

[31] An organizational framework can include a joint body, mechanism, authority, committee, commission or other institutional arrangement. Refers to international basins/aquifers.

Status and progress: Danube Basin: The International Commission for the Protection of the Danube River (ICPDR) was established in 1998 and is an International Organisation consisting of 14 cooperating states and the European Union. Tisza Sub-basin: At the ICPDR Ministerial Meeting in 2004, the representatives of the five Tisza countries signed the Memorandum of Understanding to develop a River Basin Management Plan for the Tisza River. Drafting the 2nd RBMP has finished in 2019. Bilateral transboundary cooperation: Hungary has bilateral agreements with each of the seven neighbouring countries regulating water management issues. The conventions are based on intergovernmental agreements, and their implementation is in the responsibility of the Transboundary Water Commissions. Transboundary water cooperation covers all water management areas (surface- and groundwater). We have a transboundary water cooperation agreement with seven neighbouring countries. The existence of appropriate organizational frameworks is necessary for the implementation of agreements.						
Way forward: Periodically reviewed and revised transboundary commitments according to IWRM and new initiatives. Ensuring adequate financial resources is essential for efficient operation						
f. Sub-national[32] authorities for leading IWRM implementation.[33] Score 60	**No n**dedicated sub-national authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[34] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Sub-national authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Status and progress: 12 regional water directorates and 12 water authorities are responsible for the management of water resources but their capacities are insufficient for effectively leading formulation of plan or implementation of IWRM.						
Way forward: Capacity building of 12 regional water directorates and 12 water authorities						

[32] Sub-national can include, but not limited to: provincial, state, county, local government areas, council. In this case, sub-national should not include basin/aquifer levels as this is dealt with in question 2.2a. Answer this question for the highest sub-national level(s) that are relevant in the country, and specify what these are.

[33] This question has replaced question 2.2f from the baseline survey, which was for federal countries only. This is in recognition of the fact that many countries have sub-national authorities for water resources management, even if they are not federal countries.

[34] For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 13. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

3 Management instruments

This section includes the tools that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions. It includes management programmes, monitoring water resources and the pressures on them, knowledge sharing and capacity development. Many of the questions in this section relate to other SDG 6 targets and indicators (see 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide), and coordination between different SDG reporting processes is encouraged where feasible.

Terminology used in the questions:

- **Limited, Adequate, Very good, Excellent:** Are terms used describe the status, coverage and effectiveness of the management instruments assessed in this section. Respondents should apply their own judgement based on the 'best-practice' descriptions of management instruments in the glossary, the section introduction, and through footnotes. For example, 'adequate' may imply that the basic minimum criteria for that particular management instrument are met. Please provide qualifying information to the question score in the 'Status description' cell immediately below each question.
- **Management instruments:** Can also be referred to as management tools and techniques, which include regulations, financial incentives, monitoring, plans/programmes (e.g. for development, use and protection of water resources), as well as those specified in footnotes on questions and thresholds below.
- **Monitoring:** collecting, updating, and sharing timely, consistent and comparable water-related data and information, relevant for science and policy. Effective monitoring requires ongoing commitment and financing from government. Resources required include appropriate technical capacity such as laboratories, portable devices, online water use control and data acquisition systems. May include a combination of physical data collection, remote sensing, and modelling for filling data gaps.
- **Short-term / Long-term:** In the context of management instruments, short-term includes ad-hoc activities and projects, generally not implemented as part of an overarching programme with long-term goals. Long-term refers to activities that are undertaken as part of an ongoing programme that has more long-term goals/aims and implementation strategy.
- **Accountability mechanisms:** refer to mechanisms that increase Transparency, Accountability, and Participation, and strengthen Anti-corruption (TAP-A. See also Annex A: Glossary). For each question in this section, it is suggested that TAPA-related mechanisms should "exist", as relevant, to achieve a score of 80 or 90 ("High" threshold), and should be "effective" to achieve a score of 100 ("Very high" threshold).

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

3. Management Instruments							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
3.1 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at the national level?							
a. National monitoring of water availability[35] (includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country).		**No** national monitoring systems in place.	Monitoring systems established for a **limited** number of **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Long-term** national monitoring is carried out but with **limited** coverage and limited use by stakeholders.	**Long-term** national monitoring is carried out with **adequate** coverage but limited use by stakeholders.	Long-term national monitoring is carried out with **very good** coverage and adequate use by stakeholders.	Long-term national monitoring is carried out with **excellent** coverage and excellent use by stakeholders.
Score	80						
Status and progress: National monitoring system includes surface waters and groundwater monitoring both quantity and quality with more or less adequate coverage of the country but access to information for other sectors and for stakeholders still a bit limited.							
Way forward Information technology developments of harmonized water databases is needed with appropriate access rights for all stakeholders							
b. Sustainable and efficient water use management[36] from the national level, (includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country).		**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across different water users and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across different water users and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across different water users and the country, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across different water users and the country, and are **highly effective**.
Score	80						
Status and progress: All types of management instruments exist without any geographic differences but the level or evidence of implementation across different stakeholder groups are not the same							
Way forward: Periodically reviewed and revised water management policy especially in sectors with less efficient use.							

[35] See definition of monitoring in Terminology at the beginning of section 3.

[36] Management instruments include demand management measures (e.g. technical measures, financial incentives, education and awareness raising to reduce water use and/or improve water-use efficiency, conservation, recycling and re-use), monitoring water use (including the ability to disaggregate by sector), mechanisms for allocating water between sectors (including environmental considerations). Coordination with SDG indicator 6.4.1 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Pollution control[37] from the national level. Score 80	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across sectors and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across sectors and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across sectors and the country, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across sectors and the country, and are **highly effective**.
Status and progress: There are national regulations and management instruments corresponding to EU regulations.						
Way forward: Periodically reviewed and revised water management policy especially in sectors with significant pollution						
d. Management of water-related ecosystems and biodiversity[38] from the national level. Score 80	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country. Environmental Water Requirements (EWR) analysed in some cases.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are **effective**. EWR analysed for most of country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are **highly effective**. EWR analysed for whole country.
Status and progress: Environmental Act and Nature Protection Act ensure to use all types of management instruments and evidence of implementation across different ecosystem types. Groundwater dependent terrestrial ecosystems are subject of joint research by ecologists and hydrogeologists. Within the framework of the NÖSZTÉP project ecosystem services of natural and near-natural ecosystems are assessed, mapped and evaluated on a national scale.						
Way forward More attention on ecosystem services and usage of remote sensing techniques.						

[37] Includes regulations, water quality guidelines, water quality monitoring, economic tools (e.g. taxes and fees), water quality trading programmes, education, consideration of point and non-point (e.g. agricultural) pollution sources, construction and operation of wastewater treatment plants, watershed management. Coordination with SDG indicator 6.3.2 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

[38] Water-related ecosystems include rivers, lakes and aquifers, as well as wetlands, forests and mountains. Management of these systems includes tools such as management plans, the assessment of Environmental Water Requirements (EWR), and protection of areas and species, to ensure ecosystem functions and services. Monitoring includes measuring extent and quality of the ecosystems over time. Consider coordination with SDG indicator 6.6.1 Focal Point and results, as well as with the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (under the Convention on Biological Diversity), when answering this question.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Management instruments to reduce impacts of water-related disasters[39] from the national level. Score 90	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage of at-risk areas.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage of at-risk areas and groups.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage of at-risk areas and groups, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage of at-risk areas and groups, and are **highly effective**.
Status and progress All types of management instruments are used related to Seveso Directive. The risk management instruments are implemented for all types of water-related disasters but the risk not eliminated yet. The implementation of Flood Directive is also part of the process. Register of critical infrastructures and potentially risky plants have been established.						
Climate change considerations: The risk from water-related disasters increasing with the impact of climate change.						
Way forward: Periodically reviewed and revised water management policy especially in sectors with significant risk						

[39] 'Management instruments' can cover: understanding disaster risk; strengthening disaster risk governance; investing in disaster risk reduction; and enhancing disaster preparedness. 'Impacts' include social impacts (such as deaths, missing persons, and number of people affected) and economic impacts (such as economic losses in relation to GDP). 'Water-related disasters' include disasters that can be classified under the following: Hydrological (flood, landslide, wave action); Meteorological (convective storm, extratropical storm, extreme temperature, fog, tropical cyclone); Climatological (drought, glacial lake outburst, wildfire); and severe pollution events. Coordination with SDG indicator 11.5.1 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

3.2 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at other levels?						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Basin management instruments.[40] Score 70	**No** basin level management instruments being implemented.	Use of basin level management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects.	**Some** basin level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **adequate** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with **effective** outcomes and **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with **highly effective** outcomes and **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage.
Status and progress: River Basin Management Plans include all management instruments needed to effectively manage river basin across country at different level and implement Programme of Measures across different stakeholder groups. RBMP is only partly implemented. Implementation of the Flood Risk Management Plan is on-going.						
Way forward Strengthen political commitment and stakeholder involvement.						
b. Aquifer management instruments.[41] Score 70	**No** aquifer level management instruments being implemented.	Use of aquifer level management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects.	**Some** aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **adequate** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **effective** outcomes and **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **highly effective** outcomes and **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage.
Status and progress: River Basin Management Plans include all management instruments needed to effectively manage river basin across country at different level and implement Programme of Measures across different stakeholder groups. RBMP is only partly implemented.						
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment and stakeholder involvement.						

[40] Basin and aquifer management: involves managing water at the appropriate hydrological scale, using the surface water basin or aquifer as the unit of management. This may involve basin and aquifer development, use and protection plans. It should also promote multi-level cooperation, and address potential conflict among users, stakeholders and levels of government. To achieve 'Very high (100)' basin and aquifer management scores, surface and groundwater management should be integrated.

[41] See previous footnote on basin management instruments, which also applies to aquifers.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Data and information sharing <u>within</u> countries at all levels.[42] Score 70	**No** data and information sharing.	**Limited** data and information sharing on an **ad-hoc** basis.	Data and information sharing arrangements **exist** on a more **long-term** basis between major data providers and users.	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented** on a more **long-term** basis**,** with **adequate** coverage across sectors and the country.	Data and information sharing arrangements implemented on a more **long-term** basis**,** with **very good** coverage across sectors and the country.	All relevant data and information are online and freely accessible to all. Appropriate measures are in place to ensure data integrity[43].
Status and progress: In the last decades a lot of efforts have done to share information among different sectors and ensure access to information for public but still it is a bit limited. Some data and information are online and accessible to anybody but not the all relevant data.						
Way forward: : Information technology developments needed to ensure that stakeholders are informed						
d. Transboundary data and information sharing <u>between</u> countries. Score 70	**No** data and information sharing.	**Limited** data and information sharing on an **ad-hoc** or informal basis.	Data and information sharing arrangements **exist**, but sharing is **limited.**	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented adequately.**	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented effectively.**[44]	All relevant data and information are online and accessible between countries.
Status and progress: Data and information sharing arrangements exist in bilateral agreements and among ICPDR but still some limitations. DAREFFORT project (Danube River Basin Enhanced Flood Forecasting Cooperation) focus on the establishment of the Danube Hydrological Information System (DanubeHIS) which is a fundamental step towards flexible and sustainable data exchange.						
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment of the parties and common projects to establish information systems on water quality of surface water and groundwater as well.						

[42] Includes more formal data and information sharing arrangements between users, as well as accessibility for the general public, where appropriate.

[43] Data integrity is the maintenance of, and the assurance of, data accuracy and consistency over its entire life-cycle.

[44] E.g. institutional and technical mechanisms in place that allow for exchanging data as agreed upon in agreements between riparians (e.g. regional database or information exchange platform with a river basin organization including technical requirements for data submission, institutionalized mechanisms for QA and for analysing the data, etc.).

4 Financing

This section concerns the adequacy of the finance available for water resources development and management from various sources.

Finance for investment and recurrent costs can come from many sources, the most common being central government budget allocations to relevant ministries and other authorities. Other sources include fees and tariffs levied on water users, polluter fees or grants from philanthropic or similar organisations. In-kind support should not be included as it is not easily measurable but can be mentioned in the 'Status and progress' field. Finance from Official Development Assistance (ODA) specifically for water resources should be considered part of the government budget. Note that the level of coordination between ODA and national budgets is tracked by the 'means of implementation' SDG indicator 6.a.1: "Amount of water- and sanitation-related official development assistance that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan", as part of reporting on Target 6.a: "By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-development support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies".

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

4. Financing							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
4.1 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at the national level?							
a. National budget[45] for water resources **infrastructure**[46] (investment and recurrent costs).		**No budget** allocated in national investment plans.	**Some budget** allocated but only partly covers planned investments.	**Sufficient budget** allocated for planned investments but insufficient funds disbursed or made available**.**	Sufficient budget allocated and **funds disbursed for most** planned programmes or projects.	Sufficient funds disbursed for investment and recurrent costs, and **being utilised in all** planned projects. Accountability mechanism(s)[47] in place.	Budget **fully utilised** for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Score	50						
Status and progress: Mainly EU Funds are allocated to cover infrastructure project and only some (but more and more) sources come from central government budget. Significant problem is the stakeholder contributions to investments.							
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment and stakeholder involvement.							

[45] Allocations of funding for water resources may be included in several budget categories or in different investment documents. Respondents are thus encouraged to examine different sources for this information. When assessing the allocations respondents should take account of funds from government budgets and any co-funding (loans or grants) from other sources such as banks or donors.

[46] Infrastructure includes 'hard' structures such as dams, canals, irrigation schemes, flood control, stormwater drainage etc., as well as 'soft' or 'green' infrastructure and environmental measures such as catchment management, sustainable drainage systems etc. The focus should be on infrastructure related to 'broader' water resources management, as opposed to infrastructure for drinking water supply or sanitation services (WaSH) (noting that WaSH financing is covered in the GLAAS surveys). Any differences in budget between water resources and WaSH infrastructure should be explained in the 'status and progress' field. Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance.

[47] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. National budget for **IWRM elements**[48] (investments and recurrent costs). Score 70	**No budget** allocations made for investments and recurrent costs of the IWRM elements.	**Allocations** made for **some** of the IWRM elements and implementation at an early stage.	Allocations made for **at least half** of the IWRM elements but insufficient for others.	Allocations for **most** of the IWRM elements and some implementation under way.	Allocations include **all** IWRM elements and implementation regularly carried out (investments and recurrent costs). Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: The central government budget covers partly the cost of the implementation of IWRM elements thus IWRM not fully implemented. Coverage of investments and recurrent costs highly depend on the yearly allocated state budget.						
Climate change considerations: When determining the IWRM elements, the impact of climate change on water management is taken into account						
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment to establish long-term financial programs to cover IWRM costs.						

[48] 'IWRM elements' refers to all the activities described in sections 1, 2 and 3 of this survey that require funding, e.g. policy, law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity development, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc.

4.2 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at other levels?							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Sub-national or basin budgets for water resources **infrastructure**[49] (investment and recurrent costs).	Score 50	**No budget** allocated in sub-national or basin investment plans.	**Some budget** allocated in sub-national or basin investment plans but only partly covers planned investments.	**Sufficient budget** allocated for planned investments in sub-national or basin investment plans, but insufficient funds disbursed or made available.	Sufficient budget allocated and **funds disbursed for most** planned programmes or projects.	Sufficient funds disbursed**,** for investment and recurrent costs, and **being utilised in all** planned projects. Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Budget **fully utilised**, for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: There are only low budgets or no separated budget for local programmes. The Rural Development Programme and the Territorial and settlement development OP includes some possibilities to develop water infrastructures on local level.							
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment to establish long-term financial programs to cover IWRM costs.							
b. Revenues raised for IWRM elements.[50]	Score 70	**No revenues** raised for IWRM elements.	**Processes in place** to raise revenue but **not yet implemented**.	**Some revenue raised,** but generally not used for IWRM activities.	Revenues raised cover **some** IWRM activities.	Revenues raised cover **most** IWRM activities. Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Revenues raised **fully cover** costs of IWRM activities. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: Different types of revenues raised and mechanisms exist to meet requirements but not straight connection between collected tax and covered costs. Most of the revenues collected at national level and distributed to local level by centralised way. The local mechanism to collect revenues is regulated by government, prices are influenced by several point of view							
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment to establish transparent revenue policy.							

[49] Refer to footnotes 47 and 48, from question 4.1a.

[50] For 'IWRM elements', see above footnote. **Level**: revenues are likely to be raised from users at the local, basin, or aquifer levels, though may also be raised at other sub-national or national levels (please indicate which level(s) in the status and progress field). **Revenue raising** can occur through public authorities or private sector, e.g. through fees, charges, levies, taxes and 'blended financing' approaches. E.g. dedicated charges/levies on water users (including household level *if* revenues are spent on IWRM elements); abstraction & bulk water charges; discharge fees; environmental fees such as pollution charges, Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes; and the sale of secondary products and services.

		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Financing for transboundary cooperation.[51]		**No specific funding** allocated from the Member State (MS) budgets nor from other regular sources.	MS **agreement** on country share of contributions **in place** and in-kind support for the cooperation organisation/arrangement.	**Funding less than 50%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	Funding **less than 75%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	Funding **more than 75%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	**Full funding** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.
Score	90						
Status and progress: The annual share of funds agreed from MS national budgets to support the agreed ICPDR arrangement. Financing of operation of Transboundary Water Committees is ensured in the budget of Ministry of Interior. Membership in some international organisations suspended for financial reason e.g. INBO. There are also projects under CBC programs, some of which support the development of certain elements of IWRM on cross-border level.							
Way forward: Mobilisation of Interregional funds (EUDRS) to cover some(more) transboundary cooperation activities.							
d. Sub-national or basin budgets for **IWRM elements**[52] (investment and recurrent costs).		**No budget** allocations at sub-national or basin level for investments and recurrent costs of IWRM elements.	**Allocations** made for **some** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level and implementation at an early stage.	Allocations made for **at least half** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level but insufficient for others.	Allocations for **most** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level and some implementation under way.	Allocations include **all** IWRM elements and implementation regularly carried out (investments and recurrent costs). Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach at sub-national or basin level **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Score	50						
Status and progress: There are only low budgets or no separated budget for IWRM elements. The Rural Development Programme and the Territorial and settlement development OP includes some possibilities to cover IWRM elements on local level.							
Way forward: Strengthen political commitment to establish long-term financial programs to cover IWRM costs.							

[51] In this question "Member States (MS)" refers to riparian countries that are parties to the arrangement. "Contributions" refers to the annual share of funds agreed from MS national budgets to support the agreed TB cooperation arrangement. Regular funds obtained from for example, water user fees (e.g. hydropower charges) and polluter-pays fees based on existing regulation are also considered as sustainable funding. As variable and unsustainable, donor support should not be considered in the scoring, but may be referred to in the 'Status and progress' and 'Way forward' fields.

[52] 'IWRM elements' refers to all the activities described in sections 1, 2 and 3 of this survey that require funding, e.g. policy, law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity development, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc. This question has been added since the baseline survey, acknowledging the importance of funding being available at more 'operational' levels.

5 Indicator 6.5.1 score

How to calculate the indicator 6.5.1 score

Please complete the table below as follows:

1. Calculate the average score of each of the four sections by averaging all question scores in each section, rounded to the nearest whole number.
   Example: Section average of 41.5 should be rounded to 42. Section average of 70.2 should be rounded to 70. If 'not applicable' is selected for any question, this should not be included in the indicator calculations, and therefore will not affect the average score. However, questions with a score of '0' (zero) should be included.
2. Calculate the average of the four section scores (whole numbers) to give the overall score for indicator 6.5.1, **rounded to the nearest whole number**.
   Example: Calculating final IWRM score from four section scores: (81+ 63 + 47 + 58)/4 = 62.25. Final 6.5.1 score (rounded to a whole number) = 62.

   Please note an automated calculation template is available here if required.

Section	**Average Scores** (all values rounded to nearest whole number)
Section 1 Enabling environment	
Section 2 Institutions and participation	
Section 3 Management instruments	
Section 4 Financing	
Indicator 6.5.1 score **= Degree of IWRM* implementation (0-100)***	

* Use rounded section average scores (to the nearest whole number), to calculate the indicator score, and round this to the nearest whole number.

Interpretation of the score

The score indicates the 'degree of implementation of integrated water resources management', on a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 signifying 'very low' implementation, and 100 signifying 'very high' implementation. However, the true value of the survey to countries lies within the scores, 'status and progress' and 'way forward' fields for each question, as this helps to identify which actions need to be taken to move towards a greater degree of implementation of IWRM.

Quick QA checklist for the Focal Point

To ensure robustness of the final submission, and to avoid further revisions, you may use this QA checklist to avoid common mistakes in the submission.

(*The checklist is provided to assist Focal Points in the QA process only and does not affect the submission scores in any way).*

The submission cover page contains **up to date contact information of the Focal Point** (or alternative contact)	☐
All questions have been answered (either with a score or n/a) in the yellow cells immediately below each question.	☐
The individual survey questions are **scored in increments of 10 or as n/a only**. I.e. possible scores are 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100 or n/a.	☐
Explanatory information is provided for all questions in the fields called 'Status and progress' and 'Way forward'.	☐
Section 5 of the survey has been filled and **final score for indicator 6.5.1 has been calculated** from the four section average scores, rounded to the nearest whole number (E.g. score 55.5 would be rounded to 56).	☐
Annex B (Key priorities and targets for IWRM implementation) has been completed.	☐
Annex C (6.5.1 Country reporting process form) has been completed.	☐

Annexes:

Annex A: Glossary

- **Accountability mechanisms:** provide ways for all partners to hold each other to account on the specific, measurable, time-bound actions they have committed to. In the context of this survey, they may include activities that increase Transparency, Accountability, and Participation, and strengthen Anti-corruption (TAP-A). Together, these form a framework for integrity.[53] For example, in relation to the financing questions in section 4, 'accountability mechanisms' typically include mechanisms that make data and information on budgets and expenditures publicly available, and enable participatory budgeting and monitoring of expenditure where appropriate. Such mechanisms should include functions to identify and address corruption and mismanagement.
- **Authorities:** could be ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/departments/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.
- **Basins:** Includes rivers, lakes and aquifers, unless otherwise specified. For surface water, the term is interchangeable with 'catchments' and 'watersheds'.
- **Federal countries:** Refers to countries made up of federated states, provinces, territories or similar terms.
- **Gender mainstreaming:** Gender mainstreaming is about fully integrating gender perspectives in water planning, management, and decision-making, in a cross-cutting manner. It is not just about increasing women's representation on committees, or having a general national legal framework on gender equality, although those actions may be part of the overall framework. The dedicated Gender Checklist can be used as a discussion tool to help stakeholders to agree on the score for question 2.2d, and to inform the 'status and progress' and 'way forward' responses to that question. The Gender Checklist is derived from the report - Advancing towards gender mainstreaming in water resources management – which presents examples of some specific mechanisms, practices, and tools that have been developed and used by countries in order to progress with gender mainstreaming in water resources management. These have been grouped into six categories: (1) advocacy, high-level commitment, changing prevailing norms and stereotypes; (2) legislative and policy framework and governance; (3) human capital, financial resources, institutions, and support organisations; (4) women's participation and parity; (5) monitoring activities to track and assess progress; (6) awareness raising, capacity development, and education.[54]
- **IWRM:** Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) is a process that promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources in order to maximise the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems. IWRM is not an end in itself but a means of achieving three key strategic objectives:
    - efficiency to use water resources in the best way possible;
    - equity in the allocation of water across social and economic groups;
    - environmental sustainability, to protect the water resource base, as well as associated ecosystems.
- **National (level):** Refers to the highest level of administration in a country.

[53] Source: Water Integrity Network: Integrity Walls. https://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/integrity-walls-tap/

[54] Mainstreaming gender in resources management supports a range of targets in the SDGs, including under Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls (e.g. SDG Target 5.5). Furthermore, question 2.2d also addresses the call for gender disaggregated data in the 2030 Agenda (e.g. SDG Target 17.18).

- **Sub-national / state (level):** refers to levels of administration other than national. For federal countries, these are likely to be provinces or states. Non-federal countries may still have sub-national jurisdictions with some responsibility for water resources management, e.g. regions, counties, departments.
- **Programmes:** Nation-wide plans of action with long-term objectives, for example to strengthen monitoring, knowledge sharing and capacity development, with details on what work is to be done, by whom, when, and what means or resources will be used**.**
- **Transboundary:** Refers to surface and groundwater basins that cross one or more national borders. Only the most important transboundary basins or aquifers that are regarded as significant, in terms of economic, social or environmental value to the country (or neighbouring countries), need to be included in this survey. It is up to countries to decide which ones these are. Where feasible, basins/aquifers included in this survey should be cross-referenced with those included in 6.5.2 reporting (www.sdg6monitoring.org/indicators/target-65/indicators652/), and the focal point for 6.5.2 should be consulted in this process. In the absence of 6.5.2 data or national databases, global databases on transboundary river basins (http://twap-rivers.org/indicators/), and transboundary aquifers (https://www.un-igrac.org/ggis/explore-all-transboundary-groundwaters), may be referred to. If you include a national (sub-basin) as part of a larger transboundary basin, please also include the name of the larger basin. When answering transboundary questions, the majority of most important basins/aquifers must meet the criteria described in each threshold to achieve the score for that threshold.
- **Stakeholders:** In this survey, stakeholders are the main groups important for water resources management, development and use. Examples of stakeholders in each group are given in footnotes as they appear in the survey.
- **Water Resources Management** is the activity of planning, developing, distributing and managing the optimum use of water resources. Ideally, water resource management planning considers all the competing demands for water and seeks to allocate water on an equitable basis to satisfy all uses and demands. An integrated approach (see IWRM) is needed to ensure water resources management is not isolated within sector silos resulting to inefficiencies, conflicts and unsustainable resource use.

Annex B: Key priorities and targets for IWRM implementation

1) What are the **priority action areas**[55] to advance IWRM implementation overall in the country? Include priorities/actions that are ongoing, already planned, and/or those that may be emerging based on the survey results. Where relevant, please also note the status of implementation of the priorities/actions (e.g. giving some indication of necessary follow-up).
   Answer:

2) **Target setting**

The intention of the table below is to encourage discussion among stakeholders on the likelihood of reaching the global targets[56], or on the need to establish national targets. It can also be used to inform regional and global processes about whether countries feel they are on track to meet the global targets or not, and if they prefer to set national targets.

Scores may be the same in both columns. It is also possible to only complete one column, and/or to only provide scores for the overall indicator (bottom row). I.e. use the table as is most useful.

Section	Business-As-Usual (BAU) projected score for 2030*	National target for 2030**
Section 1 Enabling environment		
Section 2 Institutions and participation		
Section 3 Management instruments		
Section 4 Financing		
Indicator 6.5.1 score = Degree of IWRM implementation (0-100)		

* approximate score (or range), based on reporting in 2017, 2020, 2023, current rates of progress, and stakeholder judgement. A simple calculation template is provided in the calculation template (see 'Projections-Targets' worksheet), if useful.

** potential 'realistic' score by 2030, if certain measures are put in place, for example as described in question 1 of this annex. Please indicate if these are existing targets, or informal targets defined during this monitoring process.

[55] Priority action areas: could include any of the aspects covered in this survey, or others. E.g. improving cross-sectoral coordination; raising the profile of the importance of IWRM implementation at the highest planning and financing levels (advocacy); developing or implementing laws, strategies, plans, programmes, projects; improving revenue raising; improving monitoring and evaluation of implementation; increasing institutional capacity at national/basin/aquifer level; improving transboundary cooperation, etc.
[56] Average scores of 91 or above ('very high' category), for each of the four dimensions and the overall indicator score.

3) **Additional comments on target-setting:**
Answer:

4) **<u>Additional general comments</u>** (e.g. related to the: status/challenges of IWRM implementation; country context; threats to water resources; impacts of climate change, or other):
Answer:

Annex C: 6.5.1 country reporting process form

To increase transparency and confidence in results, please provide a brief overview of the reporting process. e.g. main actors involved; meetings/workshops held; other means of gathering inputs from stakeholders; iterations of drafts and finalisation/approval processes. Also note the main challenges/strengths of the process. Use as much space as needed. If you have completed a full Stakeholder Consultation report, please provide a brief summary here, and refer to that report.

Focal Point affiliation	
Brief process overview: Any main points of difference in stakeholder opinion in answering the survey questions?: Additional comments on the survey or supporting materials, if any:	

Stakeholder groups	**Level of engagement** (mark with 'X')			**Additional information** (e.g. which stakeholder organisations were involved, how they contributed or were engaged, or any challenges faced)
	Low (given opportunity to contribute)	**Medium** (some input)	**High** (discussion/ negotiation)	
National water agencies				
Other public sector agencies				
Sub-national water agencies				
Basin/Aquifer agencies				
Water User Associations				
Civil society				
Private sector				
Vulnerable groups				
Gender expertise				
Research/academia				
Transboundary expertise				*(e.g. Focal Point for SDG 6.5.2 and/or other)*
Other SDG focal points				*(e.g. Focal Points from other indicators)*
Please add rows if required				