### Country Survey Instrument for SDG Indicator 6.5.1

Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0 - 100)

Submission Form				
Country	Hungary			
Date this document was	15/05/2020 (plan: 30/06/2020)			
submitted				
Date(s) any earlier versions of this	(for initial and revised submissions, as required)			
document were submitted	15/05/2020			
National SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point in	nformation			
Name	Ida Nagyné Sós			
Organisation	Ministry of Interior			
Title				
Contact email	ida.sos.nagyne@bm.gov.hu			
Contact phone	+36304912624			
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:			
6.1.16.2.16.3.1 X	_6.3.2 X _6.4.1 X _6.4.2 X _6.5.2 X _6.6.16.a.1 X _6.b.1Other SDG indicator(s) (please specify here):			
SDG 6.5.1 in-country data collec	tion and reporting process overview (Please provide further details on the consultation process in Annex E)			
Were other institutions/stakeholder	rs involved and consulted in the reporting process for this indicator?			
_X_YesNo				
If yes, please indicate the mode(s) o	f consultation (please provide further details in Annex E):			
Phone callsX _Email exchar	ngesIn-person meetingsDedicated stakeholder workshop(s)Other (please specify):			
Contact person regarding further questions/clarifications relating to this submission				
_X_SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point listed abo	oveOther (please specify contact details here):			

### Part 1 - Introduction

This is the official survey instrument for country reporting on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 6.5.1: "Degree of integrated water resources management implementation (0 - 100)". The indicator 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 instrument is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 monitoring guide. Both this survey instrument and the monitoring guide are available from UN Environment in six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and Portuguese through the Help Desk by emailing iwrmsdg651@un.org.

#### **About the indicator:**

Indicator 6.5.1 represents the degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation, on a scale of 0 - 100. It is calculated based on scores from approximately 30 questions covering different aspects of IWRM.

#### About the survey instrument

The primary purpose of the survey instrument 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. It measures implementation in incremental steps, which allows countries to identify barriers and enablers to furthering IWRM. The completed survey instrument can be used as an input to planning and working towards target 6.5.

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 made available and used for water resources development and management (apart from drinking water supply and sanitation) from various sources.

Each section has two sub-sections covering the "National" and "Other" levels, to address the target 6.5 wording "... at all levels." "Other" levels include sub-national, basin, local and transboundary (see Annex A - Glossary). Questions relate to these levels depending on their relevance to the particular aspect of IWRM. 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 most of the 'most important' transboundary basins / aquifers, which should be listed in the table in Annex B. Filling out that table: increases the transparency of the transboundary questions; makes the information more useful for dialogue with neighbouring countries; and

enhances coordination with <u>SDG indicator 6.5.2</u> on arrangements for 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 Annex C.

### How to complete the survey

**Scoring:** For each question, a score between 0 and 100 should be selected, in increments of 10, unless the country judges the question to be 'not applicable (n/a)'. It is not possible to omit questions. 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 in order for a country to respond that it has reached a specific level of implementation for each question. Furthermore, if an aspect of IWRM is specified in a lower threshold, it is implicit that this aspect is also addressed in the higher thresholds for that 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 description" and "Way forward". General guidance on the type of information that countries may find useful to include in each field is as follows:

**Status description:** 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 since the first round of reporting on SDG indicator 6.5.1 (baseline in 2017/18). Where possible, provide a brief explanation of why the score is different to the baseline. If reporting was not submitted for the SDG baseline, reflect 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 baseline 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 data collection process, but that this guidance text is deleted before final submission.

### Progress and differences since baseline reporting

172 countries established a baseline for indicator 6.5.1 in 2017/18. This is the second round of data collection. Where available, countries should refer to the baseline survey responses, available here: <a href="http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/">http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/</a>. Countries are encouraged to consider progress, or lack of progress, since the baseline, in the 'Status description' fields, and give reasoning for differences in scores.

The current survey version is highly comparable, though not completely identical, to the baseline survey. Some minor amendments have been made following a review process, and noteworthy changes to the baseline 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 instrument. This helps to increase stakeholder participation and ownership of water management and decision-making processes, and makes the completed survey instrument a more robust and useful diagnostic tool for further discussions and planning. Country Focal Points are asked to fill in the Reporting Process Form in Annex E to increase transparency and increase 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.<sup>1</sup>

The national IWRM Focal Point is responsible for the Quality Assurance and formal submission of the completed survey instrument to UN Environment. The survey instrument should be emailed to the IWRM Help Desk at UN Environment: <u>iwrmsdg651@un.org</u>.

Upon request, the Help Desk will provide support to the national IWRM focal points on matters such as interpretation of questions and thresholds, the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement in countries, and support to submitting the final indicator scores.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Monitoring of 6.5.1 is being done as part of the UN-Water initiative on integrated monitoring of SDG 6. 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 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<sup>2</sup>. 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 description" 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.

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	Development <b>not</b>	Exists, but not	Based on IWRM, approved	Being <b>used</b> by the	Policy objectives	Objectives consistently achieved,				
resources <b>policy,</b> or	started or not	based on IWRM.	by government and starting	majority of relevant	consistently	and periodically reviewed and				
similar.	progressing.		to be used by authorities to	authorities to guide	achieved.	revised.				
Score 80			guide work.	work.						
Status description: Nationa	l Water Strategy (Kvass	ay Jeno Plan) was ado	opted in 2017							
(https://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/	hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A	17H1110.KOR×ł	hift=fffffff4&txtreferer=00000001.7	<u>[XT</u> ). National Water Strateg	gy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) ii	mplementation under operational				
programmes is in progress. The	e implementation of th	e Plan is monitored.								
Implementation of the EU water policy according to 2000/60/EC Water Framework Directive since 22/12/2000 ( <u>http://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/index_en.html</u> ). According to the WFD River Basin Management Plan has done in 2009 and 2015. The second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan is in progress. The implementation of the Program of Measures and the status of waters are monitored.										
Way forward: The progress	in implementation of th	ne 2 <sup>nd</sup> River Basin Mai	nagement Plan and improvement i	n 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.										
[E.g. planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of policies; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]										
b. National water	Development <b>not</b>	Exists, but not	Based on IWRM, approved	Being applied by the	All laws are being	All laws are enforced across the				
resources law(s).	started or not	based on IWRM.	by government and starting	majority of relevant	applied across	country, and all people and				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> For examples of good practices of policies, laws and plans, please see case studies under 'enabling environment' in the Global Water Partnership (GWP) IWRM ToolBox.

Score	90	progressing.	to be applied by authorities.	authorities.	the country.	organizations are held accountable.		
Status description: The last 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.								
[E.g. reference to law(s), when it was created, mechanisms in place to apply/enforce the law, or examples of the law being applied.]								

Way forward: The Act amendments were focusing on development of electronic administration (e-Governance) in water sector and simplifying irrigation permitting.

[E.g. planned or recommended legislation, or activities to advance implementation of existing laws; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)			
c. National integrated water	Development <b>not</b>	Being prepared,	Approved by government	Being implemented	Plan objectives	Objectives consistently			
resources management	started or not	put not approved and starting to be by		by the majority of	consistently	achieved, and periodically			
(IWRM) plans, or similar.	progressing.	by government.	government. implemented by relevant a		achieved.	reviewed and revised.			
Score <mark>80</mark>									
Status description: National Water Strategy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) was adopted in 2017 (https://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A17H1110.KOR&timeshift=fffffff4&txtreferer=00000001.TXT). National Water Strategy (Kvassay Jeno Plan) implementation under operational programmes is in progress. The implementation of the Plan is monitored.									
( <u>https://www.vizugy.hu/index.ph</u> and the status of waters are mon [E.g. reference to plans, progres	(https://www.vizugy.hu/index.php?module=vizstrat&programelemid=149) The second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan is in progress. The implementation of the Program of Measures and the status of waters are monitored. [E.g. reference to plans, progress reports, status of implementation of activities by relevant authorities.]								
Way forward: The progress in in (especially the prolonged drough [E.g. planned or recommended	mplementation of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> Riv t) are hampering the achieve activities to advance impler	er Basin Management Pla ment of the goals. mentation of plans; barr	in and improvement in status of v iers and enablers; draft interim	vater are not as fast as it v targets where appropria	was expected. The cons	equences of climate change			
1.2 What is the status of polic	cies, laws and plans to sup	port IWRM at other le	vels?						
a. Sub-national³ water resources policies or similar.Development not started or delayed in most sub-nationalExist in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRMBased on IWRM, approved by the majority of authorities and starting to be used to guide workBeing used by the majority of relevant authorities to guidePolicy objectives consistently achieved by a majority of and periodically reviewed									
Score <mark>70</mark>					authorities.				
Status description: The Integra Serbia, Slovakia and Ukraine. This River Basin Management Plans (a The second reviews of the WFD F [E.g. reference to policies, repo	ted Tisza River Basin Manage plan includes the primary as according to WFD) were elabo River Basin Management Plan rts; evidence of implementa	ment Plan was drafted w pects of the EU Floods Di prated to 4 sub-basins and s to sub-national levels an ation of policies; and at v	ith involvement and joint efforts rective (2007/60/EC, https://ec.e d 42 subunits to enforce impleme re in progress. which level policies are being de	of the five countries that uropa.eu/environment/w ntation of WFD on sub-na eveloped and implement	share the Tisza River Ba ater/flood_risk/index.h tional level. It also inclu ed.]	nsin — Hungary, Romania, htm) as well. udes the program of measures.			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Sub-national includes jurisdictions <u>not</u> at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit subnational 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.

Way forward: The progress in implementation of the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of policies; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

b. Basin/aquifer	Development <b>not</b>	Being prepared for	Approved in the majority	Being implemented	Plan objectives	Objectives consistently
management plans <sup>4</sup> or	started or delayed in	most	of basins/aquifers and	in the majority of	consistently	achieved in all
similar, based on IWRM.	most basins/aquifers	basins/aquifers.	starting to be used by	basins/aquifers.	achieved in	basins/aquifers, and
	of national		authorities.		majority of	periodically <b>reviewed</b> and
Score <mark>70</mark>	importance.				basins/aquifers.	revised.

**Status description:** 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.

[E.g. reference to most significant basins/aquifers, their plans, progress reports, evidence of implementation of plans.]

Way forward: The Government approved a proposal on irrigation development in Hungary in 2018 (https://net.jogtar.hu/jogszabaly?docid=A18H1426.KOR&txtreferer=00000001.TXT). Elaboration of a drought management plan is in progress.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of plans; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)		
c. Arrangements for	Development <b>not</b>	Being prepared	Arrangements are adopted.	Arrangements'	Arrangements'	The arrangements'		
transboundary water	started or not	or negotiated.		provisions are partly	provisions are	provisions are <b>fully</b>		
management. <sup>5</sup>	progressing.			implemented.	mostly	implemented.		
Score 90					implemented.			
Status description: 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/main/icpdr/danube-riv	er-protection-conve	ntion)					
Tisza Declaration to facilita	ate the constitution among	the basin's countrie	s (http://www.kotivizig.hu/inde	ex.php?option=com_cont	tent&view=article&id=2	257%3Atisza-		
declaration&catid=55%3A	tisza-voelgyi-mhely&Itemid	=1)						
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)								
Transboundary Agreemen	Transboundary Agreements with the 7 neighbouring countries were signed on different dates.							

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> For 'transboundary' definition and guidance on how to fill out all transboundary level questions, see Annexes A and B. All transboundary level questions should reflect the situation in most of the 'most important' transboundary basins/aquifers, as listed in Annex B. 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. Refers to international basins/aquifers only. Arrangements may be interstate, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial, interagency or between regional authorities. They may also be entered into by sub-national entities.

[E.g. describe the situation for each of, or groups of, the basins/aquifers listed in Annex B. E.g. reference to agreements, reports, evidence of implementation.] 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. [E.g. planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of agreements; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.] d. Sub-national water Development **not** Exist in most Based on IWRM. approved **Some** regulations All regulations All regulations being resources regulations<sup>6</sup> started or delayed in in most jurisdictions and being applied in the being applied in applied and enforced in all jurisdictions, but jurisdictions, and all (laws, decrees, most sub-national not necessarily starting to be applied by majority of the majority of ordinances or similar).<sup>7</sup> iurisdictions. based on IWRM. authorities in some iurisdictions. iurisdictions. people and organizations iurisdictions. are held accountable. Score n/a Status description: xxx [E.g. reference to regulations, mechanisms for enforcement, examples of enforcement.] Way forward: xxx [E.g. planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of regulations; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Sub-national includes jurisdictions <u>not</u> at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit subnational regulations, please answer this question by considering how national regulations are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, nonnational level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> 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 equality. The 2030 Agenda stresses the importance of partnerships that will require public participation and creating synergies with the private sector.

The burdens of water-related work carried out predominantly by women have been acknowledged for decades,<sup>8</sup> which has led to a focus on women's practical needs around water, especially in relation to carrying water and managing it within the home. In the context of water resources management, there has been growing recognition that, a strategic and practical focus on increasing women's voice and influence, at all levels of decision-making, must become a priority. Furthermore, mainstreaming gender in the water sector supports a range of targets in the SDGs, including under Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls.<sup>9</sup> Including a gender-related question in this survey (q.2.2d) also addresses the call for gender disaggregated data in the 2030 Agenda.<sup>10</sup>

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 description" 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> E.g. Dublin Principle Nr. 3 (1992): "Women play a central part in the provision, management and safeguarding of water". "[the] role of women ... has seldom been reflected in institutional arrangements for the ... management of water resources. Acceptance and implementation of this principle requires positive policies to address women's specific needs and to equip and empower women to participate at all levels in water resources programmes, including decision-making and implementation, in ways defined by them." <sup>9</sup> E.g. SDG target 5.5 "Ensure women's full and effective participation and equal opportunities for leadership at all levels of decision-making in political, economic and public life." <sup>10</sup> E.g. SDG target 17.18 "By 2020, ... increase ... the availability of ... data disaggregated by ... gender, ... and other characteristics relevant in national contexts."

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	No dedicated	Authorities exist,	Authorities have clear	Authorities have	Authorities have the	Authorities have the				
authorities <sup>11</sup> for leading	government	with clear	mandate to lead IWRM	the capacity to	capacity to effectively lead	capacity to effectively				
IWRM implementation.	authorities for	mandate to lead	implementation, and the	effectively lead	periodic monitoring and	lead periodic IWRM				
	water resources	water resources	capacity <sup>12</sup> to effectively lead	IWRM plan	evaluation of the IWRM	plan <b>revision</b> .				
Score <mark>80</mark>	management.	management.	IWRM plan formulation.	implementation.	plan(s).					
Status description: Main natio	nal government authoriti	es are the Ministry of In	terior ( <u>http://www.kormany.hu/er</u>	<u>/ministry-of-interior</u> ), th	e General Directorate of Water N	/lanagement ( <u>www.ovf.hu</u> )				
and regional water directorates,	the National Directorate	for Disaster Manageme	nt and its regional directorates (ht	tps://www.katasztrofave	delem.hu/130/vzgyi-s-vzvdelemi-	hatsgi-tevkenysg). Not all				
areas of expertise are integrated	into these governmental	authorities thus to mar	age IWRM inter-ministerial coordin	nation is needed (for examination is needed (for examin	mple Ministry of Human Capacitie	es is responsible for				
sanitation, or Ministry for Innova	ition and Technology is re	sponsible for water infr	astructures or climate change mitig	gation and adaptation).						
[E.g. reference to authorities an	d Natura Protection Ac	apacity, reports.j	d in 2020, which now enough at	tention to protecting I	lunger de neturel wetere es ne	art of adaptation to				
way forward: The Climate an	a Nature Protection Ac	a has launghad in 202	a in 2020 which pays special at	a retational economy	Ainistry of Agriculture appear	and in 2010 that				
changed climate conditions m	ole Huligary Programmin	e has launched in 202	Lungarian water management	a rotational economy.	age, the goal new is water ret	option, and in addition to				
state incentives, science, edu	cation and research has	ange the tradition of a	nunganan water management.	instead of water drain	age, the goal now is water ret					
[F g planned or recommended	activities to improve ca	nacity or effectiveness	of authorities: harriers and enab	lers, draft interim targe	ts where appropriate 1					
h Coordination between	No information	Information on wat	er Communication:	Consultation:	Collaboration: Formal	Co-decisions and co-				
national government	shared between		Information	Opportunities for	arrangements between	nroduction:				
authorities representing	different	nlanning and	experiences and	different sectors to	different government	Shared nower between				
different sectors <sup>13</sup> on water	government sectors	management is may	te opinions are <b>shared</b>	take part in policy	sectors with the objective	different sectors on				
resources policy planning	on policy planning	available between	between different	planning and	of agreeing on collective	ioint policy planning				
and management.	and management.	different sectors.	sectors.	management	decisions on important	and management				
Score 90				processes.	issues and activities.	activities.				
Status description: Inter minis	torial coordination is part	of the governance mee	hanism. To align the operations of	agriculture and water ma	nagement a new authority (co. co	llod "Irrigation Agonov") was				
established at 01/01/2020 Repre	sentatives of government	authorities representir	nament. To align the operations of og different sectors are members of	f the National Water Cou	ncil (NWC) The Ministry of Interi	or is the governing hody $\Delta t$				
sub-basin level there are 4 Sub-b	asin Water Councils, and	at regional level 12 Reg	ional Water Councils.		nen (terre). The Winistry of Intern	or is the governing body. At				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> 'Government authorities' could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> 'Capacity' in this context is that the responsible authorities should be adapted to the complexity of water challenges to be met and 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Relates to coordination between the government authorities responsible for water management and those responsible for other sectors (such as agriculture, energy, climate, environment etc.) that are dependent on water, or impact on water. Coordination between groundwater and surface water development/management should also be optimised. The relevant sectors should be considered according to their importance for the country.

[E.g. reference to mechanisms for cross-sectoral coordination, evidence of meetings, reports.]

**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 [E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve cross-sectoral coordination; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Public	No information shared	Information on water	Communication:	Consultation:	Collaboration:	Representation: Formal
participation <sup>14</sup> in	between government	resources, policy,	Government	Government authorities	Mechanisms <sup>15</sup>	representation of the
water resources,	and the public on	planning and	authorities request	regularly <b>use</b>	established, and regularly	public in government
policy, planning	policy, planning and	management is made	information,	information,	used, for the public to take	processes contributing
and management	management.	available to the public.	experiences and	experiences and	part in relevant policy,	to decision making on
at national level.			opinions of the public.	opinions of the public.	planning and management	important issues and
Score 90					processes.	activities, as appropriate.
Status description: The	e National Water Council has	the role consulting water issu	ies at national level.			
Representatives of stake	holder groups are members o	of the water councils, includin	g stakeholder organizations	, scientific institutions, civil soc	cieties. Individuals can attend on o	convocations or initiate
disputation of any water	related issues.					
The development of Riv	ver Basin Management plan c	ontains public participation				
[E.g. mechanisms for p	public participation, types o	f groups that participate or a	any significant ones that de	o not, examples of degree of	participation.]	
Way forward: The sec	cond review of the WFD River	r Basin Management Plan con	tains public participation.			
[E.g. planned or recon	nmended activities to impro	ve public participation; bar	riers and enablers; draft in	terim targets where appropri	ate.]	
d. Private sector <sup>16</sup>	No information shared	Information made	Communication	Consultation:	Collaboration:	Representation:
participation in	between government	available between	between government	Government authorities	Mechanisms <sup>17</sup>	Effective private sector
water resources	and private sector	government and	and private sector	regularly involve the	established, and regularly	involvement established
development,	about water resources	private sector about	about water	private sector in water	used, for private sector	for water resources
management and	development,	water resources	resources	resources development,	involvement and	development,
use.	management and use.	development,	development,	management and use	partnership.	management and use
Score <mark>90</mark>		management and use.	management and use.	activities.		activities.
Status description: R	epresentatives of business ar	re members of water councils	and they have the opportur	nity to launch any water relate	d issues through ministries as we	И.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> '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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> Private sector includes for-profit businesses and groups. It does not include government or civil society. 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 description' field. <sup>17</sup> Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for private sector participation.

[E.g. mechanisms for, and evidence of private sector participation, types of businesses participating, types of programmes with private sector participation, levels (e.g. national /sub-national).]

Way forward: The second review of the WFD River Basin Management Plan contains public participation.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve private sector participation; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)		
e. Developing IWRM	No capacity	Occasional capacity	Some long-term capacity	Long-term capacity	Long-term capacity	Long-term capacity		
capacity. <sup>18</sup>	development	development,	development initiatives are	development	development initiatives	development initiatives		
	specific to water	generally limited to	being implemented, but	initiatives are being	are being implemented,	are being implemented		
	resources	short-term / ad-hoc	geographic and stakeholder	implemented, and	with effective outcomes,	with highly effective		
	management.	activities.	coverage is <b>limited</b> .	geographic and	and geographic and	outcomes, and geographic		
				stakeholder coverage	stakeholder coverage is	and stakeholder coverage		
Score <mark>80</mark>				is <b>adequate</b> .	very good.	is <b>excellent.</b>		
Status description: Accordin	ng to the National Wa	ter Strategy a long-term cap	pacity development program was la	unched in Hungary in 2018	. Special rules applicable to civi	l servants employed by water		
administrations were establis	hed which include en	hancement of competence	, management and professionalism	of water administration.				
[E.g. capacity development programs; government/public/education/academia; geographic and stakeholder coverage, 'levels' of implementation (e.g. national/sub-national).]								
Way forward: IWRM related subjects has included into training programmes.								
[E.g. planned or recommend	[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve capacity development; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]							
2.2 What is the status of in	stitutions for IWRN	/l implementation at oth	ner levels?					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> 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 programs 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.

a. Basin/aquifer level <sup>19</sup>	No dedicated	Authorities exist,	Authorities have clear	Authorities have the	Authorities have the	Authorities have the
organizations <sup>20</sup> for	basin	with clear mandate	mandate to lead IWRM	capacity to	capacity to effectively lead	capacity to effectively
leading implementation	authorities for	to lead water	implementation, and the	effectively lead	periodic monitoring and	lead periodic IWRM plan
of IWRM.	water resources	resources	capacity <sup>21</sup> to effectively lead	IWRM plan	evaluation of the IWRM	revision.
Score 70	management.	management.	IWRM plan formulation.	implementation.	plan(s).	

**Status description:** 12 regional water directorates and 12 water authorities are responsible to manage water resources 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).

[E.g. reference to authorities and evidence of capacity for leading implementation of IWRM. Any significant basins/aquifers without authorities.]

Way forward: Information technology developments will continue.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve capacity or effectiveness of organizations; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. Public participation <sup>22</sup>	No information	Information on	Communication:	Consultation:	Collaboration:	Representation: Formal
in water resources,	shared between	water resources,	Government	Government authorities	Mechanisms <sup>24</sup>	representation of the
policy, planning and	government and	policy, planning and	authorities request	regularly <b>use</b> local level	established, and regularly	public in local authority
management at the local	the public on	management is	information,	information, experiences	used, for the public to take	processes contributing to
level. <sup>23</sup>	policy, planning and	made available to	experiences and	and opinions of the	part in relevant policy,	decision making on
	management.	the public.	opinions of the	public.	planning and management	important issues and
Score <mark>80</mark>			public.		processes.	activities, as appropriate.

**Status description:** 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

[E.g. mechanisms for public participation, types of groups that participate or any significant ones that do not, evidence of degree of participation, geographic differences across country.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or for other reasons. This question only refers to these basins/aquifers. 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. <sup>20</sup> Could be organization, committee, inter-ministerial mechanism or other means of collaboration for managing water resources at the basin level.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 12. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> '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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Examples of 'local level' include municipal level (e.g. cities, towns and villages), community level, basin/tributary/aquifer/delta level, and water user associations.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

Way forward: Information technology developments will continue.								
[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve public participation; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]								
c. Participation of	Participation of	Vulnerable groups	Some procedures in	Procedures in place, with	Regular participation of	Meaningful <sup>27</sup> and regular		
vulnerable groups in	vulnerable groups	partially	place, but limited	moderate participation	vulnerable groups	participation of		
water resources planning	not explicitly	addressed, but no	budget and human	of vulnerable groups	(sufficient budget and	vulnerable groups, as		
and management. <sup>25</sup>	addressed in laws,	explicit procedures	capacity for	(moderate budget and	human capacity, and	appropriate.		
Score 80	policies, or plans.	in place. <sup>26</sup>	implementation.	human capacity).	participation is monitored).			

#### Status description:

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 participates in the preparation of national 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 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.

[E.g. types of procedures in place, with examples and consideration of (as appropriate): (i) relevant laws/policies/plans; (ii) institutional arrangements; (iii) existence and adequacy of budgets and human capacity; (iv) extent of monitoring for participation of vulnerable groups. Explain which vulnerable groups are considered, situation/differences regarding different vulnerable groups, and procedures at national level, local level, and their implementation and effectiveness.]

Way forward: The Ministry of Interior consulate with Deputy-Commissioners for Fundamental Rights in cases affecting the interests of future generations.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to increase participation of vulnerable groups, barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> 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.
<sup>26</sup> 'Procedures' can include operational processes to, for example, raise awareness, reduce language barriers, and facilitate interaction with specific vulnerable groups.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> '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 included in	Gender	Gender	Gender considerations	Gender <b>objectives</b> <sup>29</sup>	Gender objectives	Gender objectives
laws/plans or similar within	considerations <b>not</b>	considerations	included (but limited	partly achieved	mostly achieved	consistently achieved and
water resources	explicitly included in	partially included	implementation,	(activities partially	(activities adequately	effectively address gender
management. <sup>28</sup>	national/ subnational	in laws/plans or	budget or monitoring).	monitored and	monitored and	issues (activities and
	laws/plans or similar.	similar.		funded).	funded).	outcomes reviewed and
Score <mark>80</mark>						revised).
Status description: Constitution a	addresses gender objectives	s. There is low on Equal	treatment and the promotion	n of gender opportunities		
http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_d	loc.cgi?docid=A0300125.TV	#lbj1id82c2. Objectives	monitored and frequently re	ported by the Office of th	e Commissioner for Fundam	ental Rights
(https://www.ajbh.hu/en/web/ajbh	n-en/main_page)					
[E.g. gender objectives in laws/po	licies/plans/strategies. Pro	ograms/procedures to	address gender objectives,	incl. reference to report	s. Examples of gender main	streaming processes and
outcomes. Consider adequacy of	funding, human capacity,	monitoring and outco	mes (e.g. in terms of achievi	ng formal representatio	n of gender issues, applicati	on of gender parity rules, and
influence on IWRM outcomes). Co	onsider 'level' of impleme	ntation, i.e. national/s	ub-national/local/transbour	ndary. Consider also pro	gress since baseline.]	
Way forward: The Ministry of Inte	erior consulate with Deputy	-Commissioners for Fur	ndamental Rights in cases affe	ecting the interests of fut	ure generations.	
[E.g. planned or recommended ac	tivities to advance implen	nentation of gender m	ainstreaming; barriers and	enablers; draft interim ta	argets where appropriate.]	
e. Organizational framework	No organizational	Organizational	Organizational	Organizational	Organizational	Organizational
for transboundary water	framework(s).	framework(s)	framework(s)	framework(s)'	framework(s)'	framework(s)' mandate is
management. <sup>30</sup>		being developed.	established.	mandate is <b>partly</b>	mandate is <b>mostly</b>	fully fulfilled.
Score <mark>90</mark>				fulfilled.	fulfilled.	

<sup>30</sup> An organizational framework can include a joint body, mechanism, authority, committee, commission or other institutional arrangement. Refers to international basins/aquifers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> See gender discussion at beginning of section 2. Gender-responsive mechanisms can include laws, policies, plans, strategies or other frameworks or procedures aimed at achieving gender objectives related to women's participation, voice and influence. Gender-responsive 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. In the baseline survey, national, sub-national, and transboundary levels were addressed in three separate questions. These questions have been merged into a single question, allowing countries to answer the question at the level which is most relevant in the national context. The situation at different levels can be explained in the 'Status description' cell, as appropriate.
<sup>29</sup> Gender 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 description' 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 <u>UNESCO WWAP Toolkit on Sex-dis</u>

Status description: 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 2<sup>nd</sup> RBMP has finished in 2019.

Drava Sub-basin: no organisation

Transboundary aquifers designated by Parties: The Monitoring & Assessment Expert Group and the Groundwater Task Group of ICPDR deal with issues related to trans-boundary groundwater bodies of Danube River Basin-wide importance and with all aspects of groundwater management in line with the implementation of EU Water Framework Directive and EU Groundwater Directive.

Transboundary Water Committees established bilaterally by Parties deal with issues related to trans-boundary surface water and groundwater issues.

[E.g. reference to organizations, mandates, progress/annual reports]

Way forward: Periodically reviewed and revised transboundary commitments according to IWRM and new initiatives.

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve effectiveness of organizational frameworks; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
f. Sub-national <sup>31</sup>	No dedicated sub-	Authorities exist,	Authorities have clear	Authorities have	Authorities have the	Sub-national
authorities for leading	national authorities	with clear mandate	mandate to lead IWRM	the capacity to	capacity to effectively	authorities have the
IWRM implementation. <sup>32</sup>	for water resources	to lead water	implementation, and the	effectively lead	lead periodic monitoring	capacity to effectively
	management.	resources	capacity <sup>33</sup> to effectively lead	IWRM plan	and <b>evaluation</b> of the	lead periodic IWRM
Score 60		management.	IWRM plan formulation.	implementation.	IWRM plan(s).	plan <b>revision</b> .

**Status description:** 12 regional water directorates and 12 water authorities are responsible to manage water resources but their capacities are insufficient for effectively leading formulation of plan or implementation of IWRM.

[E.g. reference to authorities and mandates, at which administrative level, levels of capacity, reports.]

Way forward: Capacity building of 12 regional water directorates and 12 water authorities

[E.g. planned or recommended activities to improve capacity or effectiveness of authorities; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 12. 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 programs, 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 <u>monitoring guide</u>), 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/programs (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 program with long-term goals. Long-term refers to activities that are undertaken as part of an ongoing program that has more long-term goals/aims and implementation strategy.

### 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 description" 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 Instrume	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 n	3.1 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at the national level?							
a. National monitoring	<b>No</b> national	Monitoring systems	Long-term national	Long-term national	Long-term national	Long-term national		
of water availability <sup>34</sup>	monitoring	established for a	monitoring is carried out	monitoring is carried out	monitoring is carried	monitoring is carried out		
(includes surface and/or	systems in	limited number of	but with <b>limited</b> coverage	with <b>adequate</b> coverage	out with <b>very good</b>	with excellent coverage		
groundwater, as relevant	place.	short-term / ad-hoc	and limited use by	but limited use by	coverage and adequate	and excellent use by		
to the country).		projects or similar.	stakeholders.	stakeholders.	use by stakeholders.	stakeholders.		
Score <mark>90</mark>								
Status description: Nationa	al monitoring system	n includes surface waters and	d groundwater monitoring both q	uantity and quality with more	or less adequate coverage of t	he country but access to		
information for stakeholders	still a bit limited.							
[E.g. reference to monitorin	g systems, what is	monitored and where, evid	dence of implementation and ac	ccess to information for stake	holders.]			
Way forward: : Information	technology develo	pments needed to ensure the	at stakeholders are informed					
[E.g. planned or recommend	ded activities to im	prove effectiveness of wate	er availability monitoring; barrie	ers and enablers; draft interin	n targets where appropriate.			
b. Sustainable and	No	Use of management	Some management	Management	Management	Management		
efficient water use	management	instruments is <b>limited</b>	instruments implemented	instruments are	instruments are	instruments are		
management <sup>35</sup> from the	instruments	and only through	on a more long-term	implemented on a	implemented on a long-	implemented on a long-		
national level, (includes	being	short-term / ad-hoc	basis, but with <b>limited</b>	long-term basis, with	term basis, with <b>very</b>	term basis, with		
surface and/or	implemented.	projects or similar.	coverage across different	adequate coverage	good coverage across	excellent coverage		
groundwater, as relevant			water users and the	across different water	different water users and	across different water		
to the country).			country.	users and the country.	the country, and are	users and the country,		
Score <mark>80</mark>					effective.	and are <b>highly effective</b> .		
Status description: All type	s of management ir	nstruments exist without any	geographic differences but the le	evel or evidence of implementa	ation across different stakehold	der groups are not the same.		
[E.g. types of management	instruments and fo	or what purposes, evidence	of implementation, geographic	differences, level of impleme	entation across different stak	eholder groups.]		
Way forward: Periodically	reviewed and rev	vised water management p	policy especially in sectors wit	h less efficient use.				
[E.g. planned or recommend	ded activities to im	prove effectiveness of man	agement instruments; barriers	and enablers; draft interim ta	argets where appropriate.]			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> See definition of monitoring in Terminology.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> 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).

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Pollution	No	Use of management	Some management	Management instruments	Management instruments	Management instruments
control <sup>36</sup> from the	management	instruments is	instruments	are implemented on a long-	are implemented on a	are implemented on a long-
national level.	instruments	limited and only	implemented on a more	term basis, with adequate	long-term basis, with <b>very</b>	term basis, with excellent
	being	through <b>short-term</b> /	long-term basis, but with	coverage across sectors and	good coverage across	coverage across sectors and
	implemented.	ad-hoc projects or	limited coverage across	the country.	sectors and the country,	the country, and are highly
Score 80		similar.	sectors and the country.		and are effective.	effective.
Status description: A	ll types of managem	ent instruments except wa	ter quality trading programs ex	ist without any geographic differer	ices but the level or evidence of i	mplementation across different
stakeholder groups are	not the same. Amer	ndment of limit value regul	ations is on-going, main stakeho	olders are involved into process.		
[E.g. types of pollution r	management instrur	nents, incl. water quality m	nonitoring, evidence of impleme	entation, geographic differences, le	vel of implementation across diff	erent stakeholder groups.]
Way forward: Period	ically reviewed an	d revised water manage	ment policy especially in sec	tors with significant pollution.		
[E.g. planned or recom	mended activities	to improve effectiveness	of pollution control measures;	; barriers and enablers; draft inte	rim targets where appropriate.	]
d. Management of	No	Use of management	Some management	Management instruments	Management instruments	Management instruments
water-related	management	instruments is	instruments	are implemented on a long-	are implemented on a	are implemented on a long-
ecosystems <sup>37</sup> from	instruments	limited and only	implemented on a more	term basis, with adequate	long-term basis, with <b>very</b>	term basis, with excellent
the national level.	being	through <b>short-term</b> /	long-term basis, but with	coverage across different	good coverage across	coverage across different
	implemented.	ad-hoc projects or	limited coverage across	ecosystem types and the	different ecosystem types	ecosystem types and the
		similar.	different ecosystem	country. Environmental	and the country, and are	country, and are highly
			types and the country.	Water Requirements (EWR)	effective. EWR analysed	effective. EWR analysed for
Score <mark>90</mark>				analysed in some cases.	for most of country.	whole country.
Status description: En	nvironmental Act an	d Nature Protection Act en	sure to use all types of manage	ment instruments and evidence of	implementation across different	ecosystem types. Groundwater
dependent terrestrial e	cosystems are subje	ct of joint research by ecol	ogists and hydrogeologists. With	hin the framework of the NÖSZTÉP	project ecosystem services of na	tural and near-natural
ecosystems are assesse	d, mapped and eval	uated on a national scale (r	not yet finished).			
[E.g. types of manager	nent instruments, o	evidence of implementati	on and effectiveness, geograp	hic differences, level of impleme	ntation across different ecosyst	em types.]
Way forward: More a	attention on ecosy	stem services and usage of	remote sensing techniques.			
[E.g. planned or recom	mended activities	to improve effectiveness	ecosystem management and I	protection; barriers and enablers	; draft interim targets where ap	propriate.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Includes regulations, water quality guidelines, water quality monitoring, economic tools (e.g. taxes and fees), water quality trading programs, education, consideration of point and non-point (e.g. agricultural) pollution sources, construction and operation of wastewater treatment plants, watershed management.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> 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. Monitoring includes measuring extent and quality of the ecosystems over time.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Management	No	Use of management	Some management	Management	Management instruments	Management instruments
instruments to reduce	management	instruments is	instruments	instruments are	are implemented on a	are implemented on a
impacts of water-	instruments	limited and only	implemented on a more	implemented on a long-	long-term basis, with <b>very</b>	long-term basis, with
related disasters <sup>38</sup> from	being	through short-term /	long-term basis, but with	term basis, with	good coverage of at-risk	excellent coverage of at-
the national level.	implemented.	ad-hoc projects or	limited coverage of at-	adequate coverage of	areas, and are effective.	risk areas, and are highly
Score <mark>90</mark>		similar.	risk areas.	at-risk areas.		effective.
Status description: All type	es of management ir	nstruments are used related	to Seveso Directive. The risk m	nanagement instruments are im	plemented for all types of water-	related disasters but the risk
not eliminated yet. The imple	ementation of Flood	Directive is also part of the	process. Register of critical in	frastructures and potentially r	isky plants have been establish	ed.
[E.g. types of management	instruments, evide	nce of implementation an	d effectiveness, geographic di	fferences, level of implement	ation for different types of wate	er-related disasters.]
Way forward: : Periodical	ly reviewed and re	evised water managemen	t policy especially in sectors	with significant risk.		
[E.g. planned or recommen	ded activities to im	prove effectiveness of disa	aster risk management and m	onitoring; barriers and enable	ers; draft interim targets where	appropriate.]
3.2 What is the status of r	management instr	uments to support IWR	M implementation at other	levels?		
a. Basin management	No basin level	Use of basin level	Some basin level	Basin level management	Basin level management	Basin level management
instruments. <sup>39</sup>	management	management	management	instruments	instruments implemented	instruments implemented
	instruments	instruments is	instruments	implemented on a more	on a more long-term basis,	on a more long-term
	being	limited and only	implemented on a more	long-term basis, with	with effective outcomes	basis, with <b>highly</b>
	implemented.	through short-term /	long-term basis, but with	adequate geographic	and <b>very good</b> geographic	effective outcomes and
		ad-hoc projects.	limited geographic and	and stakeholder	and stakeholder coverage.	excellent geographic and
Score 70			stakeholder coverage.	coverage.		stakeholder coverage.
Status description: River B	asin Management P	lans include all managemen	it instruments needed to effect	ively manage river basin across	country at different level and im	plement Programme of
Measures across different sta	akeholder groups. R	BMP is only partly implement	nted. First revision of the Flood	Risk Management Plan is on-go	ping.	
[E.g. types of management	instruments, evide	nce of implementation an	d effectiveness, geographic di	fferences, level of implement	ation across different stakehold	er groups.]
Way forward: Strengthen	political commitm	nent and stakeholder invo	olvement.			
[E.g. planned or recommen	ded activities to im	prove effectiveness of bas	in management and develop	ment; barriers and enablers; d	lraft interim targets where appr	opriate.]

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> '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); and Climatological (drought, glacial lake outburst, wildfire).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> 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.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. Aquifer	No aquifer	Use of aquifer level	Some aquifer level	Aquifer level management	Aquifer level management	Aquifer level management
management	level	management	management instruments	instruments implemented	instruments implemented	instruments implemented
instruments.40	management	instruments is	implemented on a more	on a more <b>long-term</b>	on a more <b>long-term</b>	on a more long-term basis,
	instruments	limited and only	long-term basis, but with	basis, with <b>adequate</b>	basis, with <b>effective</b>	with highly effective
	being	through <b>short-term</b>	limited geographic and	geographic and	outcomes and very good	outcomes and excellent
	implemented.	/ ad-hoc projects.	stakeholder coverage.	stakeholder coverage.	geographic and	geographic and stakeholder
Score <mark>70</mark>					stakeholder coverage.	coverage.
Status description: Rive	er Basin Managemer	nt Plans include all manag	ement instruments needed to ef	fectively manage river basin acro	ss country at different level and i	mplement Programme of
Measures across different	t stakeholder groups	. RBMP is only partly imp	lemented.			
[E.g. types of manageme	ent instruments, ev	idence of implementatic	on and effectiveness, geograph	ic differences, level of impleme	ntation across different stakeho	older groups.]
Way forward: Strength	en political comm	itment and stakeholde	r involvement.			
[E.g. planned or recom	mended activities	to improve effectivene	ss of aquifer management; b	arriers and enablers; draft inte	erim targets where appropriat	e.]
c. Data and	No data and	Limited data and	Data and information	Data and information	Data and information	All relevant data and
information sharing	information	information sharing	sharing arrangements	sharing arrangements	sharing arrangements	information are online and
within countries at	sharing.	on an <b>ad-hoc</b> basis.	exist on a more long-term	implemented on a more	implemented on a more	freely accessible to all.
all levels. <sup>41</sup>			basis between major data	long-term basis, with	long-term basis, with very	
			providers and users.	adequate coverage across	good coverage across	
Score 70				sectors and the country.	sectors and the country.	
Status description: In the	ne last decades a lot	of efforts have done to s	hare information among differer	nt sectors and ensure access to in	formation for public but still it is a	a bit limited. Some data and
information are online an	d accessible to anyb	ody but not the all releva	nt data.			
[E.g. different data and i	nformation sharing	arrangements, availabi	lity and access to data/informa	tion, examples of sectors/users	across which data and informa	tion are being shared.]
Way forward: : Informa	tion technology dev	elopments needed to ens	ure that stakeholders are inform	ned		
[E.g. planned or recom	mended activities	to establish/improve d	ata sharing procedures and ir	nfrastructure; barriers and ena	blers; draft interim targets wl	nere appropriate.]
d. Transboundary	No data and	Limited data and	Data and information	Data and information	Data and information	All relevant data and
data and information	information	information sharing	sharing arrangements	sharing arrangements	sharing arrangements	information are online and
sharing <u>between</u>	sharing.	on an <b>ad-hoc</b> or	exist, but sharing is	implemented adequately.	implemented	accessible between
countries.		informal basis.	limited.		effectively. <sup>42</sup>	countries.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> See previous footnote on basin management instruments, which also applies to aquifers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>41</sup> Includes more formal data and information sharing arrangements between users, as well as accessibility for the general public, where appropriate.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>42</sup> 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.).

Score <mark>80</mark>	0								
Status description: Data and information sharing arrangements exist in bilateral agreements and among ICPDR but still some limitations. DAREFFORT project (Danube River Basin Enhanced Flood									
Forecasting Cooperat	Forecasting Cooperation) focus on the establishment of the Danube Hydrological Information System (DanubeHIS) which is a fundamental step towards flexible and sustainable data exchange.								
[E.g. different data and information sharing arrangements, access to information.]									
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.									
[E.g. planned or reco	commended activities to	establish/improve data	sharing procedures and infrasi	tructure; barriers and enablers;	draft interim targets where app	propriate.]			

## 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. Finance from <u>Official Development Assistance (ODA)</u> 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-building support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies".

"Various 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 description' field.

Investments should cover all aspects of water resources development and management but exclude any related to drinking water supply, sanitation and hygiene services as they are covered in other monitoring processes.

### 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 description" 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	4.1 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at the national level?								
a. National budget <sup>43</sup> for water resources infrastructure <sup>44</sup> (investment and recurrent costs). Score 50 Status description: Main	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 <b>being utilised in all</b> planned projects.	Budget <b>fully utilised</b> for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised.			
stakeholder contributions t [E.g. adequacy of budget; Way forward: Strengthe	o investments. budget gaps; distinction b n political commitment a	etween investments and stakeholder invo	and ongoing (operation and main vement.	tenance) costs; barriers/	enablers, including for disbur	sal.]			
[E.g. planned or recomme	nded activities to increase	e budget and/or dispe	rsal; barriers and enablers; draft i	nterim targets where ap	propriate.]				
b. National budget for IWRM elements <sup>45</sup> (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 elements and implementation at an early stage.	Allocations made for <b>at</b> <b>least half</b> of the elements but insufficient for others.	Allocations for <b>most</b> of the elements and some implementation under way.	Allocations include <b>all</b> elements and implementation regularly carried out (investments and recurrent costs).	Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach <b>fully</b> <b>utilised</b> , budgets reviewed and revised.			
Status description: 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.         [E.g. adequacy of budget; budget gaps; distinction between investments and ongoing costs; barriers/enablers, including for disbursal.]         Way forward: Strengthen political commitment to establish long-term financial programs to cover IWRM costs.         [E.g. planned or recommended activities to increase budget and/or dispersal; barriers and enablers; draft interim targets where appropriate.]									

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>43</sup> 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>44</sup> Infrastructure includes 'hard' structures such as dams, canals, pumping stations, flood control, treatment works etc., as well as 'soft' infrastructure and environmental measures such as catchment management, sustainable drainage systems etc. For this survey do not include infrastructure for drinking water supply or sanitation services. Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>45</sup> '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 building, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)		
4.2 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at other levels?								
a. Sub-national or basin	No budget allocated	Some budget	Sufficient budget	Sufficient budget	Sufficient funds	Budget <b>fully utilised</b> , for		
budgets for water	in sub-national or	allocated but only	allocated for planned	allocated and funds	disbursed, for	investment and recurrent		
resources infrastructure <sup>46</sup>	basin investment	partly covers planned	investments but	disbursed for most	investment and	costs, post-project		
(investment and recurrent	plans.	investments.	insufficient funds	planned programmes	recurrent costs, and	evaluation carried out,		
costs).			disbursed or made	or projects.	being utilised in all	budgets reviewed and		
Score <mark>50</mark>			available.		planned projects.	revised.		
Status description: There are	only low budgets or no se	parated budget for local pro	ogrammes. The Rural Develop	ment Programme and the	Territorial and settlement dev	velopment OP includes some		
possibilities to develop water in	frastructures on local level							
[E.g. adequacy of budget; bud	get gaps; distinction betw	veen investments and ong	oing (O&M) costs; barriers/	enablers, including for dis	bursal; reference to 'level' (	sub-national/ basin).]		
Way forward: Strengthen po	olitical commitment to e	stablish long-term financ	ial programs to cover IWR	M costs.				
[E.g. planned or recommende	d activities to increase bu	dget and/or dispersal; bar	riers and enablers; draft int	erim targets where appro	priate.]			
b. Revenues raised for	No revenues raised	Processes in place to	Some revenue raised,	Revenues raised	Revenues raised cover	Revenues raised fully		
IWRM elements. <sup>47</sup>	for IWRM elements.	raise revenue but <b>not</b>	but generally not used	cover some IWRM	most IWRM activities.	cover costs of IWRM		
Score <mark>70</mark>		yet implemented.	for IWRM activities.	activities.		activities.		
Status description: Different	types of revenues raised ar	nd mechanisms exist to me	et requirements but not strai	ght connection between co	lected tax and covered costs.	Most of the revenues collected		
at national level and distributed	l to local level by centralise	d way. The local mechanisr	n to collect revenues is regula	ated by government, prices	are influenced by several poi	nt of view.		
[E.g. types of revenues raised	and mechanisms; level at	which they are raised and	d used; and adequacy of rev	enues to meet requireme	nts at different levels.]			
Way forward: Strengthen po	olitical commitment to e	stablish transparent reve	enue policy.					
[E.g. planned or recommende	d activities to increase bu	dget and/or dispersal; bar	riers and enablers; draft int	erim targets where appro	priate.]			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>46</sup> Infrastructure includes 'hard' structures such as dams, canals, pumping stations, flood control, treatment works etc., as well as 'soft' infrastructure and environmental measures such as catchment management, sustainable drainage systems etc. **For this survey do not include infrastructure for drinking water supply or sanitation services.** Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>47</sup> 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 description). **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	No specific funding	MS agreement on country	Funding less than	Funding less than	Funding more than	Full funding of that
transboundary	allocated from the	share of contributions in	<b>50%</b> of that	75% of that expected	75% of that expected	expected as
cooperation.48	Member State (MS)	place and in-kind support	expected as	as contributions and	as contributions and	contributions and by
	budgets nor from	for the cooperation	contributions and	by regulation.	by regulation.	regulation.
Score 90	other regular sources.	organisation/arrangement.	by regulation.			
Status description: The a	nnual share of funds agreed f	rom MS national budgets to suppo	ort the agreed ICPDR arrar	ngement. Financing of opera	ation of Transboundary Wa	ter Committees is ensured in
the budget of Ministry of In-	terior. Membership in some i	nternational organisations suspend	ded for financial reason e	.g. INBO.		
[E.g. reference to financing	g arrangements, evidence o	f contributions.]				
Way forward: Mobilisation	on of Interregional funds (	EUDRS) to cover some(more) tr	ansboundary cooperat	tion activities.		
[E.g. planned or recomme	nded activities to increase b	udget and/or dispersal; barriers	and enablers; draft inter	rim targets where appropr	iate.]	
d. Sub-national or	No budget allocations	Allocations made for some	Allocations made	Allocations for most	Allocations include	Planned budget
basin budgets for	at sub-national or	of the elements and	for <b>at least half</b> of	of the elements and	all elements and	allocations for all
IWRM elements <sup>49</sup>	basin level for	implementation at an early	the elements but	some	implementation	elements of the IWRM
(investment and	investments and	stage.	insufficient for	implementation	regularly carried out	approach fully utilised,
recurrent costs).	recurrent costs of		others.	under way.	(investments and	budgets reviewed and
Score 50	IWRM elements.				recurrent costs).	revised.
Status description: There	are only low budgets or no s	eparated budget for IWRM elemer	nts. The Rural Developme	nt Programme and the Terr	itorial and settlement devel	opment OP includes some
possibilities to cover IWRM	elements on local level.					
[E.g. adequacy of budget;	budget gaps; distinction be	ween investments and ongoing o	costs; barriers/enablers,	including for disbursal; re	ference to 'level' (sub-nat	ional and/or basin).]
Way forward: Strengther	n political commitment to	establish long-term financial pr	ograms to cover IWRN	1 costs.		
[E.g. planned or recomme	nded activities to increase b	udget and/or dispersal: barriers	and enablers: draft inte	rim targets where appropr	iate.l	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>48</sup> 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 description' and 'Way forward' fields.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>49</sup> '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 building, 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:

- 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.

Section	Average Scores (all values rounded to nearest whole number)
Section 1 Enabling environment	80
Section 2 Institutions and participation	89
Section 3 Management instruments	80
Section 4 Financing	63
Indicator 6.5.1 score	78
= 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 description' and 'way forward' for each question, as this helps to identify which actions need to be taken to move towards a greater degree of implementation of IWRM. See the monitoring guide for further information on interpretation of scores and target setting.

# **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 description' 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 (Transboundary level) has been completed.	
Annex C (Barriers, enablers and next steps) has been completed.	
Annex D (Priority challenges) has been completed.	
Annex E (Reporting process) has been completed.	

### **Annexes**:

### **Annex A: Glossary**

- 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.
- **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:
  - o efficiency to use water resources in the best way possible;
  - o equity in the allocation of water across social and economic groups;
  - o 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.
- 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.
- **Programs:** 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 (see Annex B).
- 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: Transboundary level**

The transboundary questions for indicator 6.5.1 focus on the degree of implementation of IWRM at the transboundary level, as relevant to implementation of IWRM 'at all levels', as specified in target 6.5. Countries sharing basins of transboundary waters (rivers, lakes or aquifers) should answer the questions on transboundary issues. This information is complemented by indicator 6.5.2 'Proportion of transboundary basin area with an operational arrangement for water cooperation'.

To enable tracking of progress over time and for transparency, in the table below please list the transboundary (or 'international') basins or aquifers that are included in this survey. The 6.5.1 baseline reporting may be used as a starting point. 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 listed in this table, and the scores given, should be cross-referenced with tables and scores in the 6.5.2 reporting template (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 ensure to also include the name of the larger basin. When answering transboundary questions, the majority of the basins below must meet the criteria described in each threshold to achieve the score for that threshold.

The columns on the right of the table are optional though recommended. Filling them out would: provide countries with valuable information and a quick diagnostic tool for the status in each basin/aquifer; increase the transparency of the transboundary level responses in this survey for stakeholders both within and between countries; help countries reach consensus on scores for the transboundary questions; and provide a valuable cross-reference for indicator 6.5.2. For each basin/aquifer, a score should be given for each of the four transboundary questions in the survey, following the guidance and thresholds in the survey questions. To supplement this data, you are encouraged to provide a summary of the situation for the transboundary basins/aquifers in the 'Status description' and 'Way forward' fields to transboundary questions within Part 2 of this survey, to the extent feasible.

		OPTIONAL THOUGH RECOMMENDED*			
	Important transboundary basins	Arrangements	Institutions	Data sharing	Financing
		(1.2c)	(2.2e)	(3.2d)	(4.2c)
1.	Danube River Basin	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Tisza River Sub-basin	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Drava River Sub-basin	Y	Ν	Y	Ν
	Please add/delete rows as needed				
	Important transboundary aquifers				
1.	Mures / Maros	Y	Y	Y	Y
2.	Somes / Szamos	Y	Y	Y	Y
3.	Upper Pannonian-Lower Pleistocene / Vojvodina / Duna-Tisza köze déli r.	Y	Y	Y	Y
4.	Podunajska Basin, Zitny Ostrov / Szigetköz, Hanság-Rábca	Y	Y	Y	Y
5.	Bodrog	Y	Y	Y	Y
6.	Slovensky kras / Aggtelek-hgs.	Y	Y	Y	Y
7.	Komarnanska Vysoka Kryha / Dunántúli-khgs. északi r.	Y	Y	Y	Y
	Please add/delete rows as needed				

\* These columns may be useful to countries in determining the approximate status for each transboundary basin/aquifer, and thereby be useful in discussions on the respective question scores in Part 2 of this survey instrument.

## Annex C: Barriers, enablers and next steps for furthering IWRM implementation

This section is not used in calculating indicator 6.5.1, but is designed to be useful for countries to identify the main challenges and next steps to further IWRM implementation. It builds on the free text fields for each question – "Status description" and "Way forward" – to identify the key issues.

The third question below aims to improve transparency by documenting the main differences in opinion between stakeholders. You may amend the structure to make it more useful to the planning process in the national context. For each question, you may consider aspects under each of the four IWRM dimensions in the survey, or you may identify aspects/issues that cut-across questions and IWRM dimensions. Some issues not addressed by the questions may also be brought up here.

1) What are the main challenges/barriers to progress of IWRM implementation in the country?

Cooperation between sectors, state and stakeholders is weak. Funds and programs are sector specific instead of integrated sources and plans. No institutional background for integrated projects.

2) What are the main next steps to overcome challenges and further IWRM implementation?

### Cross-sectorial programming, supporting cooperation

- 3) What were the main points of difference in stakeholder opinion in answering the survey questions?
- 4) Additional comments

## Annex D: Priority water resource challenges

Please indicate the challenge level for each of the water resource issues below. This information will not affect the overall indicator score.

This checklist may be useful to countries in stakeholder discussions and planning. Over time, it can also help countries to evaluate whether the implementation of IWRM can help to reduce the challenge level relating to different water resources issues. The information will also help to develop regional and global oversight of key water resources challenges, and track progress of how challenge levels may change over time.

Note that 'challenge level' in this case refers to the level of difficulty associated with addressing each issue. For example, if effective and financed systems are in place for providing water for domestic use, then this may be assigned a 'low' challenge level, even though this issue would likely be classified as high priority / importance in most countries. 'Low', 'Medium' and 'High' are intentionally broad and intuitive categories.

[	r			
	Level of difficulty associated with addressing the challenge			
Water resource challenges		Medium	High	Not relevant
Water uses			•	•
Water for agriculture			$\boxtimes$	
Water for domestic use		$\boxtimes$		
Water for industry		$\square$		
Water for energy			$\boxtimes$	
Water for ecosystems/environment			$\boxtimes$	
Water for growing cities		$\square$		
Threats to the resource			-	
Water scarcity / over-abstraction (surface)	$\square$			
Water scarcity / over-abstraction (groundwater)		$\square$		
Water quality / pollution (surface)		$\square$		
Water quality / pollution (groundwater)	$\square$			
Water-related ecosystem degradation			$\square$	
Water-related ecosystem loss		$\boxtimes$		
Threats to people and economic activity				
Floods				
Droughts			$\square$	
Coastal vulnerability				
Conflicts over water resources	$\square$			

### Annex E: 6.5.1 country reporting process form

A common query received after the baseline data collection period was on the reporting process and which stakeholders were involved in reporting.

To improve transparency and increase confidence in results, you are invited to provide a brief overview of the reporting process. e.g. main actors involved; meetings/workshops held; other means of gathering inputs from stakeholders; and finalisation/approval processes. Also note the main challenges/strengths of the process. Use as much space as needed.

Focal Point affiliation			
Brief process overview:			

	Level of eng	agement (mark w	vith 'X')		
Stakeholder groups	<b>Low</b> (given opportunity to contribute)	Medium (some input)	High (discussion/ negotiation)	(e.g. which stakeholder organisations were involved)	
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					
Other SDG focal points				(e.g. FPs from other indicators)	
Please add rows if required					