

30-31 MAY 2023

## BENEFITS OF COORDINATION OF THE REPORTING ON INDICATOR 6.5.2 BETWEEN RIPARIAN COUNTRIES

Mr. Aurélien Dumont, Groundwater Section, UNESCO Mr. Alistair Rieu-Clarke, UNECE expert, Northumbria University

Workshop on Strengthening Legal and Institutional Arrangements for Transboundary Water Cooperation and Data and Information Exchange Beirut, Lebanon, 30-31 May 2023







## Why coordinating the replies?

**6.5.2 coordination** between countries sharing the same transboundary river(s), lake(s) or aquifer(s) has several **benefits**:



Help countries reach a common understanding on basic data or the need to address gaps



Improve the overall quality of 6.5.2 data



Evaluate cooperation and its outcomes within a river basin or aquifer, jointly reviewing Section II of the report and using it as a checklist

- allow countries to reach a common understanding of the challenges, opportunities and priorities
- provide an opportunity for countries to set common targets



## NOTE!

The SDG indicator 6.5.2 asks countries to report at national level. While coordination is useful and should be encouraged, countries may ultimately have different views on their transboundary waters and may therefore submit different data and information.



## Why the focus on coordination now?

- Good examples of co-ordination between countries exist from the 2017 and 2020 data drives
- However, in other cases it has been difficult to provide basin level analysis on 6.5.2 due to gaps and discrepancies in the national reports.
- These discrepancies arise due to the use of different data sources or calculation methods.
- The hidden nature of aquifers adds complexity and the identification, delineation and/or recognition of their transboundary nature can vary greatly.



INITIATIVE FOR SDG 6

RATED MONITORING SDG IND

# Common discrepancies include: > countries not listing the same rivers, lakes or aquifers as shared > countries not listing the same arrangement(s), and

countries not agreeing whether or not the four criteria for operationality have been met.



## THE SWEDISH EXPERIENCE

Preparation of the Sweden's 2nd national report was coordinated by the Swedish Agency for Marine and Water Management (SAMWM).

#### **Coordination steps:**

- completion of the draft questionnaire by a working group at SAMWM
- consultative meetings held online with neighboring countries (Norway and Finland)
- consultations with administrative boards of counties with transboundary waters on section II
- consultations with the Finnish- Swedish transboundary river commission on section II



UNECE



Unesco

П

п

п

## How can countries coordinate: a checklist

#### National 6.5.2 focal point / coordinator

- o exchange draft reports with neighboring countries sharing transboundary waters
- o consult past reports of neighboring countries sharing transboundary waters<sup>2</sup>
- o report on the coordinated actions undertaken in the national report



### Secretariat or Country representative of an RBO or joint mechanism, including bilateral commissions

- identify next meeting of RBO or similar where to include 6.5.2 reporting as an agenda item, or convene a dedicated meeting
- o review section II of the reporting template for your basin and liaise with countries



#### Member of a National Geological Survey with information

 enquire about the proper integration of transboundary aquifers in the national reporting, especially when technical projects between countries to characterize transboundary aquifers took place



 based on mandate, promote co-ordination amongst countries, particularly where RBOs or similar do not exist, by running workshops or other events on 6.5.2





## What data and information should coordination focus on?

Basic questions to consider are the following:

- Are the same transboundary river and lakes basins and aquifers listed by all countries sharing them?
- Are the same arrangements for transboundary water cooperation listed?
- Are national reports consistently reporting on whether a river, lake or aquifer is covered by an operational arrangement? Do all relevant national reports agree on whether
  - a joint body has been established?
  - data and information is exchanged annually?
  - meetings take place annually?
  - joint or coordinated management plans or a similar instrument is in place?



## TRANSBOUNDARY AQUIFERS: A SPECIAL CASE

- Require special attention often more complex than river and lake basins to evaluate
- Lack of recognition of their transboundary nature by countries adds further complexity
- Necessary to involve specific knowledge - through geological surveys or encourage RBOs to better integrate groundwater and aquifers into their work

Global databases can be a useful source of data – see IGRAC and UNESCO-IHP's Transboundary Aquifers of the World map (https://ggis.un-igrac.org).

Notable aquifer-specific cooperative arrangements were partially reported:
North Western Sahara Aquifer System (Algeria, Libya, Tunisia)
Nubian Sandstone Aquifer System (Chad, Egypt, Libya, Sudan)
Al-Disi/Saq-Ram Aquifer (Jordan, Saudi Arabia)







## NOTE!

National reports also provide an opportunity for countries to include joint statements on the status of cooperation, express their common views on achievements and challenges, or highlight any differences in opinion. These statements can be added in the free text boxes of specific questions, in the Additional information of Section I, or in Section IV.



## Helpdesk



#### **UNECE:**

transboundary water cooperation reporting@un.org

#### **UNESCO:**



transboundary water cooperation reporting@unesco.org

#### Webpages on reporting – Indicator 6.5.2









**INITIATIVE FOR SDG 6** 





**INTEGRATED MONITORING SDG INDICATOR 6.5.2** 

TRANSBOUNDARY WATER COOPERATION



#### Beirut, Lebanon, 30-31 May 2023