

FINAL REPORT

EVALUATION OF WATERLEX

KRISTEN LEWIS AND ROBERTO LENTON

NOVEMBER 16, 2016

Final Report
Evaluation of WaterLex
Kristen Lewis and Roberto Lenton¹
November 16, 2016

1. Executive Summary

This report is an evaluation of WaterLex activities for the period 2013-2016. The evaluation aimed to assess the relevance of WaterLex programs and the effectiveness of its approach in achieving its mission. More specifically, the evaluation sought to determine:

- the degree to which the organization met its targets and objectives;
- the extent to which the organization’s objectives responded to the actual needs of stakeholders;
- the degree to which its work supports national work on water governance-related legal and policy frameworks as well as the Sustainable Development Goals; and
- the extent to which actual programmatic activities and outputs are consistent with the overall mission of the organization.

Key findings included the following:

WaterLex occupies a unique niche. Overall, the evaluation found that WaterLex has carved out an important area of work, both in terms of substantive focus and approach, which constitutes a clear niche in which it has a comparative advantage over other players in the field. WaterLex brings to bear unique legal and policy expertise in its specific niche area of realizing the human right to water and sanitation and has recognized and articulated how the Human Rights to Water and Sanitation (HRWS) provides a useful framework to advance the WASH objectives 6.1 and 6.2 of SDG 6. The core elements of economic, social and cultural rights—accessibility, availability, quality, affordability, acceptability, non-discrimination, access to information, participation, accountability, and sustainability—and the primary obligation of the state to respect, protect and fulfil the HRWS within its jurisdiction and to develop a national plan to progressively achieve the full realization of the HRWS, are the key elements of this framework and help unpack virtually every aspect of the first two objectives of SDG 6.

WaterLex has achieved significant, high-quality outputs. Over the last three years, and despite having a very small budget and staff and undergoing a transition in management, WaterLex has achieved significant outputs in the area of human rights-based approaches to water governance. The training materials, reports, database, research, and other outputs it has produced are considerable. Partners and beneficiaries of WaterLex speak positively of their experience of working with WaterLex, particularly of the substantive expertise, work ethic, and dedication of staff. Overall, its outputs and impacts are more than could reasonably have been expected at this relatively early stage of development.

¹ See Annex 1 for brief biographies of both authors

WaterLex has developed strong brand recognition. One significant accomplishment is that WaterLex has become an internationally recognized NGO, sought after by partners for its advice. WaterLex has made a name for itself as an organization that assists stakeholders as a facilitator and translator, and a trusted partner of other agencies working in the WASH area that are doing a lot to help implement the HRWS without necessarily articulating their work in these terms. This is important because the concept of the Human Right to Water and Sanitation can sometimes create tensions between the development and Human Rights communities.

The evaluation suggests that WaterLex should do the following moving forward:

Focus on a narrower range of activities. For the next few years, we would strongly advise WaterLex to hew narrowly to questions of the legal and policy aspects of the HRWS and to focus its research and attention on its work with parliamentarians, NHRIs, countries seeking to adapt their laws and policies to the HRWS and SDGs 6.1/6.2, and development banks.

Legal Database The WaterLex legal database is a valuable project that fits squarely within the area of WaterLex comparative advantage: legal and policy aspects of the HRWS.

SDG6 Implementation Plans Country mapping and the development of action plans is a valuable contribution to the development of national-level laws and policies that support HRWS realization. We would encourage WaterLex to continue work in this area, using the tested country mapping methodology.

Support to Parliamentarians Changing laws and policies is the work of parliamentarians, and building their commitment, capacity, and expertise in the area of HRWS is among the most effective approaches that WaterLex can pursue.

Support to NHRIs Providing training and capacity building to National Human Rights and facilitating links between them and their government counterparts are strategic, valuable areas of intervention for WaterLex.

Business and Human Rights

WaterLex is to be commended for seeking to engage with the private sector, an area of work that is clearly relevant to WaterLex's mission and to the realization of the HRWS.

Development Partners. Development banks and their internal policies and practices have enormous impact, for good and for ill, on governance in developing countries. Ensuring that the policies and practices of International Financial Institutions (IFIs) support HRWS and their staff have full understanding of key issues is strategic and important.

HRBA to IWRM & wastewater research

WaterLex should focus on the aspects of IWRM that deal with the overall governance of the resource, which is vital for the realization of the HRWS and thus the attainment of

SDG 6.1 and 6.2. We would caution against intensive WaterLex involvement in IWRM issues that lie beyond the human right to water and sanitation as the field of actors with legal and policy expertise in IWRM topics like transboundary waters is crowded.

Update and consolidate web presence and branded materials. WaterLex is eager to update and consolidate its web presence, including its main website, the NHRI platform, and the legal database. We would advise that WaterLex seek to raise funds to take on these tasks all at once, as part of an integrated strategy, and to hire a single vendor responsible for developing a strong visual language and clear, consistent, simple messaging and building a new platform where all these functions could live.

Improve communication with key partners.

Our interviews suggest that WaterLex should take steps to improve responsiveness and better manage communications with key partners. The staff changes of the past year created understandable challenges in this regard. Nonetheless, goodwill, effectiveness, and sustainability depend upon key partners, donors in particular, but implementing partners, as well, receiving regular, reliable, high-quality reporting as stipulated in contracts and formal agreements as well as prompt responses to ad-hoc queries. One concrete recommendation, one that already is planned, is that the new Development Director create and implement a system for tracking and meeting formal donor reporting commitments, maintain regular contact with and provide updates to current and potential partners, and ensure timely responses to ad-hoc requests.

Foster strategic partnerships.

Having completed its first five years, it will be important for WaterLex to consider the appropriate structure of WaterLex going forward. At present, its small size is potentially a serious limiting factor, and it may simply be too small to ensure long-term financial stability and sustainability as well as being efficient and effective. Taking into account its growing partnerships with larger organizations working in the WASH space like WaterAid, UNICEF and WSSCC, WaterLex should explore a partnership with other like-minded organizations, networks or systems that might enable WaterLex to retain its independent identity and expertise while at the same time providing a more sustainable vehicle for WaterLex's work.

Another potential area of strengthened partnership relates to the work of the Special Rapporteur on Water and Sanitation (SR), which is very complementary to that of WaterLex and where closer ties, perhaps formalized, could benefit both parties. WaterLex staff have noted that the work of WaterLex has benefited from its association with the Special Rapporteur. Moreover, WaterLex is in a good position to support the SR, to help strengthen the SR's access to technical information and backstopping and to create something tangible from the SR's country missions. Supporting the SR represents a huge win-win opportunity to make the SR's work more effective and to confer legitimacy on WaterLex.

Prioritize financial stability.

To prevent the recurrence of financial management challenges, WaterLex should develop a clear long-term financial sustainability plan that includes narrowing WaterLex's scope, making tough

choices to eliminate initiatives or activities that are not central, and bolstering fundraising and development, with a focus on multichannel, long-term funding rather than short-term contracts, diversifying funders and developing new relationships with longer term funders. One key element of any financial sustainability plan for WaterLex is core support; project funding is important but without core support WaterLex cannot have the continuity it needs. To secure such core support, however, WaterLex will need to continue to demonstrate that it is an excellent and cost effective investment by donors.

2. Brief Description of WaterLex

WaterLex was founded as a Swiss non-governmental organization (NGO) in 2010, following the recognition of the Human Right to Water and Sanitation (HRWS) by the UN General Assembly in that year. The organization initially focused narrowly on making comparative legal information available to governments regarding how different countries had implemented the HRWS in their national contexts and developing practical tools and resources to help implement the HRWS on the ground. Subsequently, the organization came to believe that the “human right to water could not be realized without a sustainable water resources management at river basin level,” and the organization thus broadened its scope to encompass water governance. Today, WaterLex’s work is seen increasingly within a larger water governance and integrated water resources management (IWRM) frame. Nonetheless, the organization’s clear niche within this larger frame is its unique legal expertise around the HRWS, and it is this expertise for which WaterLex is most valued by stakeholders.

As now conceived of and described on the WaterLex website, the organization’s mission is **“to create sustainable solutions based on human rights to improve water governance worldwide.”**

Its core areas of work are to:

- Review water law and policy frameworks for human rights compliance and sustainability.
- Assist parliamentarians and governments with law and policy advice.
- Through multi-stakeholder dialogues, and with a focus on Sustainable Development Goal 6, empower parliamentarians, civil society, development practitioners and industry to improve legal compliance and positive impact on the human right to water and sanitation.
- Champion sustainable water governance on the global agenda.
- Use its expertise in water governance laws and policy, and build on its status as a neutral and independent body for advising law makers, to improve water governance.

In service of these aims, WaterLex undertakes the following activities:

- It performs legal research and inclusive water governance mappings as the foundation of projects and programs.
- It uses this research to create tools and training materials for knowledge-sharing for water governance stakeholders.
- It leverages its specialized methodologies, its research, and its status with governmental institutions to support the development of new legal and policy frameworks and the strengthening of law enforcement and compliance at national level.

The structure of the organization is a small core team based at the Geneva office, which is located in the World Meteorological Organization building, home to several UN agencies, including UN Water, and near the Palais des Nations building; the Board; an expert pool; and the membership.

The core team is comprised of twelve people, made up of eight permanent staff members, many of whom are currently working on reduced, 70 percent schedules, consultants (some of whom are former staff members), volunteers, some of whom will transition to permanent staff when funding is available, and interns.

The Board, which meets three or four times a year, oversees both the administration and the program of WaterLex. The Board sets policy and provides oversight and control, but does not make executive decisions. Decisions must be taken by the executive, i.e. the Director General. The Board appoints the Director General, but all other personnel decisions are taken by the Director General.

The expert pool is a practical human resources mechanism designed to supply as-needed expertise in support of WaterLex work. The pool brings together some former staff as well as experts from all around the world who have the expertise and willingness to take on short-term assignments related to water law/policy reforms, capacity building, etc. This group has been pre-vetted, they have signed confidentiality agreements, and there are MOUs in place with them; they are the first port of call for WaterLex core staff when looking to bring on additional expertise for short-term projects.

WaterLex has 93 members; the organization was originally formed as a membership association. The membership meets annually at the General Assembly meeting, at which the Director General presents an annual report and a few projects. The General Assembly approves the budget after it has been reviewed and approved by the Board. The membership provides a pool of expertise to which WaterLex can refer about specific topics. It includes human rights specialists known and respected worldwide, including several former and current UN and Regional Treaty Body experts and UN Human Rights Council mandate holders, as well as organizations like Cap-Net and UN Water. More regular interaction takes place with a subset of the membership who make up the scientific committee, valued for their intellectual contributions and the credibility they afford WaterLex.

WaterLex has pro bono support from a UK law firm, White & Case, that compiles information and research for their water law data base, and this support is coordinated by Thomson Reuters Trust Law. In addition, WaterLex works with a Swiss-based law firm, Eversheds, a firm that deals with contractual issues for WaterLex on a pro bono basis. This latter firm managed the contracts-related matters associated with the personnel turnover process of last year and helped to develop contracts for the members of the expert pool. WaterLex outsources accounting to PricewaterhouseCoopers in Geneva.

3. Evaluation Purpose

Overall, this evaluation aimed to assess the relevance of the WaterLex programs and the effectiveness of its approach in achieving its mission. More specifically, the evaluation:

- Assessed the degree to which the targets and objectives set out in the LogFrame for the 2013-2016 period were achieved.
- Assessed whether and to what degree these WaterLex targets and objectives responded to the actual needs of stakeholders seeking to create an enabling environment for improved water governance;
- Sought to ascertain the extent to which WaterLex's work aligns with current water governance-related legal and policy frameworks at the national level and responds to current strategic global and regional water governance-related developments, in particular the new global sustainable development agenda as presented in the Sustainable Development Goals.
- Sought to determine the extent to which actual programmatic activities and outputs remain consistent with the overall mission of the organization, as well as with the intended impact and effects.

The evaluation focused on activities and objectives related to WaterLex's first four strategic objectives:

- Shaping and promoting consistent water law and policy frameworks that support effective water governance and human rights.
- Supporting stakeholders' efforts to improve water governance for the realization of human rights through integrated water governance assessments, capacity building, and the development of implementation tools.
- Capacity building, including establishing a stabilized International Secretariat staff and increased Geneva office presence.
- Coordinating multi-area expert pools and maintaining expertise through adequate information and talent managements systems.

In keeping with the TOR, the evaluation focused on the first four strategic objectives of WaterLex, comprising both the core activities (strategic objectives 1 and 2), and those related to WaterLex's internal structure (strategic objectives 3 and 4). The evaluation method and approach we employed differed between these two categories, as described below. In both cases, the evaluation aimed to contribute to the development of WaterLex's new strategy and provide recommendations for improvement.

The evaluation relied chiefly on a desk review of key WaterLex documents, including core documents (such as donor agreements and the logframe), project documents, and training materials; the development of questionnaires for different types of informants; the use of these

questionnaires during targeted interviews with relevant people at key institutions; data analysis and description; development of findings; and preparation and presentation of a final report.

Method and Approach for Evaluation of Core Activities

Overall, we assessed the relevance of the focus and implementation of WaterLex programs and the effectiveness of its approach, with specific attention to evaluating the achievement of the indicators, targets and objectives outlined in the LogFrame for the period 2013-16. The evaluation assessed whether WaterLex's Strategic objectives are responding to the priorities and needs of key stakeholders, the extent to which its work aligns with current water governance-related legal and policy frameworks at various levels, and the extent to which activities and outputs are consistent with the overall mission.

The key components of the proposed evaluation approach and method were the desk review, the development and use of questionnaires, targeted interviews with relevant persons/institutions, and development of findings.

- Interviews were conducted with the WaterLex staff and Board members, implementing partners, and beneficiaries listed in Annex 2
- The questionnaires were tailored to the particular stakeholders to be interviewed and were used to guide discussions and interviews. The actual questionnaires used to guide the evaluation interviews are attached as Annex 3 and 4; they are in English and Spanish, respectively.
- The Desk Review entailed an extensive review of all the documents shared by WaterLex, including both the core documents and project documents and reports, training tools, etc., as listed in Annex 5. We also brought to bear our own personal judgment, knowledge and experience to provide insights to WaterLex.

In keeping with the TOR, in assessing the extent to which WaterLex's current focus and programming is effectively contributing to WaterLex overall strategic goal and to the current logframe, the evaluation paid particular attention to the following six criteria: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and replication/innovation/scaling up.

While the TOR make a reference to assessing "both the outcome and output levels," we would caution that it is unlikely that WaterLex's activities have led to any real long-term outcomes at this stage, since they were initiated only recently. For this reason, we focused principally on the activities that were carried out to date and the outputs that these activities produced, rather than their long-term outcomes. This also means that our comments on questions of impact and sustainability are somewhat tentative, based primarily on our own judgment and the opinions of those we interviewed.

In carrying out our desk review and conducting interviews and in developing our findings, we addressed the six identified criteria as follows:

Relevance

In this area, we focused on assessing the extent to which the core activities and objectives of WaterLex met the priorities and needs of key stakeholders in creating an enabling environment for improved water governance at various levels. The desk review of core documents and the interviews were the principal element in assessing the relevance of activities/outputs and how these support efforts by stakeholders to improve water governance and human rights. In developing our findings, we used our knowledge of water governance and our experience and judgment as appropriate to assess broader questions on the extent to which activities might be relevant to other countries or regions, and whether WaterLex's overall strategic objectives and impact pathways will remain relevant going forwards. We also used our judgment and experience to develop recommendations on ways to further enhance the relevance of WaterLex's core activities

Effectiveness

In this area, we focused on assessing the extent to which WaterLex core activities attained their objectives. The desk review of core documents and the interviews were the principal element in assessing the extent to which the objective and outputs laid out in the logframe have been attained by WaterLex. The interviews with partners were designed to help us assess some of the 'how' questions, such as how the design and implementation of programs, including training modules, is strengthening the capacities of various actors and increasing their knowledge to develop/adjust laws and policies for improved water governance, or how the legal database has served as a knowledge hub. We used our judgment and experience to develop some recommendations on ways to improve effectiveness.

Efficiency

In this area, we focused on assessing the achieved outputs in relation to inputs. The desk review of core documents and the interviews were the principal element in assessing the extent to which objectives and outputs (not outcomes) were achieved on time and were allocated resources sufficient to achieve the results, and whether WaterLex has been able to achieve synergies among its different programs. In developing our findings, we used our knowledge of water governance and our experience and judgment as appropriate to assess how WaterLex's input/output cost ratio compares to those of other institutions, to assess whether WaterLex could improve its programming to achieve more synergies and whether it has adopted the most efficient processes to achieve the desired outputs, and to develop recommendations and suggestions on ways to improve the use of resources and/or the efficiency of its operations.

Impact

In this area, we focused on assessing what are likely to be the positive and negative changes produced by WaterLex's core activities, both directly and indirect, intended and unintended. Since the activities covered in this review were initiated recently, it is unlikely that they have led to any real long-term impacts and outcomes at this stage. For this reason, our comments in this area are based primarily on our own judgment and the opinions of those we interviewed. To elicit the latter, we asked beneficiaries to give us examples of ways in which WaterLex programs have contributed to an enhanced capacity or to shaping and promoting water law and policy

frameworks that support effective water governance and human rights, and also asked them for suggestions on ways in which WaterLex could improve its impact. At the development of findings stage, we used our knowledge of the water sector and the SDGs as well as our experience and judgment as appropriate to assess whether there are additional impact domains to be considered, including in relation to the SDGs, and to make suggestions and recommendations on ways in which WaterLex could improve the impacts of its operations.

Sustainability

In this area, we assessed the environmental and financial sustainability of WaterLex's activities. In carrying out our desk review and in our interviews with beneficiaries, we asked whether they are prepared to continue the activities delivered by WaterLex and what they believe to be the likelihood that results will continue after programs end. In our interviews with staff, we endeavored to ascertain to what extent staff organized their interactions with beneficiaries to ensure ownership. And in developing our findings, we used our judgment and experience to identify ways in which challenges to sustainability can be overcome and the sustainability of programs enhanced.

Innovation, replication and scaling up

In this area, we focused on assessing the innovative qualities and added value of WaterLex, and the extent to which its activities could be scaled up and/or replicated elsewhere. In carrying out our desk review and in our interviews with beneficiaries, we endeavored to identify the innovations created and promoted by WaterLex and their characteristics, and also ask for ideas and suggestions on ways in which activities could be further replicated or scaled-up.

Method and Approach for Evaluation of WaterLex's internal structure

The focus here was on determining the extent to which WaterLex has succeeded in i) stabilizing its International Secretariat staff and increasing its Geneva office presence (Strategic objective n°3); and ii) ensuring dynamic coordination by WaterLex International Secretariat with multi-area expert pools and maintaining expertise through adequate information and talent management systems (Strategic objective n°4). In assessing the extent to which strategic objectives 3 and 4 have been achieved, we employed the following methods:

- Consultant visit to Geneva
- Interviews with key staff and Board members, and review of Board meeting minutes
- Review of core WaterLex documents
- Use of our knowledge of the internal structure of other like-minded organizations at an equivalent stage of development, coupled with our experience and judgment as appropriate

Approach to Stakeholder Involvement

As outlined in the TOR, we conducted the evaluation in a participatory way. To allow for meaningful involvement by project partners and beneficiaries in all stages of the evaluation (design and planning; information collection; development of findings; evaluation reporting; and results dissemination), we provided a verbal summary of our evaluation approach to all the individuals to be interviewed. Subject to approval by WaterLex, we would propose that WaterLex

take responsibility for sharing the final report with all findings and results with stakeholders as appropriate.

4. Findings

This section has two parts. The first part focuses on the findings on core activities that resulted from the document review; from our interactions and interviews with the WaterLex staff and board; and from our interviews with donors, partners, and beneficiaries. It is informed by our general knowledge of the international architecture for water governance, human rights-based approaches to water governance and development more broadly, and the reasonable expectations for progress for an organization that is fewer than six years old.

In the second part of the findings section, we explore questions of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and replication with regard to WaterLex as a whole, answering, in essence, two questions: is WaterLex doing the right things, and is it doing the right things well, in the areas of human rights-based approaches to water governance. Here we also present our findings relating to WaterLex's internal structure, including the extent to which WaterLex has succeeded in establishing a stabilized International Secretariat staff and increased Geneva office presence, and in ensuring coordination with expert pools and maintaining expertise through adequate information and talent managements systems.

A. Findings on Core activities

This section reviews the core activities of WaterLex: the legal database; SDG implementation plans; HRBA to IWRM; support to parliamentarians; support to national human rights institutions; and support to development partners.

Legal Database

The Water Lex Legal Database project is a searchable, partly crowd-sourced database on various legal and policy aspects of the HRWS from 120 countries around the world. The database, built from scratch by a consultant, is populated by legal research generated primarily by WaterLex staff and supplemented by submissions to the database from users; these submissions are vetted by a scientific committee made up of WaterLex desk officers and legal experts from eleven leading academic institutions from around the world. Academic researchers on water, sanitation and hygiene, integrated water resources management practitioners, those concerned with water security, lawyers and law firms working on specific cases, and those involved with law and policy design are regular users of the database. Users both use the database in their own work and contribute to it by sending WaterLex information on new laws and policy changes from their country or area of expertise.

The database is poised to expand significantly. WaterLex's pro bono law firm partner, White & Case, has been engaging in a long-term legal research effort for WaterLex, and the results of this research will soon be added to the database; further White & Case research is expected in the future, as well.

Relevance: This project is highly relevant to those engaged with water sector reform and water law development or revision, either in relation to the HRWS or to implementation of SDG 6.1 and 6.2. No other database like this one, which focuses so directly on the HRWS, exists. The database is a valuable resource for the sector as a whole, including PhD candidates, professors, researchers, policy-makers, and practitioners. WaterLex staff use it themselves in their training, research, consultations, and publications.

Effectiveness: This project has met its objectives of establishing a database, sourcing data via a combination of crowd sourcing and collaboration amongst partners, and releasing briefs on important legal aspects of HRWS and water governance; the quality of this work is excellent.

The database, whose chief interface is presented as a world map, is well-designed, intuitive, and easy to use. The user can either click on a region and then a country within that region to access legal documents pertinent to that place, such as a national law on water and environment, or an international treaty to which that country is signatory, such as the Convention on the Rights of the Child, or they can use a key word search bar to search by country, region, type of law, or human rights topic, such as non-discrimination, indigenous issues, or access to information. Accompanying the database on the section of the WaterLex site dedicated to it are research papers on topics like international case law on the HRWS, or national human rights institutions. The database is extremely intuitive and sensibly designed, suitable for the needs and technical capabilities of a wide range of users. Many databases fall short by creating too-complicated user interfaces; this is not the case with the straightforward WaterLex interface.

Efficiency: The pro bono law firm support coupled with the in-kind contributions of database users (Geneva Water Hub and International academic centers, the broader water expert communities like UNESCO IHE and IWA, PhD candidates and other researchers) to source its research is a low-cost, efficient way to keep the database current. WaterLex estimates that the Case & White pro bono support has a value of 50,000 Euro per country included in the database. Databases always require a not-insignificant commitment of time by the staff who manage it to keep it up-to-date and relevant; they can never be self-maintaining, and without maintenance, they become irrelevant in a few years. Core staff attention to this, supplemented by the assistance of other users and White & Case, is a practical way to manage the database and worth the time investment. Creating an accompanying financial management scheme has not yet occurred.

Impact: It is difficult to assess the impact of the database at this time as it is fairly new. Tracking use through citations and web hits might provide more information on impact, as would a survey of users. At present, WaterLex is not able to assess the degree to which practitioners are using it, although that section of the WaterLex website receives a few hundred uses annually, which represents a fairly robust use of the site, especially given the limited number of people around the world who would have need for this sort of very specific information.

Sustainability: One aim of the project was to create for it some kind of financial management

scheme. This has not yet occurred. However, the system of crowd sourcing, oversight by the scientific committee, and management by WaterLex is not an extremely costly endeavor. The sustainability could be enhanced in various ways, such as partnering with other rights or water organizations to jointly host this and other databases, or exploring the feasibility of networks of law schools or large organizations paying a fee, or “dues” of some kind, to support what is, in essence, a public good.

Replicability: The project’s concept and design framework are inherently replicable; the taxonomy and user interface allow for the addition of new countries and new laws. The website was originally built to present the information it currently contains, and flexibility to add new countries and laws was not built in; thus it is not feasible to add new countries to the existing platform. Building a new back-end with expansion capabilities would not be a complicated task for a coder or a prohibitively expensive undertaking, however, especially since the design of the user interface could remain as-is with a few tweaks. The database is a one-of-a-kind resource, and thus, by definition, innovative. Scaling it up would be possible once the back-end gets a technical upgrading to allow for more information to be added.

SDG Implementation Plans—Country mapping in Uganda

The year-long Uganda research project was conducted as a baseline study of the existing legal and policy frameworks and the degree to which the HRWS is being implemented and monitored in Uganda. Using the WaterLex Mapping tool/approach first pioneered in Benin and working in close cooperation with the Uganda Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), SIWI, and local partners, such as the National Association of Women’s Action in Development (NAWAD) and the local office of WaterAid, project staff and partners worked to identify gaps in the legal framework as well as the degree to which the legal framework, key sector policy frameworks, and implementation and monitoring strategies align with the existing human rights commitments of the government with respect to HRWS.

More specifically, project implementers identified gaps in the legal and policy framework through a structural analysis; gaps in planning and implementation of public policies through a process analysis; and gaps in monitoring of public policies through an outcome analysis. Steps included extensive desk reviews of the legal and policy frameworks; stakeholder mapping undertaken at the levels of law and policy-making, planning, implementation and monitoring; and evidence collected through field studies in five sample districts – Kisoro, Nakapiripirit, Lira, Kamuli, and Amuru. These districts were selected through both random and purposeful sampling, using an agreed protocol defined and approved by the Project Steering Committee that was established and chaired by the Uganda Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE). Research findings were shared in a national stakeholder workshop during which an action plan for targeting the current unserved and underserved population of Uganda was defined to support the government’s efforts for securing universal access to safe water and sanitation.

The work resulted in a high-quality, comprehensive report that was presented at a workshop of approximately 60 people, including state and non-state Ugandan actors, development partners, representatives from the districts that were part of the project, and NGOs. Donors, partners, and

other stakeholders praised the report, and, according to a local partner, members of parliament in Uganda asked for and use the report.

Relevance: Countries around the world are faced with the challenge of aligning their national legal and policy frameworks to ensure that they respect, promote and realize the HRWS and abstain from rights violations as well as revising laws to facilitate the implementation of SDG 6.1 and 6.2. National water ministries and other responsible bodies tend to lack the expertise required to address human rights issues, and NHRIs seldom have sufficient knowledge on the HRWS, despite having a human rights mandate. CSOs may be strong in technical matters, or in advocacy, rights-promotion, and mobilization, but they, too, rarely have legal expertise in the area of human rights generally and human rights to water and sanitation particularly. In addition, the relationships between governments and NHRIs, between governments and civil society advocates, and even in some cases among civil society organizations, can be contentious and marked by distrust. WaterLex has carefully cultivated a reputation as neutral, honest broker of knowledge and expertise in a very specific area, legal and policy frameworks related to the HRWS. There is both a need for their service and a willingness on the part of governments to work with them specifically – something that is required if WaterLex is to operate in many countries. The WaterLex approach of bringing together NHRIs, government, academia, and other water sector actors addressed not just a need to build capacity at many levels, but also created a shared understanding of the law and a shared demand for and commitment to legal reform—steps that are critical for collective action.

Effectiveness: The WaterLex approach in Uganda was effective in many ways. First, they established a project team anchored and chaired by the water ministry; this gave the project legitimacy and cultivated a sense of ownership. There was good buy in from the government after they established this Ministry-led team. Second, WaterLex acted as a partner with government, rather than taking a more confrontation stance and challenging the government to change. WaterLex positioned itself as a group of technical experts with the capacity to highlight a country's international commitments and help them meet those commitments through a programmatic approach rather than an activist/advocacy perspective. In many countries, avoiding taking a confrontational approach, striving to act as a constructive, practical technical partner, and providing concrete recommendations about how to improve laws and policies to meet human rights obligations adds value and increases effectiveness. Third, the expertise of WaterLex was widely acknowledged and respected.

The project experienced some challenges, as complex, multi-actor projects often do. One was difficulties in ensuring that local partners fulfilled their commitments and responsibilities for the project; this problem was addressed by a consultant working on the project expanding her role and taking more of a lead in coordination and providing links to the government. When many actors are involved, having one on-the-ground person to push things forward and act as a champion and cheerleader for the effort is important. Cultural differences created some conflicting expectations. The fact that a chief partner was selected by donors for the project was also somewhat problematic, since the two organizations did not have a strong existing relationship, no funds were allocated for collaboration, and the partner was understandably

under pressure to deliver on, and thus prioritize, its own fully-funded projects for which it would be held accountable. Nonetheless, through persistence, professionalism, and hard work, the WaterLex staff member got things on track in a way that greatly impressed other informants. Informants were concerned that dealing with internal WaterLex issues at the same time as managing complex field realities had been difficult for the WaterLex staff member, though the staff member worked at a high level throughout.

Efficiency: Delays due to staff changes and challenges related to coordination of the partners on the ground extended the duration of the project, which in turn created financial challenges; running short on funds was a problem. Even had the project run according to plan from start to finish, however, the ambition of the initiative outstripped the resources available to do it.

Replicability: The methodology WaterLex has developed for country mapping is replicable to other countries without a doubt. The steps taken, from selecting partners and developing a relationship with the government to doing the multi-level gap analyses used in in Uganda, can all be transferred to most other developing country contexts provided the government is willing. However, it will never be an easy, out-of-box process. Making the case for the human rights framework and related legal issues can be a challenge; there is a need to deconstruct and simplify it. Nondiscrimination was not a barrier in this instance as Uganda is quite progressive in terms of gender inequality in their water legislation, but this and other human rights principles can be less acceptable to other governments. Turning legal and normative frameworks into concrete, actionable steps can be challenging in any context, as can making the case for how and why taking a human rights approach is different from and better than other approaches, such as aiming for universal coverage. In some country contexts, finding civil society actors that are viewed as acceptable, trustworthy partners to the government will be more challenging than in Uganda, as will getting organizations on the ground to work together. Joining NHRI institutions with water sector professional can be difficult; they “speak different languages” and it’s hard to get them out of their boxes.

None of this means that WaterLex should not work in this area: it should. But it is important to be realistic about the time and financial resources required for this process.

Impact: The country mapping process is a necessary but not sufficient step in revising/reforming the legal and policy framework for water governance and the realization of the HRWS. After countries understand the baseline situation and have identified gaps in the legal, regulatory, and monitoring frameworks (the status after the country mapping), they then need practical help in addressing those gaps and reforming their laws and policies. To create this kind of impact (which WaterLex staff clearly want to do), they must have the resources to extend their country presence and support to assist in the implementation of the action plans they create as part of the mapping process. In addition, to the degree possible, they must be ready to act in response to windows of opportunity. For instance, at present, Uganda is working to review and amend the Water Act. The report and plan WaterLex and its partners created is being used in this process, and numerous stakeholders have asked for it and found it useful. Having a WaterLex person still in Uganda to present the findings, explain how to use them and what they mean,

drive the process forward, and work with parliamentarian partners on the nitty-gritty of legal revision of the Water Act would help take the project over the finish line into the realm of real impact; there is a need for follow-up assistance right now, and any such effort would likely have a significant impact. This is a question of resources. Another easier-to-implement way to further impact is to adapt the reports and other materials to the needs and preferences of different potential users. The Uganda report is quite long, understandably given the wealth of material covered and the thoroughness of the research. Supplementing the main document with short, policy-oriented, practical briefs that are explicitly geared to policy-makers would be a useful practice to adopt for all reports aimed at policy change and legal reform.

HRBA to IWRM & wastewater research

The chief activity here was the elaboration of the “Human Rights Based Approach to Integrated Water Resources Management” manual and the Wastewater Regulation E-Book. This section focuses chiefly on the former. This manual, written by UNDP CAP-Net, REDICA, the Water Governance Facility, and WaterLex, introduces human rights and IWRM to the reader, progressively integrating them into a single approach that has been dubbed a ‘human rights-based approach (HRBA) to integrated water resources management’ or, in short, an ‘HRBA to IWRM’.

Relevance: The context of this work is that the way in which water resources are allocated is deeply problematic. Water resources allocation for a range of productive purposes, from agriculture to industry to ecosystem services, is typically inequitable; powerless groups tend to be shut out not just of access to water resources but also of the processes whereby allocation decisions are made. Although integrated water resources management is ostensibly guided by a balanced concern for economic efficiency, environmental sustainability, and social equity, in practice, the social equity goal is often given less priority when water allocation decisions are made. There is growing consensus that a human rights based approach offers a way to ensure that the social equity aspect of water resources management receives greater priority. However, challenges remain. Stakeholders have divergent views about how best to bring equity, and water resources management policy-makers and practitioners, lawyers specializing in national and international water law, and international civil servants charged with ensuring that all their programs take a human rights-based approach have different perspectives on the utility of the human rights-based approach and speak different “languages.” A manual that focuses on why, how, and under what circumstances the human rights-based approach can help in the development of practical ways to allocate water is thus highly relevant.

In terms of the e-book on Wastewater treatment, wastewater treatment is an important and, for too long, overlooked aspect of IWRM more broadly; drinking water supplies as well as ecological quality are both at risk when, as happens around the world, waste is released directly into rivers, lakes, and seas. A compendium of best practices in law, policy, and regulations is a useful contribution to the field.

The larger question, though, is how relevant is this work to the specific *raison d’être* of WaterLex, namely supporting the realization of something quite specific, the HRWS, in a very specific way,

namely through legal and policy reform. There are many actors working in the space of transboundary and water basin management laws and policies and a comparatively robust international architecture for dealing with this matter. The more specific issue of laws and policies to support the implementation of the HRWS, on the other hand, has many fewer actors, and in this small pool, WaterLex stands out as the leader of high-quality expertise.

To be sure, when conducting a national assessment of the legal and policy framework for the realization of the HRWS, WaterLex must include the full landscape of water law in that country as well as other laws that could have an impact on the HRWS. WaterLex needs to be able to articulate why, within the larger IWRM context, governments need to set aside water for domestic use, properly articulate the law in this regard, set up regulatory, monitoring, and accountability systems around water quality and access, and make sure other aspects of water law and national policy don't adversely affect the HRWS. In addition, to engage credibly and effectively with partners in the larger international architecture for water governance, such as UN Water and the Global Water Partnership, WaterLex requires technical and scientific capacity in the area of water resources more broadly.

Effectiveness: The HRBA to IWRM manual is well written and reflects the expertise of a highly qualified group of partners. It has not yet been designed and printed, so seeing how it is being used and whether partners find it useful is not yet possible. The wastewater manual, which was launched at Water Week in August 2015, is well designed and written and quite practical in its approach. We don't have enough information to say how it is being used, however.

Efficiency: The process to produce this HRBA to IWRM manual, which was some three years in the making and has not yet been released in a printed version, encountered many obstacles. The smooth functioning of this project was impacted significantly by the personnel changes within WaterLex and by different understandings and standards on the part of various partners. There were disagreements about the prominence of the right to drinking water within the overall HRBA to IWRM context among the partners, and unhappiness with the quality of inputs at different points. Communications difficulties were also an issue amongst partners, leading to delay and frustration.

Impact: It is too soon to make any assessments about impact with regard to either manual.

Sustainability: For the HRBA to IWRM manual, sustainability was in question during the production process. Insufficient resources were allocated for this, particularly given the intense level of cooperation required, and there were periods when the project was in danger of not being completed. Now that the report is nearing the finish line, however, sustainability is no longer an issue.

Replication: Producing training manuals is a common, time-honored way to deliver technical assistance. It is important to note, however, that manuals can't make change on their own; they are most effective when used as one of many tools within a systematic, demand-driven capacity-building effort.

Parliamentarians

Partnerships with parliamentary assemblies have been a major area of work. WaterLex has focused on training groups of parliamentarians on water rights principles and sustainable water governance, making presentations during Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) gatherings on national challenges and opportunities in relation to water governance for parliamentarians, publishing a compilation of best legal practices and model laws related to water, and providing technical expertise with regard to the drafting of IPU decisions related to the HRWS. WaterLex has provided training to groups of parliamentarians through parliamentarian associations in Africa and Europe as well as through IPU. WaterLex has also supported the IPU Committee on Middle East questions with technical expertise related to water governance.

Relevance: It is difficult to imagine a more strategic or highly relevant target group for WaterLex activities than parliamentarians in general and the IPU in particular. Parliamentarians make laws and policies, so supporting them to undertaken legal and policy reform in support of HRWS and good water governance more broadly is highly strategic.

Effectiveness: By all accounts, the IPU partnership has been extremely effective. Two examples are illustrative. First, IPU and WaterLex collaborated in 2015 in order to facilitate the drafting and the adoption of the resolution “Shaping a new system of water governance: promoting parliamentarian’s action on water” (which was then adopted during the 132th Assembly in Hanoi). Second, more recently, WaterLex worked to facilitate an IPU water roundtable on the Middle East, which involved facilitating a first round table and drafting a follow-up plan of action to be presented to the Middle East Committee. At least one interviewee noted that WaterLex involvement had created a constructive environment for discussing water in the Israel/Palestine context, something that larger, better resourced organizations had failed to do.

In general, WaterLex support to regional processes is as important as the end result. They have built a relationship with IPU over time, and that was facilitated by the fact that WaterLex is not a political NGO leading with passionate advocacy. They come at the issue from the dispassionate legal angle, which is a more palatable entry point. Through this careful relationship-building, WaterLex has developed an action plan for the Middle East Region with the IPU, thus laying the ground work for years.

Efficiency: Working with groups of parliamentarians by region as well as with the IPU allows WaterLex to maximize the resources of its small team by taking a “wholesale” approach to parliamentarian capacity building, rather than a strictly “retail” approach that would require fielding missions to individual parliaments and parliamentarians around the world. Work at this upstream level by targeting a strategic group like the IPU potentially has an enormous multiplier effect.

Sustainability: This project enjoys strong support by IPU, and the groundwork for a longer-term partnership has been established through the action plan and the positive working relationship established thus far, factors that auger well for long-term sustainability. The need for WaterLex

services in this area will only increase as more countries grapple with the implications of their commitments to SDG 6.1 and 6.2 for national water law and policy.

Replicable/Scale-up. This structure is in place for this project to be scaled up through more trainings, more technical assistance around specific issues, and greater interaction and cooperation generally. Intervening with upstream groups is an approach that should be sought in other projects.

National Human Rights Institutions (NHRIs)

The National Human Rights Institutions Initiative for Good Water Governance is designed to build the capacity and strengthen the role of national human rights institutions (NHRIs) in advancing, promoting, and protecting the human rights to water and sanitation and monitoring water governance. It set out to create a network of NHRIs that can exchange experiences and best practices with each other; and support and build the capacity of NHRIs to strengthen their role in ensuring a human rights based approach to water governance through training.

NHRIs are independent public bodies that protect and promote human rights, including monitoring. They contribute to the realization of rights by reviewing legislation, policy, budgets and programs to ensure they are consistent with the HRWS and related rights; investigating complaints by right holders and ensuring adequate redress; undertaking field investigations; reporting to the national parliament; and participating in UN human rights-accountability mechanisms. Despite their mandate and potential to serve an important role in the realization of the HRWS, however, in general these institutions have limited understanding of what the HRWS demands of the state and grants to rights-holders. They are typically not well acquainted with water issues or water law.

The program supports community creation initiative, including side events, a publication on good practice, and a password-protected online platform for the use of the 28 NHRIs that are members of the network. This platform provides news, resources, updates, and tools, and allows for interaction. It was created at the end of 2015 and launched at the beginning of 2016.

It also supports training programs for NHRIs, typically held as 2-day regional training sessions for a group of organizations, which cover the following topics:

- The international legal framework for human rights based water governance;
- The instruments and tools available to NHRIs for monitoring the right to water and sanitation;
- International case law about water and sanitation and how to use it as a tool of monitoring;
- Collaboration between NHRIs and other actors, such as civil society groups, in relation to the right to water and sanitation;
- The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) in relation to human rights and SDG 6 on water; and
- Human Rights and Business.

In addition, regionally-specific topics are added as needed.

Importantly, all training materials are available online, including PowerPoint presentations from training sessions, a compilation of good practices, and a comprehensive training manual on NHRI's role in achieving rights-based water governance, the latter prepared in collaboration with the Danish Institute for Human Rights, a key partner in this project.

Relevance: The work on strengthening the capacity of NHRIs on water governance for the realization of Human Rights is clearly relevant, given the fact that most NHRIs in Africa, Latin America and Asia could play an important role in advancing and protecting the HRWS but do not at present have the knowledge base and competencies in human rights based water governance to do so effectively. The fact that this work attracted funding from multiple donors provides further evidence that work in this area is viewed as one in which WaterLex has a clear comparative advantage.

One of the first NHRI activities was a side event at the formal ICC meeting in Geneva in 2014, during which WaterLex offered a training for national institutions; about 30 people attended. The following year, their similar side event had 90 attendees, evidence that such training was perceived as important by partner institutions.

Effectiveness: In terms of training and capacity-building, in Central America and Mexico, WaterLex has been effective in achieving project results. Feedback received from the NHRI's in El Salvador and Mexico was highly positive. In our view, WaterLex's effectiveness was largely because WaterLex responded to clear local needs and laid the ground effectively through previous contacts prior to running the training in 2014. In El Salvador, for example, WaterLex had organized in May 2013 in partnership with a regional NGO coalition, a workshop to sensitize development stakeholders and authorities on issues related to the implementation of the right to water, during which the National Commission for Human Rights of El Salvador discussed their interest in training to enhance their skills on the right to water and the monitoring of its implementation. Likewise, in Mexico, the National Commission for Human Rights had invited WaterLex FAN Mexico to a workshop in October 2013 to better understand the challenges related to the theme. Trainings in Malaysia and Uganda were likewise well-received. The training materials, particularly the training manual, are thorough and accessible.

WaterLex has implemented this project with a core group of partners, including the Danish and South African NHRIs and the Hungarian Ombudsman for Future Generations. Having NHRI colleagues support the project is key, as other NHRIs find it extremely useful to talk to other similarly placed institutions and to establish working relationships with their counterparts in other countries.

In terms of the online platform, it is difficult to access its effectiveness. On the one hand, it is well designed and populated with a wealth of useful and relevant information. On the other, it has been used less frequently than one might hope by NHRIs. Setting up a virtual platform for

sharing of experiences is a strategy employed by many organizations. While it often seems like a good idea, especially in the case of far-flung networks with members seldom able to meet face-to-face, this approach often proves less effective than anticipated. A rewarding and inspiring regional meeting, during which participants shared experiences and ideas, is frequently the catalyst for the creation of such a platform; people want the positive interactions to continue. Yet the dynamics of face-to-face interaction seldom transfer well to an online virtual meeting space; in the end, many of these platforms are not heavily trafficked.

The content and layout of this particular platform is very good, and in a sense has a more modern look than the main website. Opening up the NHRI site to the outside world and merging it with the regular WaterLex site might be worth looking into; a list of all the NHRI members and their contact information could still be available to members only via a password-protected portal, allowing for those who wanted to exchange ideas to do so directly. This is a matter to be part of the larger discussion on updating all of the outward-facing websites of WaterLex—the main website, this website, and the legal database.

Efficiency: WaterLex was able to be efficient in its interventions because the work in each distinct country was part of a global program with common activities (preparation of training materials for NHRIs, providing training to NHRIs, establishing a community of practice of NHRIs on water governance and linking the NHRIs in the region to this larger community). Training sessions were held on a regional basis, which had the benefit not only of bringing people together to learn from one another but also eliminating the need of country visits to dozens of countries. This enabled WaterLex to achieve economies of scale, while tailoring the materials to the needs of each region.

Impact: Our interviews with the NHRI in El Salvador suggest that WaterLex was able to contribute to achieving a larger impact because it recognized the opportunity to make a difference in the region and worked with the right partners. In particular, it found an opportunity to engage not only with the NHRI in El Salvador but also the network of NHRIs with which they work in the region, and in so doing plugged into and helped strengthen an existing network of NHRIs.

Since the collaboration with WaterLex was a part of a larger set of efforts in the region rather than a separate activity, it is hard to distinguish WaterLex's achievements and impacts from the achievements of the network and the many national and regional actors engaged in it. WaterLex's work was an input to the network, not the sole cause of the impacts.

The SDGs provide a special and helpful entry point for the work of the NHRIs, a development likely to increase their impact. WaterLex could support NHRIs from both Mexico and Indonesia to play a facilitating role in national water reform process using the helpful SDG framing, and they are interested in doing so; they would play a complementary specialized training role.

Sustainability: Given the strong degree of local ownership of the activities and the mutually reinforcing nature of the network of NHRIs in the region, the work is likely to be sustainable in the long-term without further inputs from WaterLex. However, in the short-term there may be discontinuities; for example, in El Salvador the Government has recently changed the entire NHRI

team, which will inevitably result in some loss of momentum. The online platform is unlikely on its own to provide sufficiently strong “glue” to hold the network together; “push” communications like regular newsletters will be more effective than putting content on the site and waiting for users to go there.

Replication, Innovation, Scaling up: The strong degree of local ownership and the mutually reinforcing nature of the NHRI network suggests that prospects for replication and scaling up are good.

Business and Human Rights

Based on our discussions with Board members and staff, we confirm that WaterLex is actively seeking to engage with the private sector. It has done research and developed training materials; however, aside from that, its main activity in this area thus far is its work in training of water operators.

Relevance: WaterLex is to be commended for beginning to engage with the private sector. The impact outcome 2.3 “Increased business compliance with human rights for good water stewardship (Business Unit)”, is clearly relevant to WaterLex’s mission, given that the water delivery private sector has a direct role in ensuring the HRWS, and the water-using private sector, e.g. the food and beverage industry, can sometimes directly threaten the HRWS of local communities.

Effectiveness: To be effective in the area of business and human rights, it is important to have a clear strategy that differentiates work with businesses that provide water services to people (e.g. water operators), and work with businesses that use water (e.g. the hotel industry), since the needs and the tools to address such needs are vastly different.

At present, WaterLex is focusing on businesses that provide water services to people -- water operators. However, it has been exploring potential activities relating to the hotel industry.

Efficiency: Training for water operators doesn’t seem to be the most strategic use of scarce WaterLex staff resources. Perhaps a training that took place at something like an international water operators conference, where hundreds of people might be in attendance, might allow for a “wholesale” approach to training. Similarly, if such training can be offered by a local partner using WaterLex materials or embedded into other initiatives, it would be worthwhile.

Impact, Sustainability, Replication, Scaling up: Since this work is at the very early stages, it is not possible to comment on the potential for impact, sustainability, replication and scaling up.

Innovation: Work in this area would seem to lend itself to very innovative approaches, but that has not been evident in the materials that we have examined to date.

Development Partners

WaterLex's initial work with development partners was the WaterLex Toolkit, which focused on integrating the HRWS in programming. The toolkit became the basis for WaterLex's work with the African Development Bank on a project that involved a desk review of AfDB internal policy, programming, and monitoring documents, including the draft water policy, the checklist for program development, and various sorts of guidelines as well as training sessions in Abidjan and Nairobi with AfDB Water and Sanitation Department (OWAS) task managers during the summer of 2016.

Relevance: WaterLex's work with the African Development Bank on "Aligning the Human Right to Water and Sanitation and SDG Implementation and Monitoring Frameworks in Africa," and in particular its work to help build capacity of the staff of the AfDB Water and Sanitation Department (OWAS) on HRWS, is highly relevant to the mission of WaterLex, given the hugely important role of AfDB in assisting countries in Africa to realize the HRWS of its people. The fact that WaterLex was invited to carry out this project with the AfDB speaks to its relevance and represents a recognition of WaterLex's mission and the potential value added it could bring to the AfDB. While AfDB and other development banks are generally reluctant to view their work in human rights terms, the realization of the HRWS is built into AfDB's work on WASH as well as in its overall safeguard policies.

Effectiveness: WaterLex's work with AfDB was productive and generated the agreed project outputs – developing recommendations to enhance AfDB Water Policy, reviewing sample AfDB programming documents, and training of AfDB staff in support of HRWS/SD Implementation in Africa.

Feedback from one of the AfDB OWAS staff who participated in the training program suggests that the training was useful in terms of 'sensitizing' staff to issues relating to the HRWS, though in the view of this staff member it would be difficult to make changes in their approach to the sector given the sensitive nature of human rights in the region in which AfDB works without a similar effort to sensitize their counterpart staff and relevant policymakers in the government agencies of borrower countries. We understand that this issue was discussed with AfDB, to identify ways in which HR principles and norms could be integrated in program design at the country level even when the HR language was not outrightly welcome. We also understand that WaterLex has since submitted a concept note for a follow-up project for country-level support that would involve capacity building for counterpart staff as well as establishing baselines and country mapping.

Our examination of the project documents suggests that the project outputs, in particular the comprehensive 67-page document, "A Toolkit for Aligning Programming, Monitoring and Evaluation with the Human Right to Water and Sanitation (HRWS) Framework Including Training Report" submitted to AfDB in September of this year, are relevant and useful. The toolkit and its detailed analysis of the core elements of ESCR and the primary obligations of the state to progressively achieve the full realization of the HRWS provides a good basis for the applied work with which AfDB staff are engaged and represents a clear value added by WaterLex to AfDB. As

with the IPU partnership, linking up with a large organization whose programmatic and policy reach is significant is a strategic way to build capacity for HRWS policy-making.

Efficiency: WaterLex has been able to carry out this project efficiently because the responsible staff member has prior experience with the AfDB and was able to understand its needs and develop a program that met these needs. If the work were to be extended to other development banks, it would likely require a significantly greater investment of staff time and effort.

Impact and Sustainability: As noted above, we understand that WaterLex has submitted a concept note for a follow-up project for country-level support that would involve establishing baselines and country mapping as well as capacity building for counterpart staff, which would directly contribute to enhancing the potential impact and sustainability of the project within AfDB and the countries in which it works. Unfortunately, however, we have been unable to speak to a senior policy-level member of the AfDB staff to ascertain their views of the proposed new collaboration.

Innovation: The work with development partners would seem to provide opportunities for innovation, which don't seem to have been fully realized in this initial project. The work with AfDB seems somewhat similar to the work it has carried out with other partners, and doesn't fully capitalize on the accountability/recourse features of large development banks².

In particular, the materials examined by the evaluators did not directly make a reference to AfDB's safeguard policies nor to its recourse mechanisms, although we understand that the issue was raised by the participants in the training program in Nairobi. For example, the box with examples of relevant AfDB provisions on non-discrimination makes no reference to AfDB's "environmental, climate and social safeguards," which are highly relevant to vulnerable groups and includes a section on "vulnerable groups and indigenous peoples." And the section on accountability doesn't make a reference to the AfDB's Comprehensive Review and Mediation Unit (CRMU) and the Independent Review Mechanism (IRM), which enable people who believe that their HRWS have been affected by a project financed by the AfDB to seek recourse.

An issue that wasn't directly addressed in the project materials but which we understand was extensively discussed during the training sessions is the possible impacts of large projects in sectors other than water on the HRWS³. This is an important concern given that projects in some of the AfDB's priority areas such as energy, transport, food, and industrialization could potentially have an impact on the HRWS of communities affected by such projects.

Replication, Scaling up: The work with AfDB is described in the project document as a "pilot" and clearly has the potential to be replicated and/or expanded, both within AfDB and with other

² We note that, as a general rule, there may be a tradeoff between innovation and efficiency in the short-term, in that efforts to innovate may require more time and effort in the initial stages, leading to lower efficiency in the short-term. though hopefully higher efficiencies in the medium and long-term..

³ We understand that, during the discussions at the training sessions, WaterLex staff gave guidance on how to avoid negative HR impacts through strengthened contract negotiations and other measures.

development banks. Project activities with AfDB beyond the pilot phase were contemplated in the Terms of Reference of the original agreement between AfDB and WaterLex, and as noted above, WaterLex has now submitted a concept note for a follow-up project with AfDB for country-level support.⁴ WaterLex is also currently exploring collaborative activities with the Asian Development Bank. If the AfDB work were to be replicated with AsDB and/or other development banks, it would likely require a significantly greater investment of staff time and effort as noted earlier.

B. Findings about WaterLex itself

This section of our findings focuses on WaterLex itself. It is based on our review of documents and interviews with the WaterLex staff and board and its donors and partners and our knowledge of water governance, HRWS and other water institutions at a similar stage of development.

The first part of this section focuses on the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, sustainability, and replication of the programs of WaterLex, essentially answering two questions – is WaterLex doing the right things, and is it doing the right things well. The second part focuses on the internal structure of WaterLex, with particular attention to the Secretariat and strategic goals 3 and 4.

Findings about WaterLex programs

Is WaterLex doing the right things? WaterLex's niche

In our view, WaterLex has carved out an important area of work, both in terms of substantive focus and approach, which constitutes a clear niche in which it has a comparative advantage over other players in the field. WaterLex is a unique player in its specific niche area of realizing the human right to water and sanitation. This is where WaterLex are the experts. WaterLex has been most effective when it has focused narrowly on this niche.

Specifically, WaterLex has recognized and articulated how the Human Rights to Water and Sanitation (HRWS) provides a useful framework to advance the WASH objectives 6.1 and 6.2 of SDG 6. The core elements of economic, social and cultural rights -- accessibility, availability, quality, affordability, acceptability, non-discrimination, access to information, participation, accountability, and sustainability – and the primary obligation of the state to respect, protect and fulfil the HRWS within its jurisdiction and to develop a national plan to progressively achieve the full realization of the HRWS, are the key elements of this framework and help unpack virtually every aspect of the first two objectives of SDG 6. Importantly, Governments and other actors often lack an understanding of the added value of taking a human rights approach and of how to apply the HR principles in practice.

⁴ Unfortunately, we have been unable to speak to a senior AfDB staff member to discuss the potential scaling up of the project within AfDB.

In this context, the unique niche for WaterLex has been to identify water governance reform opportunities based on this HR approach. However, rather than working in a purely legalistic way, Water Lex has adopted a very practical, facilitating approach, working with partners in a common effort to achieve the WASH goals rather than challenging them as advocates, being seen not as a human rights organization per se but rather as a technical group that highlights a country's international commitments and helps them meet those commitments, and using a programmatic approach rather than an activist/advocacy perspective. In countries where the national context requires it, WaterLex staff are careful not to talk about the HRWS outright, and to use terms like "inclusion" rather than "universality", to seek common ground and present topics in ways that are palatable, avoiding taking a confrontational approach, and striving to be seen as a constructive, practical technical partner. In countries where human rights language is accepted, WaterLex uses it. This flexible approach is pragmatic and effective.

An important and relatively new element of this niche is the SDGs, which really help provide a common goal for the work of WaterLex and its partners. The SDG process has been enormously useful to WaterLex, and permits its objectives to be described simply in terms of the WASH objectives of SDGs 6.1 and 6.2 instead of "realizing the HRWS". Indeed, the biggest opportunities for WaterLex in the coming years revolve around the SDGs for WASH, which has created more willingness and desire from partners to have WaterLex's help and a greater appreciation of where WaterLex can contribute.

While strongly endorsing WaterLex's area of expertise and comparative advantage and recognizing the need for WaterLex to address broader water governance as a means to eventually contribute to securing the HRWS, we have two caveats.

The first is that the focus on water governance should not necessarily translate into a focus on "sustainable water resources management at river basin level." While a water basin provides a framework from which water resource supply can be managed, the "river basin" is only one kind of water basin; in some contexts, the aquifer or the lake basin may be the more appropriate unit of analysis. More importantly, decisions on water governance are more often taken at administrative levels, such as a state or province (which in federal systems usually have responsibility for water management), rather than a water basin. From this perspective, outcome 2.2 in the WaterLex logframe, which seeks to ensure that "stakeholders in twelve major river basins understand and know how to implement Human Rights-based Water Governance" doesn't seem useful or relevant.

The second caveat is that, while WaterLex has a clear niche, it has engaged in some activities that lie well outside this niche. While the bulk of its work is in areas of clear relevance and comparative advantage (the legal database support, Parliamentarian dialogue, NHRI Initiative, Development Banks), some other activities, such as those related to the larger questions of IWRM, don't strike us as focusing centrally on areas of comparative advantage.

Is WaterLex doing the right things well?

Over the last three years, and despite having a very small budget and staff and facing severe challenges in the International Secretariat (see below), WaterLex has undoubtedly been able to achieve significant outputs in the area of human rights-based approaches to water governance. The training materials and other outputs it has produced are considerable. And partners and beneficiaries of WaterLex speak positively of their experience of working with WaterLex, particularly of the substantive expertise, work ethic, and dedication of staff. Overall, its outputs and impacts are more than could reasonably have been expected at this relatively early stage of development.

One significant accomplishment is that WaterLex has become an internationally recognized NGO, sought after by partners for its advice. WaterLex has brought a human rights perspective to water governance; and the toolkit practical work has been recognized and is respected, especially in Latin America and Africa. WaterLex has been able to attract prominent authorities in the field to its Board. And it has been able to generate trust with important partner organizations, which clearly see in their relationship with WaterLex an opportunity to learn and integrate this learning into their own strategies.

In our view, there are several reasons why WaterLex has been able to be efficient and effective:

- WaterLex has made a name for itself as an organization that assists stakeholders as a facilitator and translator, and a trusted partner of other agencies working in the WASH area that are doing a lot to help implement the HRWS without necessarily articulating their work in these terms. This is important because the concept of the Human Right to Water and Sanitation can sometimes create tensions between the development and Human Rights communities.
- WaterLex has quite clearly stayed away from advocacy work and stressed instead the need for practitioner work -- to have an impact and make sure that the HRWS approach made a difference.
- WaterLex's efforts not to be strictly legal but instead to act as a bridge builder, to approach its work as an opportunity to facilitate the implementation of the Human Right to Water in a positive rather than a confrontational way.
- WaterLex's ECOSOC accreditation, which means they are registered and can be part of meetings and they are invited to participate as experts in official UN events.
- The expertise and international recognition of its Board members, many of whom are the leading experts in the field, and the 'door opening' role of the Board members (which for example enabled WaterLex to become a member of UN-Water).
- WaterLex's ability to remain agile and relatively focused, which enables them to be more tailored and focused and responsive to things on the ground.

Findings about WaterLex's internal structure

In our view, WaterLex has largely succeeded in achieving its strategic objectives 3 and 4, relating to its International Secretariat. In the analysis below, we address each of these two objectives, and discuss related issues of governance and financial sustainability.

Strategic Objective 3. WaterLex has stabilized International Secretariat staff and increased Geneva office presence⁵

In terms of strategic objective #3, the International Secretariat of WaterLex has clearly stabilized the staff. Everyone now is a permanent member of staff involved in strategy and project development, and funding is sufficient to cover staff salaries, albeit at 70 percent, through next year (keeping in mind also that WaterLex salaries are low by Geneva standards). WaterLex also brought in a personnel specialist to help staff move beyond the challenges of the tumultuous period of change. They have hired a development director, moved to a new, smaller office in a more strategic location, flattened the structure, eliminated director positions and did away with the three levels of staff they'd had before. Secretariat staff now includes, in addition to the Director General, a senior legal person, a junior legal person, a specialist in policy and governance with a WASH background and Africa experience/knowledge, a consultant with a similar background but with a Middle East focus, a specialist in Latin America with a strong legal base working on a voluntary basis, a water scientist with water governance, IWRM, and water quality expertise, a communications specialist, an administrative colleague who does administration and human resources, and a fundraising specialist. This team is complemented by, at present, two research interns.

Overall, the feeling among the staff appears to be one of optimism and relief. There is a nice esprit de corps – the organization is flat, staff meet every Tuesday, they discuss everything, they know what everyone is doing, etc. Staff have reported that, while before there was an unrealistically complicated hierarchy, now there is more transparency about decisions, priorities, the budget, etc. – they are realizing their right to information and participation!

In addition, administrative procedures and systems are said to be much improved. While we understand that earlier there were few processes in place for anything, there are now systems and processes. WaterLex hired PWC to do their accounting, and Eversheds law firm is helping them with all other personnel matters, such as agreements with the pool of experts, consultant contracts, internship contracts, volunteer arrangements, etc. The 2015 audit report identifies some problems, but apparently the 2014 audit was highly critical of the organization.

Compared to this time last year, Secretariat staff have informed us that they are much more focused and guided by sound project management. Staff say that the new Director General has

⁵ The sub-objectives in this area are:

- 3.1 WaterLex maintains an effective recruitment process to match the workforce to the organizational needs;
- 3.2 Motivating the existing workforce and inspiring long term commitment (employee engagement)

turned things around and helped them focus and get back on track. In addition, staff believe that WaterLex has regained the trust of its external partners and are known to be under new management and to have a refined focus.

Nevertheless, Secretariat staff are overworked, it is clear that they go beyond a 70 percent schedule despite being paid at that level, and they work without adequate support in such areas as administration, IT hardware and IT expertise. Overall, the Secretariat at present is overburdened and faces challenges in providing the proper administrative support, including for event planning. The small number of professional staff in the Secretariat need to attend to a significant number of administrative duties. At present, the Secretariat's small size in relation to its program activities is a serious limiting factor.

Importantly, most external respondents offered the highest praise with regard to the subject knowledge, technical expertise, dedication, work ethic, collaboration, and professionalism of WaterLex staff. Despite the organizational challenges and the upheaval that those challenges no doubt caused in the lives of the staff, they nonetheless maintained high standards and impressed their partners with their great ideas and high-quality work. Though administration faltered, the substance of the work did not. The staff deserve high praise for this impressive performance in difficult circumstances, which augurs well for what they will be able to achieve in a more stable and structured work environment.

Strategic Objective 4. WaterLex International Secretariat ensures dynamic coordination with multi area expert pools and maintains expertise through adequate information and talent management systems⁶

The issue of expert pools is particularly important to WaterLex since, as a result of the management problems alluded to earlier, they were reduced to a small team at the beginning of the year, and need to supplement their core expertise by bringing in experts as consultants and volunteers. WaterLex currently has many ex-staff on a consulting basis as well as experts from all around the world who have signed up for the expert pool. This expert pool, which has about 20 people in it, consists of those who have the expertise and willingness to take on short-term assignments related to water law/policy reforms, capacity building, etc. They are pre-vetted, have signed confidentiality agreements, there are MOUs in place with them, etc., and are the first to be called on projects that come in. All in all, the expert pool is a practical human resources mechanism.

⁶ The sub-objectives in this area are

- 4.1 WaterLex receives and efficiently processes requests from individuals who wish to contribute on a volunteer or consultant capacity to the work of the organization
- 4.2 WaterLex designs learning schemes to ensure that staff, volunteers and consultants meet the required skills and aptitudes to achieve their objectives
- 4.3 WaterLex uses a human resources information systems to improve the coordination with and among expert pools
- 4.4 WaterLex provides valuable internships through the assistance and support of WaterLex Management Team

WaterLex is also able to draw on the expertise of its membership; WaterLex has nearly 100 members, each of whom pay 50 Euros a year in membership fees. The members constitute a pool of high expertise to which WaterLex staff can refer about specific topics. This is the way in which WaterLex can stay cutting edge in this area. It's a highly qualified group of members, many of whom are recognized leaders internationally in the area of water law. At present, WaterLex has not tapped their expertise and realized the full potential of this group from a substantive or reputational point of view to the degree possible. One recent move is the more intense interaction with a subset of members by involving them in a scientific committee (see below), which just met in September. Members are useful for intellectual contribution, credibility, and consultation, and are also a good vehicle for writing new papers and new areas.

WaterLex has also been successful in obtaining pro bono support not only from a UK law firm that compiles their water law data base, but also from one in Geneva that deals with personnel issues for them. They managed the personnel processes of last year and helped to develop the expert pool. Accounting activities are outsourced to PricewaterhouseCoopers, though they are expensive.

In terms of strategic objective #4, their new office building location has indeed increased WaterLex contact and engagement with other key water sector actors, as hoped. UN water is on the first floor, and WMO and other water organizations are there, plus they are just across the street from the UN building. All this provides huge networking opportunities and constitutes a real advantage.

While all these developments are positive, WaterLex clearly needs a proper recruitment for water lawyers and policy experts. In addition, while WaterLex has been able to maintain expertise and expand its work through the use of volunteers and pro-bono legal assistance, and by ensuring coordination with expert pools, the use of unpaid staff raises questions about accountability and results.

The Role of the WaterLex Board and other governance bodies

Based on our review of the minutes of the Board meetings in the period 2014-16, we believe that the Board took appropriate steps to address the challenges that the organization faced in 2015. The meeting minutes suggest that in 2014, deliberations around management issues were quite perfunctory, but by 2016, they were much more substantive. In particular, the WaterLex Board took steps over the last two years to strengthen its oversight and policy-making role in response to the difficulties experienced by its International Secretariat. In particular, the Board has added several new members and also has taken steps to ensure that its members regularly attend its meetings. The Board now meets three or four times a year, and oversees both the administration and the program of WaterLex. The Board has a "control" function, but not a decision-making one – decisions must be taken by the executive, i.e. the Director General. The Board appoints the Director General but all other personnel decisions are taken by the Director General. The Board sets policy, oversees and controls but does not make executive decisions. Board terms are for four years and can be renewed.

Three other bodies perform important functions for WaterLex:

- The General Assembly (of all the members), which meets once a year, formally approves the budget (after it has been reviewed and approved by the Board), and formally appoints the members of the WaterLex Board on the recommendation from the Board.
- The Scientific Committee, which gives advice on new projects and programs
- The Donor Meetings, which take place twice a year and which 1-2 Board members also attend. It is mostly attended by the core funders, SIDA and SDC, although some of the smaller donors as well as former donors are invited and sometimes attend.

We note that the regional composition of WaterLex's board doesn't seem to represent the global nature of its mandate and programs across the world.

Financial sustainability

During the small period of time that WaterLex has been in existence, it has faced two major financial crises, resulting in each case in drastic reductions of staff and a host of related problems. While small NGOs often face financial challenges in their initial years, the extent and frequency of WaterLex's financial challenges is unusual. We attribute this to at least three factors: inadequate financial monitoring and control, insufficient fund-raising capacity, and an inability to say no to projects of marginal value and/or inadequately funded. The recent financial/management issues will be largely avoidable going forward if WaterLex narrows its scope, makes tough choices to eliminate activities that are not central to its mission, and bolsters fundraising and development.

WaterLex has now a professional fundraiser on their staff who has the skills to help the organization fundraise in a professional way. However, whether WaterLex is sufficiently established to be able to say no to trusted partners at this point is still a question. Also, WaterLex does too much work for free (i.e., work that is not project-supported but rather done with staff time supported by the core). For instance, WaterLex's work with CAPNET and on indigenous people was carried out free of charge. The logframe provides a good tool to enable WaterLex to say no and should be used in this way.

For financial sustainability in the middle and long-term, WaterLex clearly needs multichannel, long-term funding; WaterLex can't work with just small, short-term contracts. Overall, WaterLex needs a financial sustainability plan as part of the new strategy, to address the overall question of funding over the long term, taking into account that humanitarian crises are diverting the funding available to traditional donor sources. Such a strategy will need to include diversification of funders and the development of relationships with longer-term funders. We understand that WaterLex is moving forward along these lines and developing plans that include benchmarks and development coaching for program staff and that connect substantive activities with development opportunities.

Clearly, one of the reasons for WaterLex's financial crises is the small number of people, the large number of projects, and the fact that some of these projects lie outside of its niche areas of focus. So WaterLex will need to continue scoping properly and be more disciplined and intentional. It

will need to quell the desire to jump into big research projects – instead pause and ask: how many hours will this take over the next six months? How will costs be covered? Are our expectations of our partners supported by concrete commitments? The organization now needs to think of a more diversified, multi-stream funding model to achieve high level strategic impact. Based on feedback from staff and our analysis of WaterLex’s niche, one option would be to streamline and narrow WaterLex’s focus to just human rights, water law, the right to water and SDG 6.1 and 6.2 implementation.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

This section presents our overall conclusions and recommendations. It is divided into two parts, one focusing on each program area and the other focusing on the organization as a whole.

A. Recommendations for each program area

Legal Database

The legal database is a valuable project that fits squarely within the area of WaterLex comparative advantage: legal and policy aspects of the HRWS. It is a unique and uniquely important resource not only for WaterLex’s other activities, but also for the work of NHRIs, researchers, lawyers, advocates, and policy makers. Partnerships with other databases could increase the reach of the database and make more people aware of it. Networks of human rights lawyers and law firms, members of UN Water and CapNet, and other networks concerned with the HRWS might be willing to make annual contributions to the maintenance of this important resource in the form of dues.

SDG6 Implementation Plans (country mapping)

Country mapping is a valuable contribution to the development of national-level laws and policies that support HRWS realization. We would encourage WaterLex to continue work in this area, using the tested country mapping methodology. We would caution, however, that allocating sufficient resources for this task is necessary, particularly given the inherent complexities of this work. WaterLex should ensure that the expected contributions of partners, in time, money, and in-kind services, are hammered out and quite clear to all parties at the outset of the project. Having an in-country person to drive the process is critical. Another recommendation would be to ensure that a strategy and partnership plan is in place to roll out the report and build the capacity of institutions to use it; the report alone cannot make change. Lastly, WaterLex should produce, in addition to the comprehensive report, short, reader-friendly briefs that pull out quite clearly what different actors can and should do and summarize the key information different groups need to have.

Parliamentarians

This highly strategic area of work should lie at the core of the WaterLex strategy moving forward. Changing laws and policies is the work of parliamentarians, and intervening to build their commitment, capacity, and expertise in the area of HRWS is among the most effective approaches that WaterLex can take. Holding side events at meetings of the IPU, promoting the

parliamentarian help desk function, and integrating WaterLex training modules into the regular line-up of training offered by IPU are all ways to strengthen this important partnership.

NHRIs

NHRIs are key partners, and this area of work also strikes us as an important part of the WaterLex portfolio moving forward. Providing training and capacity building to these organizations and facilitating links between them and their government counterparts are valuable contributions WaterLex can make. With regard to the NHRI platform, WaterLex should survey its NHRI partners to find out what exactly they need and want from WaterLex in such a platform; learning from one another, coalition-building, and networking are important and necessary, but perhaps an online platform is not the best vehicle for this. Though they are costly, face-to-face gatherings are much more effective in creating bonds and networks. Once such networks are very strong, electronic linking mechanisms can play a more valuable role.

HRBA to IWRM & wastewater research

The human rights based approach to integrated water resources management might seem at first glance as though it would be in the WaterLex bailiwick, with its inclusion of the ideas of human rights and water. In examining this issue, we consider it important to distinguish between two separate though inter-related sets of IWRM-related issues:

- a) The aspects of IWRM at national, state, and local levels that focus on the overall governance of the resource, which is vital for the realization of the HRWS and thus the attainment of SDG 6.1 and 6.2. These aspects of IWRM are highly relevant to WaterLex's mission, which is why in the section on findings we strongly endorsed the need for WaterLex to address broader issues of water governance at local, state and national levels and to identify water governance reform issues as part of its work.
- b) The human rights based approach to IWRM, the implementation of which at all levels is embodied in SDG 6.5. As discussed in the section on findings, we believe that WaterLex's work with partners to produce a comprehensive manual on the subject is highly relevant, though we have questions on the relevance of this work to WaterLex's specific focus on SDGs 6.1 and 6.2.

Having IWRM knowledge on the staff is necessary for WaterLex's work on topic a), and will help WaterLex in engaging meaningfully with actors in the larger international water sector and in its work on country mapping of laws and policies, which must include the whole legal landscape. However, the field of actors with legal and policy expertise in the overall IWRM field is crowded, and directly addressing topic b), rather than partnering with others, may not be the most strategic area of intervention for WaterLex. In addition, the potential for engaging with unfunded UN-related IWRM processes is limitless; efforts should be made to limit engagement in this work to a small number of highly strategic and potentially remunerative partnerships.

In short, we would suggest that WaterLex concentrate on topic a) issues, at least in the coming one to two years, with the possibility of revisiting the larger topic b) issues in the future.

Business and Human Rights

WaterLex is to be commended for seeking to engage with the private sector, an area of work that is clearly relevant to WaterLex's mission. To be effective in this area, WaterLex should develop a clear strategy that (1) differentiates businesses that provide water services and businesses that use water, (2) articulates the ways in which each category of business activity impacts on the HRWS, (3) outlines the strategy that WaterLex will use to partner with each category of business to advance the realization of the HRWS, and (4) outlines the strategy to secure financing for such activities.

Development Partners

As is the case with the work with parliamentarians, work with development banks is among the most strategic areas of intervention for WaterLex. Development banks and their internal policies and practices have enormous impact, for good and for ill, on governance in developing countries. Ensuring that the policies and practices of International Financial Institutions (IFIs) support HRWS and their staff have full understanding of key issues is tremendously strategic and important.

WaterLex's work with AfDB would seem to suggest opportunities for engaging with some of the other international financial institutions, including the World Bank and the IFC as well as the other regional development banks. In doing so we would recommend working also at a more upstream level, taking into account that these institutions, while generally not using HR language in their documentations, have safeguard policies and accountability mechanisms that relate directly to the HR provisions relating to accountability and vulnerable groups. WaterLex's work with Parliamentarians is perhaps an example of work at this more "upstream" level.

WaterLex might enter into a dialogue with the accountability mechanisms of the IFIs to explore opportunities for collaboration. While the IFIs are generally reluctant to view their work in human rights terms, the realization of the HRWS is built into its safeguard policies, particularly relating to environmental assessment. The Compliance Advisor Ombudsman (CAO), the independent recourse mechanism for the International Finance Corporation (IFC), has particular experience in addressing complaints related to access to water and sanitation⁷.

Research and contribution to other processes related to HRWS

WaterLex staff are creative and imaginative; there is no shortage of ideas regarding important areas of research or willingness to pursue them. This blessing is also somewhat of a curse; it has been difficult for WaterLex to say no to projects. For the next couple of years, however, we would strongly advise WaterLex to hew narrowly to questions of the legal and policy aspects of the HRWS and to focus its research and attention on its work with parliamentarians, NHRIs, countries seeking to adapt their laws and policies to the HRWS and SDGs 6.1/6.2, and development banks.

⁷ See Advisory Note on Participatory Water Monitoring, available at <http://www.cao-ombudsman.org/howwework/advisor/documents/watermoneng.pdf>

Communication and Events

Our impression from our conversations with stakeholders is that WaterLex events are well organized and successful. We would suggest that events continue to be a core part of the WaterLex portfolio. Training is often something that needs to be done in person, and for networking and collaboration to really take hold, actors need the chance to interact in person and put faces and personalities to names. Event planning is a specialized skill and carrying out is time-consuming and requires great attention to detail. It is a poor use of the time of substantive experts and the Director General to take on this role, given the unique skills they have, and the same people who are good at legal research, capacity building, and the like, are not necessarily the same people who are good at logistics, travel arrangements, and the myriad details required to put on a successful event. Bringing on more capacity in this area would be very helpful.

One priority area for WaterLex is to develop a stronger, more straightforward description of its brand identity. When talking with WaterLex staff and its partners, what WaterLex does is clear. But this clarity is not always reflected in the architecture of its website, the coherence among the various web platforms, or in other public information materials. For instance, the first paragraph of the “what we do” section of the website is quite a mouthful, filled with jargon that regular people will not understand:

“The WaterLex Mission is **to create sustainable solutions based on human rights to improve water governance worldwide**. WaterLex reviews water law and policy frameworks for human rights compliance and sustainability. It assists parliamentarians and governments with law and policy advice. Through multi-stakeholder dialogues, and with a focus on Sustainable Development Goal 6, WaterLex empowers parliamentarians, civil society, development practitioners and industry to improve legal compliance and positive impact on the human right to water and sanitation. WaterLex ensures sustainable water governance is at the forefront of the global agenda.”

A simpler “elevator speech” would be helpful, as would a tagline. Something like “WaterLex works to make the human rights to water and sanitation a reality for people around the world” or “water rights for everyone, everywhere.” Not to say that those slogans are the best ones to use, but something clear and in plain language is required. “Shaping water law and policy frameworks” comes the closest, but even that sounds quite wonky. Maybe “making water laws work for people” or something that gets at the end result you are seeking. Water policies are not an end in themselves; they are a means to realizing people’s rights and giving them a better life. Slogans are more impactful when they highlight the end result (better lives!) rather than the way to get there (more robust, accountable, and participatory processes involving all stakeholders!).

We understand that WaterLex is aware of these shortcomings and eager to update and consolidate its web presence, including its main website, the NHRI platform, and the legal database. We would advise that WaterLex seek to raise funds to take on all these tasks at once, as part of an integrated strategy, and to hire a single vendor responsible for developing a strong

visual language and clear, consistent, simple messaging and building a new platform where all these functions could live.

WaterLex may wish to invest in a consultant with expertise in the development of training materials to help make some of the presentations more audience-friendly. Some presentations would benefit from a more polished aesthetic and many fewer words and ideas on the slides; some are simply too crowded and busy for audience members to be able to process. Ideally the designer responsible for the look and feel of the revamped web presence could also create PowerPoint templates and guidelines that everyone could use, thus creating a more coherent, polished presentation of WaterLex with key audiences.

As mentioned elsewhere, creating specialized documents for different audiences would be a good approach; this does not require new research, but rather new packaging for groups like policy-makers, journalists, donors, and others. Again, designing templates that “match” the website and training materials would help with the WaterLex brand identify and also save staff time and money designing one-off products.

B. Recommendations for the organization as a whole

Focus and niche

WaterLex is a unique player in its specific niche area of realizing the human right to water and sanitation. This is where WaterLex are the experts. WaterLex should focus narrowly on this niche, and not expand into areas like IWRM and transboundary waters, where there are many other players.

In its work in its niche areas, WaterLex should continue adopting the same approach that has been effective to date – acting as a practical bridge builder, approaching its work as an opportunity to facilitate the implementation of the Human Right to Water in a positive rather than a confrontational way, and striving to be an organization that assists stakeholders and facilitates their work. In doing so it must view itself as a partner of other agencies working in the WASH area that are doing a lot to help implement the HRWS without necessarily articulating its work in these terms.

However, WaterLex should sharply focus its work both thematically and geographically. Going forward, WaterLex should really focus on its niche areas, what it is best at. This will require streamlining, specializing and concentrating on legal and policy aspects and SDG processes – and not venturing into other areas where it does not have a comparative advantage. Specifically, WaterLex should concentrate on program areas that contribute to SDGs 6.1 and 6.2. It should not attempt to work in other areas of SDG 6, such as transboundary water law, where other organizations have a strong track record.

In addition, and taking into account that WaterLex’s current work is much dispersed geographically across a large number of countries, a sharper geographic concentration in a smaller number of priority countries would seem to improve both efficiency and effectiveness.

Secretariat and Governance

Our visit to the Geneva office suggests that, after suffering severe personnel losses and financial difficulties, the Secretariat has now been stabilized and is in a position to operate effectively. It will be important, however, to continue to pay attention to the Secretariat staff and staff morale, and to ensure that staff return to full salaries as soon as possible, otherwise staff morale will suffer.

While WaterLex has been able to expand its work through the use of volunteers and pro-bono legal assistance, the approach raises questions about accountability and results that require attention by the Secretariat and Board. To ensure accountability, project activities carried out through “individuals who wish to contribute on a volunteer or consultant capacity to the work of the organization” (specific objective 4.1) need to have a clear contractual basis that provides specifics on the individual’s accountability for results.

The Board and leadership should also pay close attention to the Secretariat staff, which as noted earlier are overburdened and facing challenges in providing the proper administrative support, including for event planning.

Based on our discussions with partners and Board members, a particular challenge for WaterLex is that the nature of its work requires staff that not only have legal and Human Rights expertise, but also a broader perspective and some governance expertise to be able to implement WaterLex’s practical approach. The need is to nurture the staff and to foster their multidisciplinary approach and ability to work outside their comfort zone, and to help them make the effort to adjust and listen. The work with IPU, with government delegations, can only be effective when staff listen to their view and understand where they are going and adjust to that. This requires a particular mix of skills that needs to be nurtured and encouraged and cannot be taken for granted.

Taking into account that the regional composition of the board doesn’t seem to represent the global nature of its mandate and programs across the world, WaterLex should consider seeking greater diversity in its governing bodies, which would help increase both credibility and effectiveness.

Communications and responsiveness

Our interviews suggest that WaterLex should take steps to improve responsiveness and better manage communications with key partners. The turmoil of staff changes created understandable challenges in this regard. Nonetheless, goodwill, effectiveness, and sustainability depend upon key partners, donors in particular, but implementing partners, as well, receiving regular, reliable, high-quality reporting as stipulated in contracts and formal agreements as well as prompt responses to ad-hoc queries. Even in times of uncertainty, responding to partners with necessary information in a timely fashion, meeting expectations regarding communications deadlines, and keeping partners apprised of delays or changes is important to the organization’s reputation and to the willingness of partners to continue working together.

One concrete recommendation, one that already is planned, is that the new Development Director create and implement a system for tracking and meeting formal donor reporting commitments, ensure the quality of such reporting as well as compliance with the terms of contracts with regard to required information, maintain regular contact with and provide updates to current and potential partners, and ensure timely responses to ad-hoc requests related to funding and partnership.

Another is that WaterLex implement a three-day response guideline, in which staff are responsible for responding to requests within three days, even if it is only to say that they will not be able to answer or respond until some specified future date. It might be useful to use off-the-shelf productivity tools like Boomerang. That particular program sends you messages within a specific time frame to remind you to follow up on key emails; it also allows to send yourself email reminders about important deadlines and commitments.

Institutional Development and Partnerships

Having completed its first five years, it will be important for WaterLex to consider the appropriate structure of WaterLex going forward. At present, its small size is potentially a serious limiting factor, and it may simply be too small to ensure long-term financial stability and sustainability as well as being efficient and effective.

Taking into account its growing partnerships with larger organizations working in the WASH space like WaterAid, UNICEF and WSSCC, WaterLex should explore a partnership with other like-minded organizations, networks or systems that might enable WaterLex to retain its independent identity and expertise while at the same time providing a more sustainable vehicle for WaterLex's work. Such an approach could potentially improve not only long-term financial sustainability but also effectiveness (because it would be able to make use of the organization's network of WASH actors) and efficiency (since financial and human resource matters and event management could be handled by the partner organization, leaving WaterLex staff to focus only on substance).

Another potential area of strengthened partnership relates to the work of the Special Rapporteur on Water and Sanitation (SR), which is very complementary to that of WaterLex and where closer ties, perhaps formalized, could benefit both parties. WaterLex staff have noted that the work of WaterLex has benefited from its association with the Special Rapporteur. Moreover, WaterLex is in a good position to support the SR, since the SR's access to technical information and backstopping is weak, and WaterLex could be very useful in creating something tangible from the SR's country missions. In principle, WaterLex's plans to support the new special rapporteur on WASH -- preparing a newsletter, preparing country missions, providing him technical expertise, etc. -- are promising and should be explored further, especially since the SR currently has only one supporting staff member. Supporting the SR represents a huge win-win opportunity to make the SR's work more effective and to confer legitimacy on WaterLex.

Financial Sustainability

To prevent the recurrence of financial management challenges, WaterLex should develop a clear long-term financial sustainability plan that includes narrowing WaterLex's scope, making tough choices to eliminate initiatives or activities that are not central, and bolstering fundraising and development, with a focus on multichannel, long-term funding rather than short-term contracts, diversifying funders and developing new relationships with longer term funders.

One key element of any financial sustainability plan for WaterLex is core support; project funding is important but without core support WaterLex cannot have the continuity it needs. To secure such core support, however, WaterLex will need to continue to demonstrate that it is an excellent and cost effective investment by donors.

Strategic recommendations about the future of WaterLex

Many if not most of the recommendations outlined above can be viewed as inputs to the new strategy that WaterLex is currently developing. In addition, in its new strategy, WaterLex has an opportunity to articulate its niche much more clearly. Specifically, this would include:

- Using the SDGs to provide a framework for the work of WaterLex, and adjusting its mission, vision and especially the signature and the long-term goals to connect/align specifically with SDGs 6.1 and 6.2.
- Being specific on what it means by "water governance" as a means to contribute to securing the HRWS, and clarifying that this does not necessarily translate into a focus on sustainable water resources management at river basin level.
- Making a clear conceptual differentiation between businesses that provide water services and businesses that use water as an input, and clarifying that both the needs and the tools to address these needs are vastly different.
- Capturing some of the complexities of the processes of social change inherent in WaterLex's mission, making sure that its project descriptions don't come across as mechanistic and stressing the political dimensions of the processes of social change it is trying to impact.

Annex 1: Brief biographies of Kristen Lewis and Roberto Lenton

Kristen Lewis is co-founder and Co-Director of Measure of America, which provides easy-to-use yet methodologically sound tools for understanding the distribution of well-being and opportunity in America and stimulating fact-based dialogue about health, education, and living standards. She is the co-author of two volumes of *The Measure of America* (Columbia University Press, 2008 and NYU Press, 2010) as well as well-being reports for California, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Marin and Sonoma Counties. Before founding Measure of America with co-director Sarah Burd-Sharps in 2007, Kristen was senior policy advisor to the water and sanitation task force of the UN Millennium Project, led by Jeffery Sachs, and was co-author of the task force report, *Health, Dignity and Development: What Will It Take?* (Earthscan, 2005). She previously worked at the United Nations for many years, first with UNIFEM and then as in UNDP's Energy and Environment Division with the organization's policy bureau, and has served as a consultant on gender equality issues for numerous international development organizations, including UNICEF and UNFPA. Kristen has undertaken several evaluations of global institutions and programs, including an evaluation of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Support to the UN Secretary-General's Advisory Board on Water and Sanitation.

Roberto Lenton is a specialist in water resources and sustainable development who earned a civil engineering degree from the University of Buenos Aires and a Ph.D. from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). He currently serves as Professor in the Biological Systems Engineering Department at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, where he focuses on global water and food security issues. Until August of this year, he was Founding Executive Director of the Robert B. Daugherty Water for Food Institute at the University of Nebraska. Roberto has served as chair of the Water Supply and Sanitation Collaborative Council and of the Technical Committee of the Global Water Partnership, Chair of the Inspection Panel of the World Bank, senior advisor at the Earth Institute at Columbia University, director of the Sustainable Energy and Environment Division of UNDP, director general of the International Water Management Institute in Sri Lanka, and program officer in the Rural Poverty and Resources program of the Ford Foundation in New Delhi and New York. He is a member of the Board of Directors of WaterAid America in New York and of the International Advisory Committee of the United Nations University Institute for Water, Environment and Health.

Kristen and Roberto have jointly served as evaluation consultants to the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA) for the thematic evaluation on "Capacity Building for Sustainable Development: The Contribution of Selected DESA Technical Cooperation"; co-authored Chapter 2, "Corruption and water resources management: threats to quality, equitable access and environmental sustainability" of the Transparency International Global Corruption Report 2008 (Corruption in the Water Sector); and worked with UNDP and GWP to explore the relationship between the Human Rights-Based Approach and IWRM, which involved the production of a scoping paper and the facilitation of a workshop on rights-based approaches and the sustainable management of water at Dundee University.

Annex 2: List of People Interviewed

WaterLex Staff

1. Amanda Loeffen, MBA, B.Sc., Director General
2. Sharon Wallis, Administrative and HR Office
3. Lenka Kručková, LLM, Legal Officer
4. Viktoria Mohos Naray, LLM, MA, Senior Legal Advisor
5. Rose Osinde Alabaster, MA, Programme Director, Africa Region
6. Lynn Sorrentino, Communications Manager
7. Géraldine Gené, Lawyer, Notary Public
8. Florian Thevenon, PhD, Scientific Officer
9. Chris Duckett, Development Director
10. Elodie Tranchez, former desk officer
11. Moez Allaoui, Former staff person, Tunisia activities

WaterLex Board

12. Jean-Benoit Charrin, Founding Executive Director
13. Eibe Riedel, Board President

Core Funding Institutions

14. Olivier Magnin, SDC
15. Anna Hjarne, SIDA

Uganda Country Mapping

16. Søren Høgsbro Larsen, DANIDA First Secretary Embassy of Denmark Uganda
17. Moa Cortobius, SIWI focal point for the Uganda project
18. Dickens Kamugisha, Local Legal Advisor for the legal mapping Uganda project

AfDB

19. Boniface Aleobua, Water and Sanitation Department, AfDB Maputo, Mozambique

Benin

20. Jean Willemin, Former WaterLex staff responsible for the Benin project

IWRM

21. Jenny Gronwall, SIWI focal point for IWRM manual

UNEP Tunisia

22. Moez Allaoui, Former WaterLex staff responsible for the UNEP project

Tunisia quick scan and CSO activities

23. Moez Allaoui, Former WaterLex staff responsible for the Tunisia Activities
24. Elodie Tranchez, Former WaterLex staff

Human Right to Water and Sanitation Indicators Conference

25. Mads Holst Jensen, Danish Institute for Human Rights

Parliamentarians

26. Mokhtar Oman, IPU advisor

NHRIs

27. Elodie Tranchez, Former WaterLex staff

28. Mads Hols Jensen, Danish Institute for Human Rights

29. Yanira Cortez, NHRI of El Salvador

30. Nathalie Seguin, FANMEX

31. Héctor Dávalos, Executive Secretary, NHRI of Mexico

Safe Water/ HWTS

32. Fanny Boulloud, Antenna

ANNEX 3: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

To say to the interviewee:

Thank you so much for agreeing to speak with me today about WaterLex. My colleague and I have been contracted to conduct an independent evaluation of WaterLex for the period 2013-2017. This evaluation, which is required by their core donors, is also meant to be a forward-looking evaluation that will inform the development of their next strategy.

To keep in mind for us:

This evaluation is meant to do the following-

- Evaluate the achievement of indicators, targets and objectives set up in the LogFrame;
- Assess the degree to which WaterLex objectives respond to the priorities and needs of key stakeholders in creating an enabling environment for improved water governance;
- Determine to which degree WaterLex's work aligns with national legal and policy frameworks for water governance as well as with the SDGs and other global and regional water governance-related developments;
- Establish the extent to which the programme activities and outputs remain consistent with the overall mission, as well as to the intended impact and effects.

Tell us about your association/work with WaterLex (nature and duration of relationship)

Note: adapt the questions to the interviewee. The question will be phrased one way for a funder, another for a WaterLex staff member, and another for a country-level project participant.

RELEVANCE

How did the WaterLex activities you were involved with/supported through funding improve water governance and support the realization of the right to water and sanitation? Can you give an example?

Are there areas of your work with WaterLex that strike you as less relevant to the overall aims of improved water governance and support to the realization of the right to water and sanitation?

Are there additional ways that WaterLex could contribute to improved water governance and support to the realization of the right to water and sanitation in the future?

EFFECTIVENESS

To what extent have the objective and outcomes of your work been/will be achieved?

Ask these questions, as relevant, to the appropriate interviewee:

How are the programmes building your capacity or that of others to develop/improve laws and policies for improved water governance?

To what extent are the human right to water and sanitation training modules building capacity in your country or program area?

Did country mapping programming contribute to better national action plans for implementing and monitoring HRWS?

Have you used the legal database? How? How has it helped you?

How has the NHRI Water Initiative built your organization's capacity in promoting and protecting water governance-related human rights?

Are there specific WaterLex activities or approaches that were less effective than others, in your view?

Do you have concrete suggestions for how WaterLex might be more effective?

EFFICIENCY

Were the objectives, outputs and outcomes of your work with WaterLex achieved on time?

Were the allocated resources sufficient for achieving the results?

Were there unexpected roadblocks in delivery and how were they resolved?

Were there any obvious inefficiencies, or can you suggest ways for WaterLex to become more efficient?

For program staff: Were there synergies between different WaterLex programs?

IMPACT

Can you give an example of how the programmes of WaterLex improved water governance-related legal and policy frameworks? Or, if the programme/intervention is quite recent, how you foresee it contributing?

Can you give an example of how the programmes of WaterLex contributed to effective water governance and human rights? Or, if the programme/intervention is quite recent, how you foresee it contributing?

How does WaterLex programming you are familiar with align with the sustainable development goals?

Were there positive or negative unexpected impacts of WaterLex programming? Elaborate.

SUSTAINABILITY

What evidence can you point to that demonstrates that the benefits of WaterLex programming are sustainable (esp. for capacity building)?

How was capacity or knowledge institutionalized?

Do you think that it is likely that the results/benefits will continue after programmes end?

Are there particular roadblocks to sustainability that you see? Do you have suggestions about sustainability can be enhanced?

INNOVATION, REPLICATION, SCALING-UP

Can you point to any examples of innovative WaterLex approaches or programs?

Can you point to any examples of WaterLex programs being scaled up? What potential for scale-up and replication do you see?

GENERAL (ask only if these issues have not yet surfaced)

What are one or two comparative advantages of WaterLex compared to other similar organisations?

Moving forward, how can WaterLex best position itself in the international framework for water governance and rights-based approaches?

If you could change/improve one or two things about WaterLex, what would they be?

What are WaterLex's greatest strengths?

What do you see as the biggest one or two opportunities for WaterLex in the coming few years?

What do you see as the greatest risks or threats to WaterLex in the coming few years?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

We've all had the experience of working with partners where everything is easy, rewarding, and goes as planned, other times where the collaboration has been difficult. Tell me a bit about WaterLex as a partner.

How would you compare your collaboration with WaterLex to your experiences with other organizations?

ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR BENEFICIARIES

What can you do now that you couldn't do before you took part in the WaterLex training/capacity building/support?

What did you benefit from the most in terms of your work with WaterLex?

ANNEX 4: INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE (CUESTIONARIO WATERLEX)

Para decirle al entrevistado:

Muchas gracias por aceptar hablar conmigo hoy sobre WaterLex. Mi colega y yo hemos sido contratados para llevar a cabo una evaluación independiente de WaterLex para el período 2013-2017. Esta evaluación, que es requerida por sus donantes principales, también debe ser una evaluación prospectiva que servirá de base para el desarrollo de su próxima estrategia.

Para tener en cuenta internamente:

Esta evaluación está destinada a hacer lo siguiente:

- Evaluar el logro de los indicadores, metas y objetivos establecidos en el marco lógico;
- Evaluar el grado en que los objetivos de WaterLex responden a las prioridades y necesidades de las principales partes interesadas en la creación de un entorno propicio para mejorar la gobernanza del agua;
- Determinar en qué grado el trabajo de WaterLex se alinea con los marcos legales y políticos nacionales para la gobernabilidad del agua, así como con los SDGs y otros procesos mundiales y regionales relacionados con la gobernabilidad del agua;
- Establecer la medida en que las actividades y resultados del programa siguen siendo coherentes con la misión general, así como con el impacto y los efectos previstos.

Cuéntenos acerca de su asociación / trabajo con WaterLex (naturaleza y duración de la relación)

Nota: adaptar las preguntas al entrevistado. La pregunta será formulada de una manera para un financiador, otra para un miembro del personal de WaterLex y otra para un participante del proyecto a nivel de país.

PERTINENCIA

¿Cómo mejoraron la gobernabilidad del agua las actividades de WaterLex con las que usted estuvo involucrado / apoyado a través de financiamiento y apoyaron la realización del derecho al agua y al saneamiento? ¿Puede dar un ejemplo?

¿Hay áreas de su trabajo con WaterLex que le parezcan menos relevantes para los objetivos generales de mejorar la gobernanza del agua y el apoyo a la realización del derecho al agua y al saneamiento?

¿Hay otras formas en que WaterLex podría contribuir a mejorar la gobernabilidad del agua y el apoyo a la realización del derecho al agua y al saneamiento en el futuro?

EFICACIA

¿Hasta qué punto se ha logrado / se alcanzará el objetivo y los resultados de su trabajo?

Haga las siguientes preguntas, según corresponda, al entrevistado apropiado:

¿Cómo están los programas construyendo su capacidad o la de otros para desarrollar / mejorar leyes y políticas para mejorar la gobernabilidad del agua?

¿En qué medida los módulos de capacitación sobre el derecho humano al agua y el saneamiento crean capacidad en su país o área de programa?

¿La programación del mapeo de los países contribuyó a mejorar los planes de acción nacionales para la implementación y monitoreo de HRWS?

¿Ha utilizado la base de datos legal? ¿Cómo? ¿Cómo te ha ayudado?

¿Cómo ha desarrollado la Iniciativa del Agua de las NHRI la capacidad de su organización para promover y proteger los derechos humanos relacionados con la gobernanza del agua?

¿Existen actividades o enfoques específicos de WaterLex menos eficaces que otros, en su opinión?

¿Tiene sugerencias concretas sobre cómo WaterLex podría ser más efectivo?

EFICIENCIA

¿Los objetivos, productos y resultados de su trabajo con WaterLex fueron alcanzados a tiempo?

¿Fueron los recursos asignados suficientes para lograr los resultados?

¿Hubo obstáculos inesperados en la entrega y cómo se resolvieron?

¿Hubo ineficiencias obvias, o puede sugerir formas para que WaterLex sea más eficiente?

Para el personal del programa: ¿Existen sinergias entre los diferentes programas de WaterLex?

IMPACTO

¿Puede dar un ejemplo de cómo los programas de WaterLex mejoraron los marcos jurídicos y políticos relacionados con la gobernanza del agua? O, si el programa / intervención es bastante reciente, ¿cómo prevé que contribuya?

¿Puede dar un ejemplo de cómo los programas de WaterLex contribuyeron a la gobernabilidad del agua ya los derechos humanos? O, si el programa / intervención es bastante reciente, ¿cómo prevé que contribuya?

¿Cómo se adapta la programación de WaterLex con los objetivos de desarrollo sostenible?

¿Hubo impactos positivos o negativos inesperados de la programación de WaterLex? Elaborar.

SOSTENIBILIDAD

¿Qué evidencia puede señalar que demuestre que los beneficios de la programación de WaterLex son sostenibles (especialmente para la creación de capacidad)?

¿Cómo se institucionalizó la capacidad o el conocimiento?

¿Cree usted que es probable que los resultados / beneficios continúen después de que finalicen los programas?

¿Hay obstáculos particulares a la sostenibilidad que usted ve? ¿Se puede mejorar la sostenibilidad?

INNOVACIÓN, REPLICACIÓN, ESCALIZACIÓN

¿Puede señalar ejemplos de enfoques o programas innovadores de WaterLex?

¿Puede señalar algún ejemplo de los programas de WaterLex que están siendo ampliados?

¿Cuál es el potencial para aumentar la escala y la replicación?

GENERAL (pregunte solo si estos problemas aún no han surgido)

¿Cuáles son una o dos ventajas comparativas de WaterLex en comparación con otras organizaciones similares?

En el futuro, ¿cómo puede WaterLex posicionarse mejor en el marco internacional para la gobernanza del agua y los enfoques basados en los derechos?

Si pudieras cambiar o mejorar una o dos cosas sobre WaterLex, ¿cuáles serían?

¿Cuáles son las mayores fortalezas de WaterLex?

¿Cuáles son las mayores oportunidades para WaterLex en los próximos años?

¿Cuáles son los mayores riesgos o amenazas para WaterLex en los próximos años?

PREGUNTAS ADICIONALES PARA SOCIOS IMPLEMENTADORES

Todos hemos tenido la experiencia de trabajar con socios donde todo es fácil, gratificante, y va según lo planeado, otras veces donde la colaboración ha sido difícil. Cuéntame un poco sobre WaterLex como socio.

¿Cómo compararía su colaboración con WaterLex a sus experiencias con otras organizaciones?

PREGUNTAS ADICIONALES PARA LOS BENEFICIARIOS

¿Qué puede hacer ahora que no pudo hacer antes de participar en el entrenamiento / capacitación / apoyo de WaterLex?

¿De qué se benefició más en términos de su trabajo con WaterLex?