



**Applying the OECD Water Governance Indicators to the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Region
at the Transboundary Scale**

DRAFT REPORT

Prepared by: Debora VanNijnatten and Carolyn Johns

July 12, 2019



Funding for this project provided under a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) Insight Grant

Table of Contents

Background 3

Methodology..... 4

Preliminary Findings from Application of OECD Water Governance Indicators to Rio Grande/Rio Bravo Region 5

Preliminary Findings from Qualitative Questions in Questionnaire..... 7

Additional Insights from Interviews..... 9

Conclusions:..... 12

Background

In 2015, the OECD conducted a comprehensive inventory of water governance indicators and developed 12 Water Governance Principles that were endorsed by the 34 OECD member countries.¹ The Principles provide a framework for understanding water governance systems and help generate dialogue and change in terms of how to improve water governance. The 12 Principles are intended to apply to all levels of government, all water management functions, and all water uses. They are clustered around three main dimensions: effectiveness; efficiency; trust and engagement.

To support the implementation of the OECD WG Principles, in 2016-17 the OECD developed 36 indicators, three for each of the 12 water governance principles.² In 2017-18, the OECD pilot tested the 36 water governance indicators (WGIS) in 12 OECD jurisdictions at various scales: basin, national, regional, and local. The approach is based on a voluntary self-assessment framework and multi-stakeholder dialogue to assess how water governance systems are performing at a given moment in time (static) or are expected to perform over time (dynamic). The OECD WGIS were designed to be *perception-based*, on the view of experts or various types of stakeholders, and *fact-based*, using available/objective data.

At the World Water Forum in March 2018, the full list of water governance indicators and methodology options were publicly released in the report *Water Governance at a Glance*.³ Findings from the first round of applications in 12 pilot jurisdictions were also presented.

To date, applications have been within various OECD member countries at various scales. However, there have been no applications in Canada, the US or Mexico, and there have been no applications in transboundary water basins. As part of our Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) project on water governance indicators in the Great Lakes and the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo regions, we have adopted and adapted the OECD's WGIS to apply them to these two transboundary cases.

¹ OECD 2015, *Principles on Water Governance* <https://www.oecd.org/cfe/regional-policy/OECD-Principles-on-Water-Governance.pdf>

² OECD 2018, *Implementing the OECD Principles on Water Governance: Indicator Framework and Evolving Practices*, OECD Studies on Water, OECD Publishing, Paris, <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264292659-en>.

³ OECD 2018. *OECD Water Governance Indicator Framework*, <http://www.oecd.org/regional/OECD-Water-Governance-Indicator-Framework.pdf>

Methodology

In summer 2018 our research team reviewed the OECD's water governance indicators and methodology options related to applications in transboundary cases. We then adopted the 36 indicators and adapted the methodology for application in the Great Lakes and Rio Grande/Rio Bravo regions at the transboundary scale. The research design and methods were approved by the Ryerson Research Ethics Board and the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board in May 2018. In summer 2018, a backgrounder on the OECD water governance principles and indicators was developed, data collection instruments were created, a pre-test was conducted with 6 experts in the Great Lakes region, and the methodology was modified for clarification and to incorporate an iterative component. Between November 2018 and February 2019, the methodology was applied in the Great Lakes region at the transboundary scale.

Then, between February and May 2019 we applied the methodology in the Rio Grande/Bravo region. We asked participants to complete a worksheet asking about the status of all 36 of the OECD's water governance indicators in their basin, and to complete a questionnaire with five queries related to the OECD's indicators and their applicability and value in the Great Lakes region. 33 people were invited to participate and we received 16 completed responses. As part of the questionnaire, participants were asked if they wished to provide additional feedback or comments in a follow up interview. We conducted 8 online/phone interviews to probe responses provided by those participants that wished to have a follow-up discussion of their answers.

Results from this phase of data collection in the Rio Grande/Bravo have been aggregated and this draft report includes our preliminary findings. All study participants are being provided with this draft report and the opportunity to provide any additional feedback before our findings are finalized. In keeping with our ethics requirements, all data was aggregated without any identifying information and aggregated findings in this draft report do not include any attribution to ensure all participants remain anonymous and their responses remain confidential.

A final version of this summary report will be posted on the Great Lakes Policy Research Network website by the end of summer 2019. Preliminary results in conference papers have been presented at conferences in spring/summer 2019 and a journal article on the Rio Grande/Bravo case is being produced for *Water Policy*. In addition to having a report and article on each of the Rio Grande/Bravo and Great Lakes cases, we hope to make a submission to the OECD Water Governance programme for their next *Water Governance at a Glance* report and produce a journal article that compares the application of the OECD water governance indicators in both of these transboundary water governance systems. This will complete Phase 1 of our SSHRC project.

Preliminary Findings from Application of OECD Water Governance Indicators to Rio Grande/Bravo Region

The worksheet containing all 36 of the OECD's water governance indicators asked respondents to choose whether each indicator was "in place, functioning", "in place, partly implemented", "in place, not implemented", "under development", "not in place" or "not applicable" (See Table 1). In this case, all of the participants – with one exception – were able to complete the indicators data collection sheet.

What is striking about the results in the Rio Grande/Bravo (RGB) case on the 36-indicator worksheet is the lack of consensus reflected across the responses and the high number of split responses on most indicators. The purple coding in the summary Table 1 highlights those indicators where there was a wide distribution of responses and no consensus. In fact, responses on 11 out of the 36 indicators are split largely between two options and an additional 16 responses are split between three or more options. Responses on fully 27 out of the 36 indicators, then, show a clear lack of agreement on the existence/implementation/functioning of the attributes described in the indicators on the part of respondents.

On only nine indicators were there a clear majority of responses favoring a specific option. In terms of where these majorities appear, there is consensus on the *presence* of agreements and institutions in place for water management and cooperation, along with designated lead agencies, agencies with regulatory functions and cooperative mechanisms more generally, as 'in place and functioning'. Consensus also exists on the *absence* ('not in place') of transboundary education/training, frameworks for revenue collection, mechanisms to identify corruption and ombuds-institutions. In addition, a strong majority of respondents also agreed that the transboundary incentives for innovation are 'not in place'.

But there the agreement ends. There is a diversity of opinion on whether the transboundary institutions, agreements, collaborative and associated mechanisms actually foster cooperation across water users (2c.), address capacity gaps (4b.), encourage bottom-up initiatives/dialogue/learning (8b.), foster knowledge and experience sharing (8c.) or cross-sectoral (horizontal) coordination and policy coherence (3a., 3b.). Further, no agreement exists on whether the governance regime possesses domestic revenues and allocations for water (6b.), sound water management regulatory frameworks (7a.), regulatory tools for both water quality and quantity (7c.), legal and institutional frameworks to promote integrity and transparency (9a.), transboundary legal frameworks to engage stakeholders (10a.), mechanisms to diagnose/review stakeholder agreement (10c.), formal provisions/legal frameworks for fostering equity across water users (11a.), regular transboundary monitoring and evaluation of water policy and governance (12a.) or transboundary monitoring and evaluation to assess water policies and practices (12b.)

Notable also is that responses tend not to cluster at one side of the spectrum among more closely related options (e.g., 'in place, functioning' and 'in place, partly implemented'). There are arguably only three cases of clustering: 2a. where respondents agree that cooperative mechanisms are in place, but disagree on whether they are functioning or partly implemented; 10b. where

respondents agree that structures for engaging stakeholders are in place, but disagree on whether they are functioning or partly implemented; and 5c. where respondents believe that mechanisms to identify data gaps are either 'not in place' or 'under development.' In all other cases of split responses, respondents were very likely to disagree on whether particular attributes were 'in place, functioning', under development' or 'not in place' at all. To provide one illustration of this tendency, respondents were just as likely to believe that transboundary legal frameworks for engaging stakeholders were in place (whether 'functioning' or 'partly implemented') as to believe such frameworks were 'not in place'. Interesting also is the observation that some responses seem to indicate an awareness that some of the mechanisms to address these gaps are 'under development', while others did not.

It is important to reflect on what might explain the lack of agreement among respondents on the presence of the 36 OECD indicators. While the number of respondents (16) is too small to provide any definitive answers to this and follow-up interviews would be needed to get more detail as to the roots of this disconnect, there are two hypotheses that might be worth pursuing in future work on water governance in the Rio Grande/Bravo. First, it may be that answers are influenced by the respondent's location in the basin. The basin is managed as separate segments in terms of water allocations and sharing, under two separate treaties. As was noted by more than one respondent, the segments "are really two separate rivers, that are managed in different ways," due to varying ecological and river conditions, different stakeholder composition, networks and power structures, and diverse modes of interaction across the border." Anecdotal evidence suggests that there are a variety of initiatives being undertaken in different parts of the basin, which may influence how respondents see governance in their part of the basin. Secondly, responses may differ based on respondents' status as water user, i.e., where are they positioned in the hierarchy of water allocations, if at all? Indeed, positionality as a feature of context figured into respondents' comments; as one explained, "I see two different categories of respondents: i) those who have water rights or concessions ...; and (ii) those with insufficient water rights. ...Those in the first category may respond more positively than those in the second..."

OECD Water Governance Indicators Worksheet: Rio Grande/Bravo Summary of Submissions

Indicator	In place, functioning	In place, partly implemented	In place, not implemented	Under development	Not in place	Not applicable	No Response Don't Know
1a. existence of water agreement/law							
1b. designated lead agencies							
1c. formal review mechanisms							
2a. cooperative mechanisms							
2b. institutions at basin-wide scale							
2c. cooperation across all water users							
3a. cross-sector approach/policies							
3b. transboundary horizontal coordination							
3c. mechanisms to review cross-sector barriers and policy coherence							
4a. merit based independent implementers							
4b. mechanisms to identify and address capacity gaps							
4c. transboundary/domestic education and training programmes for water professionals							
5a. transboundary water information systems							
5b. standardized, harmonized, official, basin-wide water-related statistics							
5c. mechanisms to identify data gaps							
6a. frameworks to collect necessary revenues to meet mandates							
6b. domestic revenues and allocations related to water							
6c. mechanisms to assess short, medium and long-term investment needs							
7a. sound water management regulatory frameworks							
7b. dedicated public institutions with key regulatory functions							
7c. regulatory tools for both water quality and quantity							
8a. transboundary policy framework/incentives to foster innovation							
8b. transboundary institutions encouraging bottom up initiatives, dialogue and learning							
8c. transboundary knowledge and experience sharing mechanisms							
9a. legal and institutional frameworks on integrity and transparency							
9b. independent audit/adjudication to investigate and safeguard public interest							
9c. mechanisms to identify corruption							
10a. transboundary legal frameworks to engage stakeholders							
10b. structures to engage stakeholders							
10c. mechanisms to diagnose/review stakeholder engagement							
11a. formal provisions/legal frameworks fostering equity across water users							
11b. transboundary ombuds/institution to protect water users including vulnerable groups							
11c. mechanisms to manage trade-offs across users							
12a. regular transboundary monitoring and evaluation of water policy/governance							
12b. transboundary monitoring and evaluation to assess policies/practices and help adjust							
12c. transboundary monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to measure extent to which water policy fulfils intended outcomes and water governance framework fits is purpose							

*all responses may not total to the total 'n' as some participants did not respond to all 36 indicators indicating a 'don't know' or unsure '?' response

NOTES

Corresponding colour indicates clear majority of responses (51% and above = 8 and above)

Two colours indicate split in responses (two cells representing values of between 4 and 7)

Purple indicates distribution of responses across more than two response categories (cells representing value of 1-7);

In a few cases respondents included checked two cells in a particular indicator - we have included both

Preliminary Findings from Qualitative Questions in Questionnaire

All study participants were asked to respond to five follow up questions about the OECD water governance indicators and their applicability at the transboundary scale in the Great Lakes region [see Appendix II]. Overall, almost all of the participants submitted responses to the questions in the questionnaire. Further, the majority of the participants found that most of the indicators could be applied at the transboundary scale in the Rio Grande/Rio Bravo, and they expressed that the exercise was positive and useful. However, the qualitative questions also indicated there were strengths, limitations and challenges in applying the indicators.

Responses on the open-ended questions (Appendix B) yielded further insights into perceptions of the water governance regime in the Rio Grande/Bravo. In terms of the first question asking for respondents' general assessment of the applicability of the OECD WGs to the Rio Grande/Bravo basin, a majority all respondents noted that the WGs were applicable. For example, one respondent noted with regard to the WGs that "most are applicable to the Rio Grande/Bravo region", while another stated that "the indicators make sense" and a third provided a similar assessment: "they are common sense indicators of the effectiveness, efficiency and transparency of the institutional arrangements designed to safeguard the sustainability of the basin." It should also be noted however that one respondent believed that the WGs were "not very relevant" to the Rio Grande/Bravo, while a second indicated that "most are related, some are not quite related or not applicable" and a third noted that "[t]he indicators reflect the general aspects of the governance of the Rio Grande Basin. They do not demonstrate specific characteristics."

A recurring theme in the open-ended responses was that the OECD WGs were a useful toolset, in a theoretical sense, for thinking about how to better manage the shared water basin, as well as for highlighting gaps in the governance regime – regardless of whether indicators were deemed to be in place and functioning in the basin at the present time, or not. One respondent commented that "these indicators are a weather vane for sustainability of any water resource" while another noted that "they are helpful tools to assess the current state, but also a good way to see what may still be needed. ... These indicators are a great way to track what's being done, who's doing it, what's needed, etc." Another believed that the WGs provide "[v]aluable guidance that could be a shared goal and process for a multi-jurisdictional approach." As one respondent explained, the WGs "do a good job of capturing strengths and weakness" (in the water governance regime); another felt that "these indicators could be a tool to better manage the basin. It provides all the elements necessary for smart planning and operations."

A majority of respondents also agreed on the value of applying the WGs, in light of charting future directions. As noted by one respondent, the exercise "shows the heavy weight of past institutions and directions that we need to innovate to be adaptable in the future." Another commented that "[i]f OECD indicators can be used as a tool to help RGB water governance respond to future water-related challenges, that would be of value." A third explained that "[t]here is value in applying the OECD water governance indicators in identifying current settings and exploring opportunities for improvement/innovation in water operations with new frameworks." Respondents variously referred to the WGs as a "checklist", "roadmap" and, as noted above, "a weather

vane”. The WGs were also described as “helpful tools to assess the current state but also a good way to see what may still be needed.”

However, there were three significant weaknesses with respect to the indicators that were noted across respondents.

Applicability to surfacewater and groundwater:

Perhaps most significantly, it was felt by a large majority of the respondents that the application of the OECD indicators do not allow for proper consideration of surface-groundwater interactions. A majority of respondents noted the difficulty of applying the WGs as it was not clear to them how such interactions could be taken into account given the nature of the indicators. Several respondents echoed the view of one respondent who explained that “my answers are limited only to surface water, since basically all my answers would have been ‘not in place’ for groundwater.” In fact, a number of respondents sought counsel from the investigator when completing the worksheet and questionnaire, asking whether they should view the exercise as being primarily about surface water or subsurface, implying that there are two different regimes. Two respondents even filled out the sheet with separate answers for the surface and subsurface regimes. One respondent was quite direct in their assessment of this challenge in applying the WGs: “The indicators are only capable of reflecting the topic concerning superficial water and nothing else.” As another respondent concluded, “[w]e need to make sure that (1) water quality (esp. salinity) and (2) subsurface water also are considered matters of governance,” implying that they are not, at present.

Applicability at different scales:

Second, respondents felt that the indicators were not likely to apply equally well across scales and jurisdictions. As one respondent noted “[t]he multi-jurisdictional issue on a regional, state and country basis makes a few of the indicators difficult to address – policy coherence, data and information, regulatory frameworks, monitoring and evaluation all seem like areas that would be extremely challenging to implement on such a large scale.” Another noted that, when they were filling out the worksheet, “the indicators labelled as ‘not applicable’ were labelled as such because at a national level there is no regulatory framework that applies to water issues. Likewise, the indicators of equity, ombudsman and compensation do not exist within the laws of water and the treaty, much less in the political constitution as an obligation to observe.” A third respondent argued that, “the indicators can’t assess key elements of water management that are happening at the local level; they operate best at regional scale, or state to state.”

In fact, several respondents noted feeling overwhelmed by myriad activities at different scales, the sheer complexity of water management in the basin and the lack of coordination among them. One explained that “[m]any people are doing really good things in their respective areas but have capacity and scale issues in thinking and reaching out beyond their areas.” Another noted that “[s]everal NGOs and planning groups are actively engaged and there are so many levels of projects/planning activities underway that many agencies are feeling overwhelmed and unable to commit to additional efforts.”

The Need for Contextualization:

Third, several respondents noted that the application of the WGIs needed to be contextualized, both in terms of how they applied to a given water management case but also in terms of the normative rationale for why they are being used in the first place. As one respondent noted, “the indicators are fine... but they can’t account for things like path dependency, turf battles, etc, which are pieces of the context and explain why things are the way they are.” Another respondent explained that, “I do believe there is value (to applying the OECD WGIs), particularly if greater context can be provided as to why using the OECD’s governance indicators may be of value...” Relatedly, another respondent noted that, “context is everything as to how respondents answer the questions.” Further, several respondents noted that the OECD WGIs could not show how things were changing in response to context, and were not themselves dynamic enough. As one respondent explained, “I feel like the diagram is too neat. I do not believe the world falls into a perfect 3X4 pie chart. I’d like it to look more adaptive.”

Additional Insights from Interviews

In general, the follow-up interviews allowed participants to elaborate on the comments they provided to the five written qualitative questions. There were several important insights about the indicators themselves, including the comment by one interviewee that the indicators do not provide any insights into which attributes (as embodied by the indicators) are more important, which would be needed if the 36 indicator-set were to be used for evaluation purposes. Another noted that considerable care needs to be taken when employing indicators as some may overlap in terms of the attributes that are being targeted - which they felt was the case with the OECD set.

Yet, participants also spoke about broader understandings of governance, water governance and adaptation/innovation of water governance in the region. Several themes stood out across the interviews.

Fragmentation of basin governance

Almost all of those who participated in the follow-up interviews noted a concern about the fragmentation of water management in the binational basin, though they came at this from different perspectives. While three mentioned the importance of the international border as a “hard line” creating a “disjointed” form of water governance, others spoke about vertical (multi-scalar) differences in governance scales and two noted real doubts about being able to take into account the wide variety of differences in water management approaches even across local governments. In this respect, several noted the need for greater coordination across the surface and groundwater management regimes, across different agencies, and across the multitude of

initiatives. Several respondents also noted the absence of a binational “vision” for water management, which might encourage greater coordination across the governance network.

Engagement – who should be included?

Another common concern mentioned by almost all interviewees regards who is included in water governance decision-making. The majority of interviewees indicated a need to think differently about stakeholder engagement; as one participant noted, “filling out the indicator worksheet, it made me ask: “who should be the people coming to the table? Who are the experts? Who else has important data that could be used in governing this resource (not just binational experts).” There were frequent mentions of the need for “bottom-up dialogue” and involvement. In this respect, more than half of interviewees pointed to the Lower Rio Grande Water Quality Initiative as a promising innovation that has shown how multi-jurisdictional and multi-scalar engagement, which is nevertheless rooted in a bottom-up approach, is possible where the goals of water management are shared. Particularly notable in this initiative has been the success in creating a truly binational data-gathering regime.

How to promote adaptability in the water governance regime?

When queried about the prospects for adaptiveness in the basin water governance regime, interviewees provided interesting ideas as to avenues that might be used to pursue change. One interviewee noted that the slow pace of decision-taking under the treaty regime has the benefit of providing time for reflection and that this has resulted in some consideration of new approaches. Another advised that, in thinking about how to make the water governance regime more adaptable, we need to focus on institutions and pinpoint “the barriers that exist” to change. A third highlighted the need for a “basin-wide vision” which could incent changes, and that this vision should be encouraged beginning at the local level. The importance of introducing new “hard technologies”, such as real-time water quality monitoring systems whose outputs are made publicly available, was also highlighted; this provides new insights into how the system is working and helps bring the barriers to engagement by a broader range of interests down.

Now may be a good time to make changes...

Several interviewees noted that, given the increasing evidence of, and concerns about, water supplies now and into the future (in terms of both surface water and – significantly – now also groundwater), stakeholders in the water regime may be more open to alternative governance arrangements and innovations, probably most likely at the watershed level.

Conclusions

Phase 1 of our SSHRC research project has focused on applying the OECD's water governance indicators in two complex transboundary water governance cases in North America: the Great Lakes and the Rio Grande/Bravo. Results from both cases show that those with high-level knowledge of water governance in the region were able to apply the OECD's water governance indicators and found some value in doing so.

The primary values of applying the OECD water governance indicators identified by participants in this case included: the ability to think about the state of water governance in the region using a set of indicators developed by the OECD at the *transboundary scale* (as one respondent noted, "it was refreshing to think outside of the box"); the opportunity to think about specific aspects of water governance (e.g., water information systems vs. stakeholder engagement vs. revenue allocation); and being able to identify opportunities for attention in terms of future basin water governance. The worksheet, open-ended questions and follow-up interview results provide a picture of a governance architecture that is multiscalar and fragmented, where multiple levels and mechanisms of governance are operating simultaneously in a 'networked' form of governance, thus complicating how the WGIs can be applied. This architecture appears to be experiencing some difficulties in performing some of the tasks embodied in the 36 OECD indicator set. At the same time, respondents suggested that there are many initiatives being undertaken in the basin, outside of formal structures and with the intent of shifting the focus of the regime in more sustainable directions. The task now seems to be in connecting these to the more formal parts of the regime.

The findings from application in this case also reveal that there are several challenges related to applying the OECD water governance indicators including: confusion about the scale at which the indicators can be applied, given the multi-scalar and networked reality of transboundary interactions; difficulties in applying the indicators across the surface and subsurface water regimes; and the apparent disassociation between the indicators and the context within which the water governance regime operates. Clearly, indicator application needs to be done alongside an analysis of the contextual factors that operate on a specific case.⁴

In addition, the findings revealed some limitations with adapting the methodology using a data collection worksheet, qualitative questionnaire and follow-up interviews. First, response rates were low. The initial findings could be more robust with more study participants. However, those who did respond have in-depth knowledge of transboundary water governance in the region, thereby making the findings more robust. Second, the qualitative responses through the questionnaire and follow-up interviews provided valuable feedback on the indicators and the worksheet instrument. By having participants respond to this draft report,

⁴ We have completed an analysis of contextual factors for both the Great Lakes and Rio Grande/Bravo cases – this report is available upon request.

we hope the results can be strengthened by gauging whether there is a general consensus about the findings supported by key actors and organizations involved in water governance in the region.

Phase 1 is being followed by Phase 2 of our study which involves the application of an indicator set we have designed, focusing on stakeholder engagement. The indicators for this phase of our project are currently under development and will be applied at a variety of scales in both the Rio Grande/Bravo and Great Lakes cases beginning in Fall 2019.

Appendix A - OECD Water Governance Indicators Worksheet: Application at Transboundary Scale in Rio Grande Region

Indicator	In place, functioning	In place, partly implemented	In place, not implemented	Under development	Not in place	Not applicable
1a. existence of water agreement/law						
1b. designated lead agencies						
1c. formal review mechanisms						
2a. cooperative mechanisms						
2b. institutions at basin-wide scale						
2c. cooperation across all water users						
3a. cross-issue/cross-sector approach/policies						
3b. transboundary horizontal/cross-sector coordination						
3c. mechanisms to review cross-sector barriers and policy coherence						
4a. merit-based independent implementers/bureaucratic officials						
4b. mechanisms to identify and address capacity gaps						
4c. transboundary education and training programmes for water professionals						
5a. transboundary water information systems						
5b. standardized, harmonized, official, basin-wide water-related statistics						
5c. mechanisms to identify data gaps						
6a. frameworks to collect necessary revenues to meet mandates						
6b. domestic revenues and allocations related to water/basin						
6c. mechanisms to assess short, medium and long-term investment needs						
7a. water management regulatory frameworks						
7b. dedicated public institutions with key regulatory functions						
7c. regulatory tools for both water quality and quantity						
8a. transboundary policy framework/incentives to foster innovation						
8b. transboundary institutions encouraging bottom up initiatives, dialogue and learning						
8c. transboundary knowledge and experience sharing mechanisms						
9a. legal and institutional frameworks on integrity and transparency						
9b. independent audit/adjudication to investigate and safeguard public interest						
9c. mechanisms to identify corruption						
10a. transboundary legal frameworks to engage stakeholders						
10b. structures and mechanisms to engage stakeholders						
10c. mechanisms to diagnose/review stakeholder engagement						
11a. formal provisions/legal frameworks fostering equity across water users						
11b. transboundary ombuds/institution to protect water users including vulnerable groups						

11c. mechanisms to manage trade-offs across users						
12a. regular transboundary monitoring and evaluation of water policy/governance						
12b. transboundary monitoring and evaluation to assess and adjust policies/practices						
12c. transboundary monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to measure extent to which existing policy fulfils intended outcomes and water governance framework fits its purpose						

Appendix B

OECD Water Governance Indicators Questions Related to the Rio Grande-Rio Bravo Case

- 1) Based on reviewing the OECD water governance indicators and completing the worksheet, what is your general assessment of the OECD's water governance indicators and their applicability in the Rio Grande-Rio Bravo transboundary region?
- 2) Were any of the indicators not applicable to the Rio Grande-Rio Bravo region? Why?
- 3) Do you think there is value in applying the OECD water governance indicators in the Rio Grande-Rio Bravo region? Why? Why not?
- 4) Do you have any other comments about the OECD water governance indicators?
- 5) Would you be interested in providing additional feedback on the OECD water governance indicators, or the use of water governance indicators more generally in the region, by participating in a short 20-30 minute online interview?

YES

NO