



SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme

Stage 1:

Stakeholder Consultation Report

SDG 6.5.1, degree of implementation of IWRM

Cambodia

31 August 2020



Prepared by:
SDG 6.5.1 focal point: Thach Sovanna, Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology
Consultation Facilitator: Khuon Komar and Mak Solieng, Cambodia Water Partnership

Stakeholder Consultation Report for SDG 6.5.1

Executive Summary

After the baseline data collection period in 2017, Cambodia received new request from the UNEP to join the Second Round SDG 6.5.1 data collection for 2020 Report together with Survey Form and Guideline. In the situation of COVID 19 pandemic, the Cambodia in collaboration with MOWRAM and the CNMC still decided to approach the Stakeholder Consultation Workshop (SCW) due to the need to have interactive discussions between stakeholders face-to-face to enrich data and information. With budget plan proposed by the GWP SEA and the need to apply guidance from the Ministry of Health, the number of stakeholders was limited to around 30 and stakeholders from local areas such as Farmers Water User Community (FWUC), the River Basin Management Committee (RBMC) and other civil societies and NGOs were not invited. Therefore, the stakeholders involved in this consultation were more from Phnom Penh and a few from the provinces, and they include national water agencies, other public sector agencies, sub-national water agency, River Basin Community, Fisheries Conservation and Development Community, gender expertise, research/academia, transboundary expertise, and non-governmental organization who in one way or another implement and/or support the IWRM implementation at sub-national, national as well as regional levels. Although there were two representations from the Civil Society, we still missed the voice of FWUC and RBMC who may have additional ideas and more demand as they are in the initial stage of IWRM implementation. The engagement of this group will be ensured in the future stakeholder consultation.

This 2nd round stakeholder consultation proceeded with facilitating the stakeholders above in a SCW (Which took place on 13 August 2020 at Sunway Hotel, Phnom Penh) to discuss, contribute experiences and inputs, make judgement on the score and provide recommended actions that address constraints and ways for improvement to better achievement. In this way, they jointly monitor the progress of IWRM implementation in 2020 by comparing with the baseline in 2017. In addition to SCW, the literatures search for evidences, and personal communication with IWRM experts and implementors were also approached for additional key information in order to fill up data/information gaps in the report.

The main findings during this Stakeholder Consultation Workshop was that after all, all agreed that the IWRM implementation has been progressed to some extent in 2020 (59) compared to the baseline in 2017 (46) as more efforts have been made by the Government and support provided by the stakeholders and Development Partners. However, the participants strongly suggested two critical actions leading to increase progress of IWRM implementation toward achieving target in 2030, including:

- (1) Capacity development and strengthening of the stakeholders, particularly at sub-national level for in-depth understanding and adequate practical skill to continue IWRM implementation; and
- (2) Ensure budget availability through raising more fund, and mainstreaming IWRM elements into the national and sub-national plans for budget security.

It is also important to note that this joint monitoring and reporting had been an interesting interaction of cross-sectors and stakeholders, and learning process that enables us to reflect on experiences, status, constraints and challenges encountered in IWRM implementation, understanding of the facts behind them and actions should be taken for achieving targets in 2030. If recommended actions will be committed and realized, the likelihood of attaining the global target by 2030 will be possible.

The next steps from here will be: (1) Conduct the same survey with the Farmer Water User Community, the River Basin Committee and the Private Sector; and (2) Follow up implementation of recommended actions.

The completed survey instrument can be found in document enclosed, namely "Cambodia Second Round Report on SDG Indicator 6.5.1_FINAL".

1. Conclusions from facilitated discussions on Section 1: 'Enabling Environment'

Key points and overall messages from the roundtable discussions and reporting back, as well as inputs received outside of the workshop. Include relevant points made around justifying the rationale for certain scoring, or divergences in scoring where applicable (e.g. between different stakeholder groups, differences in scores from different areas/levels).

a) What are the main challenges to progress in the country?

The main challenges are the limited capacity and funding, particularly at sub-national level.

b) How can the main challenges be addressed?

Develop and strengthen capacity of IWRM implementors at all level, particularly at sub-national level; increase fund raising; and ensure that IWRM activities are well integrated into the plans with budget security allocated.

c) At the question level or in general, what is the perceived rate of progress, and what is the likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030? Is there a need for national (interim) target setting (which may be taken up in more detail in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme)?

At the question level, the perceived rate of progress has been from Medium-low to Medium-high. The likelihood of reaching High implementation within the next 10 years by 2030 will be possible if recommended actions will be taken into realities. To reach this achievement, there is need to set interim target in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme.

d) What are the major points stakeholders do not agree on and why? No. e) Other interesting points of note from the discussion?

The Government tends to invest less in soft IWRM activities than in water infrastructures projects.

2. Conclusions from facilitated discussions on Section 2: 'Institutions and Participation'

Key points and overall messages from the roundtable discussions and reporting back, as well as inputs received outside of the workshop. Include relevant points made around justifying the rationale for certain scoring, or divergences in scoring where applicable (e.g. between different stakeholder groups, differences in scores from different areas/levels).

a) What are the main challenges to progress in the country?

The main challenges to progress in the country is that institution at the sub-national level, that support the national level, is struggling with limited capacity (IWRM knowledge and practices as well as facilitation skills) and fund for strengthening the institutions and for stakeholders' engagement.

b) How can the main challenges be addressed?

Capacity development on IWRM and skill in facilitation multi-stakeholders is critical for both national and sub-national level, particularly municipal/provincial River Basin Management Committee Members; and (2) Ensure sustainable fund for plans implementation at sub-national level.

c) At the question level or in general, what is the perceived rate of progress, and what is the likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030? Is there a need for national (interim) target setting (which may be taken up in more detail in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme)?

In general, the perceived rate of progress has been from Medium-low to Medium-high. The likelihood of reaching High implementation within the next 10 years by 2030 will be possible if recommended actions will be highly committed in the real situation. To reach this achievement, there is need to set interim target in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme.

d) What are the major points stakeholders do not agree on and why?

No

e) Other interesting points of note from the discussion?

Managing the river basin at the basin level by establishing the River Basin Management Committee (RBMC) is a feasible approach for promoting the IWRM implementation at sub-national level, including the grassroots level. However, the RBMCs and their IWRM-based Basin Management Plan are still at the initial stage with limited capacity and funding for implementation.

3. Conclusions from facilitated discussions on Section 3: 'Management Instruments'

Key points and overall messages from the roundtable discussions and reporting back, as well as inputs received outside of the workshop. Include relevant points made around justifying the rationale for certain scoring, or divergences in scoring where applicable (e.g. between different stakeholder groups, differences in scores from different areas/levels).

a) What are the main challenges to progress in the country?

The main challenges to progress for Management Instrument have been the limited fund and capacity in development of national knowledge hub for the water and related resources management.

b) How can the main challenges be addressed?

They can be addressed by ensuring national budget and develop technical capacity and database system and data sharing network at national level.

c) At the question level or in general, what is the perceived rate of progress, and what is the likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030? Is there a need for national (interim) target setting (which may be taken up in more detail in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme)?

In general, the rate of progress for this component has not been moved out from Medium-low, and reached to the nearly Medium-high rate. The likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030 will be possible since many related activities are taken place, and if recommended actions will be implemented. However, improvement in development of knowledge hub and data sharing network, particularly at sub-national level, e.g. at RBMC is needed. To reach High or Very High implementation by 2030, there is need to set interim target in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme.

d) What are the major points stakeholders do not agree on and why?

No

e) Other interesting points of note from the discussion?

(1) Data sharing at national and Mekong regional level needs to be strengthened for increasing cooperation at national and regional level, particularly data/information on dam operation from upstream member countries.

(2) Aquifer of the whole country and Transboundary Aquifer need to be clearly studied, their status assessed; management instruments identified; and management plan for their protection formulated.

4. Conclusions from facilitated discussions on Section 4: 'Financing'

Key points and overall messages from the roundtable discussions and reporting back, as well as inputs received outside of the workshop. Include relevant points made around justifying the rationale for certain scoring, or divergences in scoring where applicable (e.g. between different stakeholder groups, differences in scores from different areas/levels).

a) What are the main challenges to progress in the country?

The main challenges to progress in Financing have been the lower priority given to the investment on IWRM elements at national and sub-national level.

b) How can the main challenges be addressed?

(1) Integrate IWRM elements/activities into all water and water-related plans and infrastructures development and management projects in order to ensure funding and their implementation;

(2) The budget for the implementation of the IWRM, shall be prepared from the bottom, one through the provincial budget and another through the concern sectoral ministry.; and

(3) Monitor the achievement by incorporating relevant indicators.

c) At the question level or in general, what is the perceived rate of progress, and what is the likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030? Is there a need for national (interim) target setting (which may be taken up in more detail in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme)?

In general, the perceived rate of progress has been from Low in the baseline to Medium-low in 2020. The likelihood of reaching High or Very high implementation by 2030 will be possible, if all recommended actions will be implemented and the national (interim)target will be set in more detail in Stage 2 of the SDG 6 IWRM Support Programme.

d) What are the major points stakeholders do not agree on and why?

No

e) Other interesting points of note from the discussion?

Financing will continue to be the main constraint and challenges for IWRM implementation in Cambodia, if this issue will not be addressed.

5. Next steps

Key points from the closing remarks and comments, including:

(1) the cross-cutting challenges in IWRM implementation are limited capacity and fund; and urgent ways to overcome them are capacity development and strengthening, and ensuring funding security;

(2) the overall rate of progression of IWRM implementation has been from Medium-low in 2017 to Medium high in 2020 and the likelihood of achieving global targets by 2030 will be possible if all recommended actions for improvement will be undertaken seriously;

(3) recommendations for next steps for accelerating IWRM implementation include: i) Conduct the same survey with the FWUC, RBMC and private Sectors for understanding their progress and challenges; ii) conduct training need assessment for IWRM capacity building and strengthening at national and sub-national level, prioritizing activities and implement them, and iii) ensure funding for IWRM implementation through fund raising activities and through mainstreaming IWRM elements into the national and sub-national plans and water/water related projects and ensure budget allocation; and

(4) undertaking necessary follow-up actions such as: establish working group(s) and prepare planned activities to implement recommended actions, including planned activities for the continuous monitoring of the SDG 6.5.1 indicator in the country, and implement them.

ANNEXES

Annex 1: List of Participants

Annex 2: Agenda

Annex 3: Facilitator's Comments

Annex 4: Photos

Annex 1: List of participants

Workshop participants

Name	Organization	Position	Email address
H.E. Mr. So Sophort	CNMC	Secretary General	sophort@cnmc.gov.kh
Mr. Suos Bunthan	CNMC	Director of Planning	bunthansuos@gmail.com
Mr. Sok Khom	CNMC	Director of	
Mr. Chheang Hong	CNMC	Director IKMD	
Mr. Kim Seiha	CNMC	Deputy Director of Planning	
Mr. Sakhon Pory	CNMC	Deputy Director	
Mr. Sak Samol	CNMC	M&E Officer	
Ms. Keo Thavy	CNMC	Admin Officer	
Mr. Thach Sovanna	MOWRAM	Director/ SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point	thachsovanna@yahoo.com
Ms. Dom Thach	MOWRAM	Deputy Director of planning/ Gender and Water	
Mr. Heng Rath Monlida	PDWRAM, Kratie	Director	
Mr. Khun Sakhoeun	PDWRAM, Prey Veng	Deputy Director	
Mr. Kim Savuth	PDOWRAM, Svay Rieng	Director	
Mr. Meas Chivuth	MOWA	Chief Officer	
Mr. Phoeuk Sophorn	MOE	Officer	
MS. Sam Sreyoun	MME	Officer	
Mr. Kvan Sheaktra	TSA	Chief officer	
Mr. Touch Bunthong	MAFF/IFReDI	Acting Director	
Mr. Khun Khandy	MOP	Vice Chief officer	
Mr. Oeurng Chantha	ITC	Deputy Director	
Mr. Sok Try	ITC	Researcher	
Mr. Mak Bunthoeun	NGO Forum on Cambodia	Officer	
Mr. Suon Nhak	Prek Te River Basin Community	Leader	
Mr. Hor Samath	Sdeykraum- Rohalsuong Fisheries Resources Conservation Community	Deputy Leader	
Mr. Nim Cheang	Sdeykraum- Rohalsuong Fisheries Resources Conservation Community	Adviser	
Mr. Sok Saing Im		Independent Consultant	

Dr. Mak Solieng	CambodiaWP	Chair	maksolieng@gmail.com
Mr. Khuan Komar	CambodiaWP	Vice-chair	khuon.komar.ta7610@gmail.com
Mr. Kim lay	CambodiaWP	Assistant	

Other stakeholders engaged (not in workshops)

Note:

- (1) The participants tend to provide their mobile number due to it is more convenient for them to communicate through TELEGRAM, therefore we do not have their email address.
- (2) CNMC: Cambodia National Mekong Committee, MOWRAM: Ministry of Water Resources and Meteorology, PDOWRAM: Provincial Department of Water Resources and Meteorology, MOWA: Ministry of Women Affairs, MME: Ministry of Mine and Energy, MOE: Ministry of Environment, TSA: Tonle Sap Authority, IFRDI: In-land Fisheries Research and Development Institute, MOP: Ministry of Planning, ITC: Institute de Technology du Cambodge.

Name	Organization/Position	Email address	Summary of inputs (e.g. question number(s), or full survey)
H.E. Mr Ponh Sachak	Secretary of State, MOWRAM		IWRM application in water infrastructures project development, possibility for ensuring budget security
Mr Keo Serey Pich	Deputy Director, MOWRAM		Challenges in IWRM implementation in infrastructure projects implementation
Mr Tes Sopharith	National Consultant		Management Instrument

Please note that this Annex is supplemented by information in Annex E of the SDG 6.5.1 survey instrument, which reflects on the level of engagement from different stakeholder groups.

Annex 2: Agenda

Time	Activities	Responsibilities
8:00-8:30	Registration	CNMC & CambodiaWP
8:30-8:40	Welcome & Opening Remarks	H.E. So Sophort Secretary General, CNMC
8:40-8:50	Introduction to SDG 6.5.1 Monitoring & Reporting	Mr Thach Sovanna SDG6.5.1 Focal Point
8:50-10:00	Review of combined monitoring results & Assess the progress of each indicator: Component 1: Enabling environment	Facilitators and all Participants
10:00-10:30	Coffee break	
10:30-12:00	Review of combined monitoring results & Assess the progress of each indicator: Component 2: Institution & participation	Facilitators and all Participants
12:00-13:30	Lunch break	
13:30-15:00	Review of combined monitoring results & Assess the progress of each indicator: Component 3: Management instrument	Facilitators and all Participants
15:00-15:30	Coffee break	
15:30-16:30	Review of combined monitoring results & Assess the progress of each indicator: Component 4: Financing	Facilitators and all Participants
16:30-16:45	Wrap up the results	Facilitator
16:45	Closing Remarks	H.E. So Sophort

Annex 3: Facilitator's Comments

Overall, the workshop worked well and enabled us to reach into complete gathering of information needed on progress of IWRM implementation (SDG Indicator 6.5.1) for the Second Round Report in 2020. We had good interventions from the Chairman and SDG 6.5.1 focal Point, facilitators with high experience and the participants were fairly represented and actively engaged. The participants were well facilitated and they were enthusiastic and dynamic in the discussion and had made significant contribution to the survey and some of them even sent data and information to us after the workshop. Important point to be noted is that in the future, it should be ensured that more representatives from beneficiaries such as Farmer Water User Community and River Basin Management Committee Members are engaged in this important monitoring process, because they can contribute interesting inputs at the river basin level.

With reference to the Survey Instrument, most questions are clear for the technical experts and facilitators, while for some participants, particularly those of sub-national level, they need some clarification and explanation. The criteria for rating are very useful and helpful in scoring, without which it would be difficult to assess the degree of implementation and reach into consensus from all participants. It is also questionable whether the scores could be changed if these questionnaires are to be surveyed with the River Basin Management Committee members as they are still in the early stage of IWRM implementation.

It is important to note that for running this workshop in one day smoothly, we really need qualified facilitator who have long experience in multi-stakeholder facilitation and IWRM implementation and dominate well the survey instrument. This stakeholder consultation process consisted of getting the participants to understand the concept of each component by a briefing at the beginning, followed by raising the questions and discussion and selection of criteria that suit each parameter. We tended to allow participants to raise their ideas/opinion on each parameter even with different views, sometimes the Focal Point kicked-off the discussion, then with coordinated interactions, we got the participants to have consensus at the end and have final decision in answering and scoring. For some questions that require combined answers from cross-sectors and stakeholders, as this is IWRM process, the facilitators tried to create enabling environment for, and hold the participants' interactive discussion with patience. Therefore, we did not reach into any tense discussion or disagreement in the survey process.

From our role as facilitators, we observe this workshop a well coordinating process of participatory monitoring.

Annex 4: Photos



