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the Corruption Perceptions Index measures the perceived levels of public sector corruption worldwide.
Water Integrity – the sector approach

The adherence of stakeholders and institutions to governance principles of **transparency**, **accountability**, and **participation** in water service provision and water resources management, based on core values of **honesty**, **equity** and **professionalism**.
Water Integrity – Building Systems

- How?... when corruption is the norm
- Integrity approach – not chasing the corrupt, but...
- ...strengthening good governance through:
  - Transparency
  - Accountability
  - Participation

- Identify risks, support systems to become more resistant to corruption
Effects on Water

- 20-40% of water sector finances are lost to dishonest practices (World Bank)
- Distorts water sector reform
- Over-abstraction, pollution,......
- Impacts on human health, livelihoods, environmental sustainability and economic efficiency with high costs to society - hurts the poor the most!
- Undermines trust, rule of law,......
- Does NOT grease wheels!!!
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>activities</th>
<th>results</th>
<th>outputs</th>
<th>outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Water integrity risk assessment</td>
<td>Pool of trainers</td>
<td>Strengthened awareness &amp; understanding of corr. risks</td>
<td>Improved dialogue and learning on how to address corr. at regional, national and local level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community of practitioners</td>
<td>Able to diagnose corr. risks</td>
<td>Participants apply their new capacities to improve WI in their daily work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WI ambassadors</td>
<td>Strengthened cap to improve integrity in daily work</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ind. WI action plans</td>
<td>Able to put in place integrity mech.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adapt training material</td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional partners have improved cap to promote WI.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Training of trainers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support through mentorship programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Water Integrity Management Toolbox – Focus on Change in an Organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Online knowledge and learning platform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Learning summit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey was sent out to 565 alumni from 21 water integrity capacity development courses held between 2010 and 2014 in Africa and Latin America, 142 responded.

Challenges:

- Little evidence available on the effectiveness of capacity development, due to difficulties in measuring impact and to link activities with behavioural change.
- Are impacts sustained over time?
Have You Used the Knowledge from the Course to Improve Your Own Performance at Work?

- Yes 77%
- No 3%
- Did not answer 20%

n= 142

- I applied the knowledge in new and ongoing projects
- Research and capacity development delivery; academic exchange
- Awareness raising delivery and information sharing
- Professional strengthening
Have You Shared the Knowledge from the Course to Other People and Institutions?

- Yes 73%
- No 5%
- Did not answer 22%

n=n= 142

Information sharing (materials, team meetings, intranet, internal debates, experiences, sharing with the media)
- Implementation of capacity development activities (including research)
- Through projects at the community level or with other organizations
- Awareness raising delivery
Has the Course Contributed to Your Organisation Becoming More Transparent and Accountable?

Yes 57%  No 20%  Did not answer 23%  n= 142

- Leadership in transparency on water management at different levels
- Implementation of capacity development activities (including research)
- Internal changes within the organisation: approach, new strategy
- Yes, but too soon to say
National Water Integrity Assessments: Some first experiences in MENA

• Rapid assessment of water integrity risks and capacity needs to inform development of training materials

• Conducted and peer reviewed by National Partners, coordinated by IUCN

• Surveyed countries: Jordan, Palestine, Lebanon, Morocco, Tunisia

• Methodology: desk-review, face-to-face semi-structured interviews, and national consultative workshop to validate and rank integrity risks and capacity needs
Local level observations

**NGOs:** Limited civil society participation and lack of transparency in policy formulation, no formal WUAs, no advocacy/watchdog skills, lack of communication

**Consumers/Citizens:** Lack of awareness about their rights and responsibilities related to water, illegal connections, corrupt meter readings

**Farmers:** Breach of water licensing regulations, illegal wells and tampering with meters leading to over abstraction of water resources

**Media:** Little experience in reporting on water and corruption, independence questioned (links to water users and local officials)

**Gender aspect:** Women excluded from dialogues about water. More vulnerable to middlemen
Sub-national operational Level: Mid-level Water Managers

Sub-categories: Utility operators, private contractors, regional and local authorities

- **Tendering and Procurement**: Preferential treatment of contractors & inflated prices due to closed culture based on patronage networks
- **Human Resources Management**: Nepotism in recruitment processes leading to appointment of non-qualified personnel. Overstaffing, poor working moral of staff, and lack of job descriptions
- **Poor Performance**: Poor customer services relations, lack of accountability, poor coordination between government bodies
- **Unclear and non-transparent budgeting and planning**: Budget allocation, budget management, and feasibility studies
- **Political capture of administrative processes**

**Gender aspect**: Women working in these institutions are sometimes not taken seriously, hence their work, ideas, and contributions are overlooked or downplayed.
National Level: Public Officials

Sub-categories: Regulators, Planning, Controllers, Anti-corruption professionals

- Same risks as for mid-level water managers
- Poor vertical coordination within government bodies, and horizontally between government bodies
Higher-level decision makers

Sub-categories: MPs, Director Generals of line ministries, Heads of Anti-corruption Agencies, Auditor General etc

- Lack of transparency and participation in formulating policies
- Unclear basis for allocation of water rights between different uses
- Weak monitoring: Of legislations implementation and weak inspectorates
- Patronage: Policy capture, bribing of communities/regions to get popularity. Putting their own interests before the public interest
- Lack of knowledge on impacts of corruption: Where it occurs, impacts on public bodies and why to prevent and how to manage it

Gender aspect: Exclusion of women. The whole field remains with a few exceptions male dominated.
Conclusions: MENA water integrity risks

• The MENA region faces water integrity risks at multiple levels which undermines effective water governance, e.g. implementation of laws and policies, enforcement of regulations, equitable service provision and empowerment of women.

• Integrity risks also impede foreign investments in water infrastructure, including PPPs.

• Water integrity risks need to be openly acknowledged as being problematic and addressed accordingly in water reforms.
Conclusions

- Corruption in water underpins lack of water reform implementation.

- The concept of water integrity offers a constructive and pragmatic way to work with anti-corruption.

- The TAP approach is a pathway for improved water integrity.

- Working at different scales (local-national-regional) is useful to build momentum and to create a “safer space” for dialogues.
Future research orientations

• What integrity measures that work and in what contexts

• What is the role of gender in water integrity?

• Need to better understand how sector governance and “generic” governance measures can synergize

• The role of social pressures on minimizing corruption

• Integrative accountability: How to better develop mutually supportive measures to strengthen social accountability and horizontal accountability between government agencies
THANK YOU!
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