Water Integrity: Key to good governance

Concept Note

International Water Integrity Forum,
5-7 June 2013, Delft (The Netherlands)

"The global water crisis is a crisis of governance:
man-made, with ignorance, greed and corruption at its core" (Wangari Mathai 2008)

1 WELCOME TO THE FIRST WATER INTEGRITY FORUM

Dear participant of the first international forum on water integrity,

This background paper has the purpose to support the debates during the forum and to set the base. You, participants of the Forum, are encouraged to expand the base of our shared knowledge on water integrity to increase the pace of improving integrity in water systems.

This is a living document; together with you, we will build on this base, adding new insights, challenges, tools, instruments, and ways forward. This paper is thus only the beginning and we hope to develop the final report of the Water Integrity Forum with your input. Together we will add successes and strategies to improve integrity in the water sector and seek opportunities to get integrity on the global agenda.

2 WHY WATER INTEGRITY

How we are dealing with water will determine the world of future generations. Water is essential to all facets of life, but the 21st century started as a period of increasing water scarcity, conflicts over shared water resources, droughts and major floods in some of the most densely populated areas of the world. There is an ever increasing demand for water and the number and types of crisis and challenges are increasing. Often, water shortage is not due to shortage of water resources but due to governance failures, such as institutional fragmentation, lack of coordinated decision-making, corruption and poor practices of transparency and accountability, which results in a

Water Integrity

The core of water integrity is the **integrity of people and institutions** governing water resources, decision-making that is fair and inclusive, honest and transparent, accountable and free of corruption. The term recalls that management decisions have an ethical dimension, and that leadership needs courage as well as technical skills.

shortage of access to water. Governance systems are rarely able to prevent corruption, and some even provide incentives for unethical behaviour and poor professional practice.

Integrity issues lead to conflicts around water at local, national, and international levels. They form a major barrier to achieving global targets like the Millennium Development Goals (MDG). Population increase, globalization, urbanization and new insights into the long-term consequences of environmental changes question traditional approaches to water management and aggravate the impacts of corruption (see box: Rising Stakes). Improving water governance requires improving water integrity where specifically strengthening the aspects of transparency, accountability, and participation (TAP) is crucial. Massive investments and aid flowing into the water sector makes it highly vulnerable to corruption. Stakeholders need to come together and bring water integrity principles into international water discourses, political and development processes like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG), World Water Week, World Water Forum, and in the agenda of UN agencies, governments and donors. It requires evidence based knowledge, strong alliances, good tools and institutional changes to enhance integrity.

To extend the base and increase the pace to tackle corruption and promote integrity through co-operative approaches, the Water Integrity Network (WIN), UNESCO-IHE, and the Water Governance Centre have come together to jointly organize the 1st Water Integrity Forum. The forum aims to bring the knowledge and experience of different water sector stakeholders together, to take stock, share tools, make space for new innovative methods to fight corruption, and to build alliances to address the integrity challenge beyond the Forum.

3 INTEGRITY CHALLENGES IN THE WATER SECTOR

The term integrity, derived from the Latin word for ‘whole’, implies wholeness and consistency, a state according to a high (moral) standard. The importance of personal integrity of people and institutions governing water is widely acknowledged and enshrined in concepts such as good governance or social accountability. Corruption, the ‘abuse of entrusted power for private gain’ [1–4], is the antonym and opposite of integrity. Frequent corruption scandals in the water sector across all regions of the world are the most obvious indicator for the need to improve integrity. Corruption is pervasive and affects all aspects of the water sector - from water resources management to drinking water services, irrigation, hydropower, and natural disaster response. Corruption is not a water-specific issue, but in the water sector, the impacts are often felt by the most vulnerable members of society.

The water sector is vulnerable to corruption, in part because of particular traits of the water sector. Public utilities supply water in local or regional monopolies that are easily exploited. Water management is capital-intensive and large infrastructure, irrigation or dam projects are complex, making procurement manipulation lucrative and difficult to detect. Decision-making in the water sector is dispersed across many political and administrative jurisdictions and defies legal and institutional classification. This allows loopholes to be exploited rampantly. Clientelism and kickbacks in contracting are common in all water sectors around the world. Studies suggest that corruption decreases efficiency of African utilities by more than 60%. In one Latin American case the cost of a

hydropower project increased almost fivefold. Especially in developing countries and emerging economies, private water supply is heavily affected by rigged water metering, illegal wells and connections, 'speed-money' for services, site selection of bore-wells in favour of local elites, bribery at the irrigation point and for water releases. Regulation protecting the environment, a vulnerable social group is hardly enforced. At national levels political and economic elites can capture policy development processes and national investment schemes in infra-structure.

Water shortage by corrupt systems

In many cities of the south informal arrangements are in place for drinking water supply. For example in many Indian cities, water tankers sell water to the poor in informal settlements. This water comes at a high price. It has been found that many of the owners of these tankers are local politicians. Water shortage is many times created by the collusion of water utilities, local politicians, and *water mafia*. In the town of Baramati, 90 % of the water tankers are owned by politicians. During the dry season, they make major profits.

Source: Pangare *et al.* (2006).

The exact costs and impacts of corruption remain estimates. Corruption and integrity issues remain the least systematically addressed governance challenge. International agencies like the UNDP considers integrity in the water sector a core ingredient for implementing anti-corruption measures and improving governance [5].The significant negative impacts of corruption on economic performance, growth and human development is treated as a tenet and control of corruption a core indicator for good governance [7], [8]. But in empirical tests the correlations remain remarkably unclear, a contradiction that resulted in the now discredited notion that corruption might actually contribute to growth by overcoming government inefficiencies [9–11]. Surveys point to the high direct cost of petty corruption, with households and firms spending an estimated 0.6-1.5 trillion USD per year in developing countries alone – but they also find that individuals overestimate the value of payments by up to 15 times [12].

Within the water sector, integrity is compromised in various water management and governance processes across the sector (see table 1). In many countries there is increasing water demands by and competition between different water users (agriculture, industry, mining, hydropower, tourism, households etc.) and this gives an opportunity for corruption to thrive. The mechanisms of corruption are, however, very complex and do not always fit stereotypical images of corrupt elites. Studies showed that the poor seek to manipulate water bills as much as the rich [13], and private companies successfully enforced strict anti-corruption measures in large infrastructure projects [14].

Process	Public-Public	Public-Private	Public-Consumer
Policy making & regulation	▪ Policy & regulatory capture on Water Resource Management ▪ Collusion for cover-up	▪ Bribery for water permits, Environmental Impact Assessment or pollution cover up	▪ Bribe to silence public protests
Planning & budgeting	▪ Distortions in decision on locations, priorities ▪ Diversion of funds ▪ Falsification of budget	▪ Bribe to influence fund allocation	▪ Denied access to project plan, budget amount
Tendering & procurement	▪ Cover up, collusion, favouritism in procurement processes	▪ Kickbacks to influence or secure contracts ▪ Collusion for inferior material supply	▪ Distorted information shared about bidding process
Construction phase	▪ Approve poor quality construction	▪ Not building to specifications ▪ False invoicing ▪ Underpayment of labour	▪ Corruption in community based construction projects
Operation & maintenance	▪ Ignoring Operation &Maintenance (O&M)	▪ False documents to show O&M undertaken	▪ Bribe for illegal connections

Table 1 Integrity issues across processes in the water sector

Water management affects many development areas, such as health, agriculture, disaster risk reduction, hydropower, tourism and many more. Poverty reduction is at jeopardy when financial resources “leaks” out of government budgets. Bureaucratic corruption creates economic inefficiencies, ranging from poor provision of services, bad public investments and non-collection of state revenues, to waste of skills as talented people make corrupt rent-seeking their profession. Corruption increases investment risks and makes it harder to raise much required public and private financial resources for better water services and management. The African Union (2002) estimated corruption in all sectors costs African economies in excess of USD 148 billion a year. This figure represents 25% of Africa's GDP and thought to increase the cost of goods by as much as 20%. According to the Global Corruption Report (2008), 25% of all water investments – about 50 billion dollar - are lost to corruption every year. Citizens bear the direct cost of paying bribes, but also indirect cost of substandard services ranging from minor nuisances to loss of life when e.g. infrastructure and disaster response is affected. Poor and disenfranchised are resettled without compensation to accommodate profitable projects. Impacts of corruption are much broader than on economic growth and service delivery. It undermines social capital and trust, human and democratic rights and the rule of law.

Apart from the traditional domains of water supply, newer integrity challenges have become more visible over the last decade. Corruption in land management, flood prevention and disaster management, climate change mitigation led to huge losses in life and livelihoods. Ineffective regulation leads to overuse of valuable water-based resources from fisheries to irrigation, threatening food security of a growing population. The integrity of water bodies is deeply affected where corruption fuels over-abstraction of water and water pollution leading to eco-system and livelihood losses. The environment and biodiversity is a stakeholder has no voice, and environmental damage is often caused by 'turning a blind eye' to breaks of regulations because it cannot protest. Water sources deteriorate due to rigged water meters and readings, illegal water connections, site selection of bore-wells in favour of local elites, bribery at the irrigation point and for water releases, and lax control of pollution and water abstractions of private companies and public utilities. In environmental and ecological communities, the term 'water integrity' usually describes the state of water systems, from rivers to aquifers to wetlands. High level advocacy groups like the InterAction Council promote water integrity as safeguarding productive aquatic ecosystems that provide livelihoods, protection against natural disasters, and other life-sustaining services mankind depends on [6]. Rising water demands present myriad challenges including a rethinking the infrastructure of the future, maximizing water efficiency in agriculture and industry, treating wastewater as a resource and using information technology for more effective water management.

Rising stakes

Water-food-energy

- 70% of the world's water for food and biofuel
- Global food demand to double in 20 years

Climate change

- 100 billion USD at stake by 2020, post Copenhagen Accord 2009

Water & land grabbing

- Between 445 million to 1.7 billion ha of land identified for agricultural investments (WB 2010)

Water Security, conflicts & disasters

- 276 major transboundary watersheds crosses 145 countries (UN Water 2013)
- 90 % of natural disaster deaths from 1990-2000 were water related (UN Water 2013)

4 EXPANDING THE BASE:

Over the past two decades, public awareness increased on the impacts of corruption on water governance. The Water Integrity Network (WIN) was formed in 2006 to specifically support anti-corruption activities in the water sector worldwide, by forging coalitions and partnerships that can take action in ways that individuals or single organisations cannot. Since the establishment of WIN, the need for addressing the corruption problem in the water sector has made major international and national headway. The 2008 Global Corruption Report on Water was a milestone to build global awareness on how corruption plays out and impacts the development of water resources management; water supply and sanitation; water for food; and water for energy.

There is wide agreement that without increased advocacy to stop corruption in water sectors, there will be high costs to economic and human development, the destruction of vital ecosystems, and the fuelling of social tension over this essential resource. Meeting the challenges and providing such

advocacy needs broad collaboration. Water professionals in many societies face a vicious cycle of corruptions breeding corruption, as integrity and cooperation is undermined and penalized by powerful elites. Refusing to participate in wide-spread corruption can even lead to social exclusion [15] [16]. No actor can facilitate change alone.

Institutional fragmentation and unclear division of roles and responsibilities contributes to non-transparency and fosters corruption – including fragmentation of donor programs and Water Management networks. Donor funds are a rich bounty for corrupt officials, and anecdotal evidence reports embezzlement rates of 90% and more. Since a competitive fundraising environment demands quick success stories, donor agencies have systemic incentives to value working relationships with corrupt partners over transparency [17]. Recently, huge sums involved in schemes monetizing the value of ecosystem services have drawn attention to verification problems, power concentrations and increased institutional complexity providing opportunities for large-scale corruption [18–21]. A major drive is needed to promote integrity in the design of such schemes. But competition and thematic specialization of international agencies, organizations and NGOs means that water management schemes and anti-corruption or integrity schemes are often promoted separately – projects by different units of the same donor agency may well have contradictory objectives [22]. The degradation of environmental systems sustaining the livelihood of people is usually not included in calculations of the cost of corruption [3], [21], [23], [24]. In similar fashion, water resource management frameworks often mention corruption only in vague terms if at all.

2013 is the international year of water cooperation, overcoming the divides between the many organizations is of crucial importance for water integrity. Expanding the base by forming a strong alliance of the existing actors is a necessary first step to promote water integrity. Finding a common language and developing a common understanding of water integrity is a key concern of the first Water Integrity Forum. The complexity of multiple geographical and institutional levels typical of water sub-sectors makes coalitions essential. Integrated Water Resource Management enshrines the principle that effective and sustainable water management has to integrate all water sectors and users, and reach across all related policy domains. Yet, in practice the paradigm is rarely fully implemented, especially environmental governance and hydrological communities remain deeply divided [25]. Inconsistent and fragmented water management threatens water integrity and sustainability, and water integrity can only be achieved when it reaches across the entire water management spectrum. Extending the base means to overcome the current fragmented state, come together to learn from each other, and systematically integrate and reach out to underserved sectors. It will require a multi-stakeholder approach to abate corruption, and safeguard the integrity of governance systems and water systems alike. The Water Integrity Forum is an important step in making the case for water integrity, clarifying the various roles different stakeholders can play. Who can do what to promote water integrity?

5 INCREASING THE PACE

"Necessity might be the mother of invention,
but calamity is the test of integrity" (Samuel Richardson)

The importance of good governance for sustainable development has been recognized and increasingly advocated over the past two decades. Effective corruption control forms a core element of this strategy. Many governments and other stakeholders have put in place anti-corruption commissions, ratified international and regional conventions, strengthened national legislation and put more emphasis on general audit functions. Experiences suggest that these responses have not been sufficient in making much required change, though in many cases measures are too new for a qualified assessment of their impact [26]. In several countries there have been specific laws, policies, reforms, processes or organisations formed to promote integrity and accountability in public and private decision-making and water resource and services management. For example, at the sub-regional level a number of SADC countries have either signed or ratified the SADC Protocol Against Corruption. The importance of improved governance and anti-corruption is also firmly embedded in the NEPAD context. Moreover, most African countries have committed to the African Union Convention on Preventing and Combating Corruption and Related Offences as well as many ACP countries have committed to the United Nations Convention Against Corruption.

These conventions, as well as general laws, policies, reforms, processes and organisations, provide an enabling environment for countering corruption and promoting integrity, transparency and accountability (TAP, see box) in the water sector specifically. Undertaking diagnostic and forensic scans using appropriate tools help identify the hotspots of corruption. After diagnosis, appropriate interventions are needed at policy, legal, institutional and management level to curb corruption. Lessons have already been learnt, tools have already been tested and applied and policies, rules and changes in institutional mechanism have been undertaken. Some examples include strengthening procurement systems, consumer redress and influence, increasing accountability and transparency in water projects, public expenditure tracking, strengthening capacities and awareness among water managers, regulators, and decision-makers. Uganda has made a water integrity risk assessment and developed a Good Water Governance Group and a national action plan to reduce corruption in the water sector. Many other measures are in place or underway: Water Watch Groups contribute to monitoring of water services in Zambia; In South Africa telephone hotlines are in

TAP

Transparency refers to citizens' rights to access information. This makes citizens knowledgeable about the standards to expect from public officials and enables them to protect their rights.

Accountability is a mechanism to hold people and institutions accountable; adhering to implementation of set rules and standards. An individual in a public function or institution must answer for their actions and includes political, administrative, and financial dimensions.

Participation entails anyone affected by a decision should, have the chance of intervening in and influencing such decisions; it fosters ownership as decisions are increasingly accepted and implemented jointly.

place for consumer redress related to corruption and mismanagement. In some African countries the judiciary has started to play a crucial role. Courts in both Kenya and Tanzania ruled against inefficient and polluting public companies, interpreting a constitutional right to life as a right to clean air and water [27].

But the current pace of progress is not sufficient to solve the water crisis. Global water governance has to find answers to multiple challenges at the same time. Water demand is increasing due to population growth, economic development and changing consumption patterns. At the same time, unsustainable levels of past water harvesting, changing weather patterns, and pollution and salinization of water sources create water stress in ever more regions. Populations are ever more concentrated in cities, often situated in former floodplains of rivers and in coastal zones. At the same time, climate change and the destruction of natural protections expose such populations to more and more extreme weather events and natural disasters, storms, floods, droughts, and rising sea levels. Substantial means are needed to meet today's challenges and water management targets enshrined in the MDGs. At the same time, the degradation of valuable water bodies and the loss of productive aquatic ecosystems are continuing unabated. Even bigger efforts will be need to solve the challenges of the future. Improving water integrity emphasizes the need for holistic and systemic changes, increasing resilience and adaptability of water management systems, and a stronger focus on preventive measures and transparency, accountability and participation.

However, it is critical to promote evidence based water integrity measures. Policy frameworks for natural resources management, as well as anti-corruption programmes, have a history of unintended side-effects, undermining livelihoods, criminalizing the rural poor, and even aggravating environmental impacts [19], [23], [28], [29] Identifying the right mechanisms to target anti-corruption measures and integrating them into natural resource management is, therefore, highly relevant. Existing successful interventions are often pilot projects and isolated efforts. The rules of statistics alone determine that the biggest successes will always be recorded in small-scale projects, a fact that is often forgotten when interventions are scaled up. Measures to curb corruption in other sectors do not always apply to water management, especially when environmental damage is considered in the equation. Decreasing the discretionary powers of officials reduces room for corruption, but policies for highly complex environmental dynamics require flexibility and adaptiveness [30], [31]. Penalties that account for social as well as environmental damage of violations increase the incentive for corruption. Prosecution of environmental offenses is generally difficult, so enforcers of legal measures often have little prospect of success, while violators have incentives to bribe their way out of sanction.

International targets resulted from the 6th World Water Forum in relation to good governance and integrity

By 2018, 30 countries will have committed to promote integrity in the water sector, diagnose/map existing or potential corruption risks, and ensure that anti-corruption policies are well implemented and effective.

By 2018, 30 countries will be implementing: transparent water budget processes, including information about water infrastructure investment planning and implementation (financial, technical, and socioeconomic impacts); and methods and tools for improving transparency and accountability within the water sector.

By 2015, 50% countries will have strengthened regulatory frameworks and adopted performance indicators (service delivery) to monitor and evaluate water policies; and all countries will have put in place capacity-building processes at national and local level to foster good governance in service delivery. By 2018, all countries will have done so.

Increasing capacity, credibility and professionalization of enforcement agencies is widely promoted, but requires complex protocols, information management, and documentation of activities [32]. In many developing countries, even the most basic means for monitoring might be absent; studies found prosecutors who failed to understand the concept of environmental damage [33]. International conventions against corruption are creating controversy with provisions that require massive investments resulting in high aid dependency [1], [5], [34]. Donor agencies implementing water projects consider corruption solely an external risk factor, seemingly assuming that the integrity of their own activities is given and has no impact on the environment they are operating in [35]. Transparency International's 2010 evaluation of the OECD Anti-Bribery Convention found that only seven of the 38 countries party to the convention actively en- forced their domestic laws to criminalize the bribery of foreign public officials, nine made some efforts, 20 little or no effort at all.

Increasing the pace on water integrity requires not only specific capacity development, but also streamlining integrity in governance frameworks, supporting the up scaling of successful programs, and providing tools to do so. This Water Integrity Forum provides strategic opportunities to make in-roads into major development processes, such as the post-2015 UN development agenda (Sustainable Development Goals, SDGs). This emerging framework is expected to guide development priorities for many years to come. Initiatives have been started both to make the water-related goals more coherent [36], and to include good governance as a potential goal in its own right [37]. The Water Integrity community has to engage with both debates to be effective. The Forum also provides opportunity to advance the water integrity objectives and targets set at the World Water Forum 2012, and the resulting OECD Initiative on Water Governance. The Forum will provide a stepping-stone towards following up on the objectives at the next WWF 2015.

6 WORKSTREAMS & THE FORUM

6.1 Work Stream 1: Water, Food, Energy

The water, food, and energy sectors are intrinsically linked to each other, which means that water, food and energy security issues cannot be addressed in silos (Bonn2011 Conference: The Water, Energy & Food Security Nexus). In a fast-developing and urbanizing world that also is burdened by climate change impacts, the demands on water, food and energy are increasingly competing. This growing competition makes our natural resources scarcer and more valuable, which in turn increases opportunities for corruption to thrive. Therefore, there is a need to address aspects of transparency and integrity as a crosscutting domain of water, food, and energy. The governance mechanisms in the three sectors have their own distinct institutional and functional dynamics and there is a need to develop synergies among the three sectors.

At present more than two thirds of global freshwater withdrawal is used for agriculture and biofuels [1]. In most river basins, the capacity to tap additional water is limited [2]. At the same time, it is estimated that global food demand will double by 2030 as result of a continuously growing population and dietary changes, particularly in India and China [3]. Combined with a shift from fossil fuels to biofuels and an increase in energy demand, this puts additional pressure on the allocation of our limited freshwater resources. It has been estimated that 75 per cent of the increase in food prices from 2002–2008 was due to competing demands on land and water resources for biofuel production [4]. Incidents of water pollution are also increasingly common, and the lack of integrity in pollution control is another major concern. Uncontrolled use of pesticides and fertilisers, poor soil management, biological contamination from livestock farming and waste discharge from cities and industries are deteriorating the water quality. Multi-purpose dams, hydropower and irrigation projects are often seen as prone to both large-scale and petty corruption and are a threat to the livelihoods of communities. They however can be part of the solution that ensures water food and energy security benefitting different stakeholders under the appropriate conditions.

6.2 Work Stream 2: Water resource management in river basins

River basins by definition have a large scale, multiple uses; represent many people with different cultures and a variety of interests, river basins cross jurisdictional boundaries and management strategies. Decision-making is dispersed over many institutions, across different sectors (water, agriculture, nature, energy, rural development, finances, security, etc.), at different levels and scales (from international to local), and spill over to many implementation (line) agencies. Decision-making is often fragmented and policies often lack coherence. Implementation organizations sometimes lack capacity to (fully) implement and enforce policies and regulations. Large amounts of public and private money flow to operation and maintenance of river systems. The complexity of river basin governance and management makes it susceptible for corrupt behaviour. Combined with a lack of transparency and accountability in governance and management systems, unsustainable management of river basins is aggravated [4, 21, 39]. River basins are faced with many integrity challenges, including procurement and contracting of (large-scale)infrastructure, coordinating the cooperation of multiple actors across several policy levels, and growing demand for (scarce) water resources (both surface and groundwater) to be allocated to different users and uses.

In transboundary rivers, issues of national integrity, power, and sovereignty play a role in international co-management and collaboration for the sustainable management of water resources. At all levels asymmetrical power balances can be observed, between different actors and uses in the governance networks (causing the environment being often the weakest *actor* in decision-making). Integrated river basin management also needs to address the question of land uses and spatial development (zoning). Upstream water supply (catchment), land and water uses have downstream implications. Downstream demands, often because of the presence of big cities, ports and large populations, are at the same time impacting upstream areas. Companies believing in water stewardship and social responsibility propose global and local water tools, but do not sufficiently look at issues through the water integrity lens. Government institutions are lacking capacities and cannot ensure regulatory oversight in an effective way. Hence, the phenomenon of corruption continues to hamper effectiveness of the river basin approach to land and water management in the absence of effective monitoring and accountability systems.

Impact of awareness campaigns and legal recourse [39]

Authorities in Sri Lanka were finding it difficult to handle the problem of illegal sand mining of a river basin that falls under different districts. Monitoring and enforcement was rendered ineffective due to fragmentation of responsibilities. Sand mining started to affect the water table, resulting in people filing public interest litigations (PIL). Civil society, consisting of the Sri Lanka Water Partnership (SLWP), and other organisations, initiated campaigns against illegal sand mining in 2008 which led to awareness creation among the police force authorised to stop illegal mining. Due to the combination of campaigns, legal route, and collaboration with authorities, the court banned sand mining in two rivers, and 30 illegal sand miners have been arrested (Ratnayake 2012).

Over the last decade, to take into account the variety of actors and interests linked to water and river basins, Integrated Water Resource Management (IWRM) is being gradually introduced as an effective way of managing rivers, their basins, allocation of resources among users and to resolve conflicts. Currently, while some positive trends can be observed, water integrity as part of the solution to water security and equitable access is often either neglected or not systematically factored into the formulation and implementation of river basin management plans. In instances when the integrity principles have been considered an important component of river basin management, it has led to better management, stronger institutions and more satisfied stakeholders [38].

6.3 Work Stream 3: Rural water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH)

Access to safe water supply, proper sanitation, and good hygiene are the basics for a healthy life. Still, many (rural) poor communities lack access to basic safe and sustainable water and sanitation services and therefore the means to apply hygiene practices. Progress towards MDG 7 for water and sanitation is especially lacking in sub-Saharan Africa. The Global Corruption Report [4] showed that the WASH sector needs to confront corruption issues in regulation, services delivery, and infrastructure development (see table: Some practical actions). Action research projects such as WASH-Cost and Triple-S have shown that transparency, accountability and lack of effective participation inhibit sustainability and result in huge investment losses called slippage. Lessons learnt need to be brought to scale, but vested interests and wilful malpractice impede this in many circumstances. Public awareness, access to information and transparency on sector performance is vital for people and civil society to hold governments and possibly private service providers accountable. WIN and partners have gained experience in diagnosing integrity risks as a basis for local and national action plans for good governance in the water and sanitation sector. Unfortunately such plans tend to be slow in implementation and a specific anti-corruption focus is often diluted or ineffective because addressing corruption is a sensitive issue at best, a cultural taboo in general, and a no-go zone at worst.

Some practical actions:

Corruption in water supply and sanitation services can be reduced by:

- Keep technology and design simple, practical and relevant
- Clarify information, plans, designs, reports and accounts.
- Make them understandable for all stakeholders
- Simplify approval procedures so that they can be easily understood and monitored
- Participation is not a silver bullet, but do include people (rich and poor) in

When applying these to the rural WASH sector, it is clear that these targets are too modest to meet the needs of the un-served poor. Also, there might be a need for a different paradigm with emphasis on better planning, management and monitoring at the local level and an emphasis on effective service delivery rather than investments in new coverage per-se. The session will specifically focus on enhancing integrity to improve livelihoods of rural communities. More specifically the partners co-convening the session are focussing on water and human rights, integrity and gender issues.

6.4 Work Stream 4: Integrated Urban Water Management and Services

This Work Stream focuses on integrity and sustainability issues in terms of managing dynamic situations and tremendous challenges of growing urbanization. By 2025, half of the world's population is expected to live in cities of one million or more citizens, especially in the global South, raising new integrity issues related to drinking water and sanitation services, pollution and over-extraction of surface as well as ground water, disaster management and the impacts of climate change, as well as the reuse of untreated industrial waste water for (peri-) urban agriculture. Many

big cities are located on river banks and in coastal zones, where speculative land-grabs and uncontrolled urban sprawl encroach on highly productive ecosystems and natural buffer zones against natural disasters. In reverse, cities in river deltas bear the rising costs of bad water governance in the upstream *hinterland*. Water integrity concerns, therefore, the currently urbanised areas, their zone of impact, as well as the water sheds on which they depend.

Currently, integrated urban water management via projects like SWITCH is advocated to sustainably manage the complex interconnections and interdependencies between urban planning, resource management, and service delivery within the urban area. Land use regulations are not easily applicable due to absence of a coherent land use plan and urban development strategies, as well as to fast expanding informal settlements connected to fast rural-urban migration. Technical engineering solutions are considered insufficient to fulfil all water demands, raising the prospect of distribution conflicts and water inequality. And cities concentrate political and economic power and institutions, providing them with great potential to either threaten or promote Water Integrity.

6.5 Work Stream 5 and 6: tools

Though it is incomprehensible to quantify corruption, tools have been developed for the purposes of assessment, diagnostics, risk mitigation and capacity development in relation to corruption and integrity. Tool is defined as any research methodology whose primary aim is to identify the extent of risks in a given context (Transparency International). Tools range from ready to use methodologies and guidelines, to one-off assessments whose methodology can be replicated. In relation to integrity, diagnostics help to understand and assess integrity and corruption levels while risk mitigation ensures taking early measures to address specific integrity gaps and weaknesses of institutions.

Different organizations have developed different tools (see box: Some tools for improving integrity). These tools are designed to assess and diagnose integrity and corruption in the private and/or public sector. There are also tools designed to support the public and civil society to be able to assess integrity and corruption and to raise their voice and support citizen's action and participation. The Annotated Water Integrity Scan (AWIS) is one tool that helps in undertaking a scan on integrity risks in the water sector through an open deliberation among different stakeholder groups. There are probably gaps in assessment tools and this work stream can identify these gaps, and seek possible solutions.

At the water integrity forum, there are two work streams dedicated to tools.

Work Stream 5 -Tools to diagnose and assess integrity takes stock of available tools to diagnose

Some tools for improving integrity

- Annotated Water Integrity Scan
- Integrity Pact
- ICT tools-FLOW, WMTI, Ugatuzi, AKVO Market Place
- Irrigation and agriculture-MASSCOTTE, AQUASTAT
- Business Principles for Countering Bribery (TI); Integrity Management Toolbox (cewas-WIN), Benchmarking WATSAN utilities (WB)
- Civil Society Procurement Monitoring (CSPM) Tool, Citizen Report Cards
- Tool Resources-Water Integrity Space (http://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/integrityspace); Gateway toolbox (http://gateway.transparency.org/)

and assess (water) integrity, shares approaches of experiences and best practices of applying tools to assess and diagnose integrity, including the possibilities of ICT, social media and smart phones.

Work Stream 6 - Tools to improve, build and monitor integrity takes stock of available tools to monitor and improve (water) integrity like monitoring public procurement processes, and shares approaches of experiences and best practices of applying tools to monitor and improve integrity. It aims to identify ways forward to develop and implement tools to monitor and improve integrity and to build alliances for further knowledge sharing and promoting the development and implementation of tools to monitor and improve integrity.

6.6 Work Stream 7: Processes to scale up integrity

The process to scale up integrity has the goal to institutionalise integrity at all levels of society (local to international) and across all sub-sectors. Lessons learned from the previous work streams will be transferred to the session in this work stream to support the process of scaling-up. Curbing corruption requires efforts that cannot be undertaken by a single organisation and not even by a specific group of organisations. To put a stop to corruption in the water sector we have to scale-up action through partnerships and anchor integrity in all relevant policies and organisations that have a stake in the water sector. Only if integrity is considered a core responsibility for the entire water sector we will be able to prevent corruption across the sector effectively.

Hence the objective of work stream 7 is to further create commitment and establish and support alliances and programs on water integrity.

7 REFERENCES

[1] S. Andersson and P. M. Heywood, “The Politics of Perception: Use and Abuse of Transparency International’s Approach to Measuring Corruption,” *Political Studies*, vol. 57, no. 4, pp. 746–767, Dec. 2009.

[2] A. Sundström, “Corruption and regulatory compliance: Experimental findings from South African small-scale fisheries,” *Marine Policy*, vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1255–1264, Nov. 2012.

[3] J. C. Andvig, O.-H. Fjeldstad, T. Sissener, and T. Søreide, “Research on Corruption: A policy oriented survey,” NORAD/CMI/NUPI, Oslo, 2000.

[4] Transparency International, *Global Corruption Report 2008: Corruption in the Water Sector*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

[5] J. Vos, “Fighting Corruption in the Water Sector: Methods, Tools and Good Practices,” UNDP, New York, 2011.

[6] H. Bigas, Ed., *The Global Water Crisis: Addressing an Urgent Security Issue*. Hamilton: UNU-INWEH, 2012.

[7] V. Thomas, M. Dailami, A. Dhareshwar, D. Kaufmann, N. Kishor, R. Lopez, and Y. Wang, *The Quality of Growth*. New York: Oxford University Press/The World Bank, 2000.

[8] D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay, and M. Mastruzzi, “Governance Matters IV: Governance Indicators for 1996-2004,” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, vol. No. 3630, 2005.

[9] K. Blackburn and G. F. Forgues-Puccio, “Why is corruption less harmful in some countries than in others?,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 72, pp. 797–810, 2009.

[10] P. Keefer, “A review of the political economy of governance: From property rights to voice,” *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper*, vol. No. 3315, 2004.

[11] M. Paldam, “The cross-country pattern of corruption: economics, culture and the seesaw dynamics,” *European Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 215–240, Jun. 2002.

[12] G. R. G. Clarke, “How Petty is Petty Corruption? Evidence from Firm Surveys in Africa,” *World Development*, vol. 39, no. 7, pp. 1122–1132, Jul. 2011.

[13] A. N. Asthana, “Decentralisation and corruption: evidence from drinking water sector,” *Public Administration and Development*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 181–189, Aug. 2008.

[14] J. Mullins and T. Rhodes, “Managing Ethically in Corrupt Environments,” *Business Strategy Review*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 50–55, Dec. 2011.

[15] M. A. Guerrero and E. Rodríguez-Oreggia, “On the individual decisions to commit corruption: A methodological complement,” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 357–372, Feb. 2008.

[16] B. Dong, U. Dulleck, and B. Torgler, “Conditional corruption,” *Journal of Economic Psychology*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp. 609–627, Jun. 2012.

[17] A. Standing, “Corruption and REDD+: Identifying risks amid complexity,” *U4 Brief*, vol. 2012, no. 2, May 2012.

[18] Transparency International, *Annual Report 2011*. Berlin: Transparency International, 2012.

[19] A. P. Kinzig, C. Perrings, F. S. Chapin, S. Polasky, V. K. Smith, D. Tilman, and B. L. Turner, “Paying for ecosystem services--promise and peril.,” *Science*, vol. 334, pp. 603–4, Nov. 2011.

[20] R. Véron and G. Fehr, “State power and protected areas : Dynamics and contradictions of forest conservation in Madhya Pradesh, India,” *Political Geography*, vol. 30, no. 5, pp. 282–293, 2011.

[21] P. Stålgren, “Corruption in the Water Sector: Causes, Consequences and Potential Reform,” *Swedish Water House Policy Brief*, vol. 4, 2006.

[22] H. Shiroyama, M. Yarime, M. Matsuo, H. Schroeder, R. Scholz, and A. E. Ulrich, “Governance for sustainability: knowledge integration and multi-actor dimensions in risk management,” *Sustainability Science*, vol. 7, no. S1, pp. 45–55, Jan. 2012.

[23] A. W. Goudie and D. Stasavage, “A framework for the analysis of corruption,” *Crime, Law and Social Change*, vol. 29, pp. 113–159, 1998.

[24] The World Bank, *Conflict, Security, and Development (World Development Report 2011)*. Washington D.C.: The World Bank, 2011.

[25] C. Pahl-Wostl, P. Jeffrey, N. Isendahl, and M. Brugnach, “Maturing the New Water Management Paradigm: Progressing from Aspiration to Practice,” *Water Resources Management*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 837–856, Nov. 2010.

[26] F. Anechiarico, “Protecting integrity at the local level: the role of anticorruption and public management networks,” *Crime, Law and Social Change*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 79–95, Aug. 2009.

[27] P. Kameri-Mbote and C. Odote, “Courts as champions of sustainable development: Lessons from East Africa,” *Sustainable Development Law & Policy*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 31–38, 2009.

[28] H. H. G. Savenije and P. Van der Zaag, “Integrated water resources management: Concepts and issues,” *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth*, vol. 33, pp. 290–297, Jan. 2008.

[29] E. Ostrom, T. Dietz, N. Dolšak, P. C. Stern, S. Stonich, and E. U. Weber, Eds., *The Drama of the Commons*. Washington D.C.: National Academies Press, 2002.

[30] C. Pahl-Wostl, “The implications of complexity for integrated resources management,” *Environmental Modelling & Software*, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 561–569, May 2007.

[31] T. Bernauer, “Explaining success and failure in international river management,” *Aquatic Sciences*, vol. 64, pp. 1–19, 2002.

[32] W. Klein, “Minimum Criteria for a Professional Environmental Process,” in *7th International Conference on Environmental Compliance and Enforcement, Marrakech, Marocco, 9-15 April 2005*, 2005, pp. 95–101.

[33] M. P. Panjer, T. S. Greenberg, and W. B. Magrath, “Justice for Forests: Improving Criminal Justice Efforts to Combat Illegal Logging,” The World Bank, Washington D.C., 2012.

[34] Commonwealth Secretariat, “Strategies To Combat Corruption,” *Journal of Commonwealth Law and Legal Education*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 151–162, Oct. 2008.

[35] K. Örtengren, *The logical framework approach - A summary of the theory behind the LFA method*, vol. 12, no. 2. Stockholm: SIDA, 2004.

[36] UN-Water, “Water Security & the Global Water Agenda,” UNU-INWEH, 2013.

[37] UN Global Compact/World Business Council for Sustainable Development, “Joint Report to the High-Levelk Panel of the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda,” 2013.

[38] B. Das, “Enhancing Integrity to Reduce Corruption in Managing Rivers,” no. September. 2012.

[39] FAO, "The state of the world's land and water resources for food and agriculture (SOLAW) - Managing systems at risk." Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. 2011.

[40] Molle, F., P. Wester, and P. Hirsch, River Basins Development and Management, in "Water for Food, Water for Life. A comprehenseive assessment of water management in agriculture." D.J. Molden (Editor), EarthScan: London. p. 585-625. 2007.

[41] FAO, "World Agriculture Towards 2030/2050. The 2012 revision". Rome: Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations. 2012.

[42] Mitchell, D., "A note on rising food prices." World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 46822008, Washington DC: World Bank. 2008.

[43] IRC, "About corruption and transparency in the water and sanitation sector. Thematic overview paper 16", IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre. 2006.

[44] Pangare G., Pangare V. and Das B., “Springs of Life: India’s Water Resources.” World Water Institute. Academic Foundation. New Delhi. 2006