SDG Indicator 6.5.1: Survey

Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation

Reporting year: **2023**

Country	**GERMANY**

Federal Ministry
for the Environment, Nature Conservation,
Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection

Submission Form	
Date of submission	15 September 2023
National SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point information	
Name, Job title	Janine Muzau, Policy Officer
Organisation	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection
Are you the national Focal Point for any other SDG indicator (apart from 6.5.1)? **If yes, please insert 'X' for all that apply:** __6.1.1 __6.2.1 __6.3.1 __6.3.2 __6.4.1 __6.4.2 __6.5.2 __6.6.1 __6.a.1 __6.b.1 __Other SDG indicator(s) (please specify here):	
SDG 6.5.1 in-country data collection and reporting process overview	
Were other institutions/stakeholders involved and consulted in the reporting process for this indicator? _x_Yes __No *(Please provide further details on the consultation process in Annex C)*	
If yes, please indicate the mode(s) of consultation (please provide further details in Annex C): __Phone calls _x_Email exchanges __In-person meetings __Dedicated stakeholder workshop(s) __Other (please specify):	
Contact person regarding further questions/clarifications relating to this submission	
_x_SDG 6.5.1 Focal Point listed above __Other (please specify contact details here):	

Part 1 – Introduction

This is the official survey for country reporting on Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) indicator 6.5.1: "Degree of integrated water resources management (IWRM) implementation". The indicator is measured on a scale of 0 – 100, calculated based on scores from approximately 30 questions in this survey, covering different aspects of IWRM. Indicator 6.5.1 measures progress towards target 6.5: "By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate". The target supports the equitable and efficient use of water resources, which is essential for social and economic development, as well as environmental sustainability. The actions to achieve target 6.5 directly underpin the other water-related targets within SDG-6: "Ensure availability and sustainable management of water and sanitation for all". Further guidance on completing this survey is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide. Both this Survey and the Monitoring Guide are available in six UN languages (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish), and Portuguese, available on the IWRM Data Portal.

About the survey

The primary purpose of the survey is global monitoring and reporting on indicator 6.5.1. It has been designed to also be useful as a simple diagnostic tool for countries to identify strengths and weaknesses of different aspects of IWRM implementation.

The survey contains four sections, each covering a key dimension of IWRM (see definition in Annex A: Glossary):

1. **Enabling environment:** Policies, laws and plans to support IWRM implementation.
2. **Institutions and participation:** The range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions and other stakeholder groups that help to support implementation.
3. **Management instruments:** The tools and activities that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions.
4. **Financing:** Budgeting and financing for water resources development and management.

Each section has two sub-sections covering the "National" and "Other" levels. "Other" levels include sub-national, basin, local and transboundary (see Annex A - Glossary). For most "other level" questions, the score should reflect the situation in most of the basins/aquifers/jurisdictions, unless specified otherwise. For the transboundary level questions, the score should reflect the situation in the 'most important' transboundary basins / aquifers, which should ideally be coordinated with reporting under SDG indicator 6.5.2 on transboundary cooperation. It is recognised that water resources management in federal countries may be more complex due to responsibilities at different administrative levels. You may further explain any specific circumstances relating to the level of decentralization of water resources management and responsibility in your country (e.g. federal countries and other large countries) in the free text responses (see next section).

How to complete the survey

Scoring: For each question, enter a score between 0 and 100, in increments of 10.. It is not possible to omit questions[1]. The score selection is guided by descriptive text for six thresholds, which are specific to each question. If a country judges the degree of implementation to be between two thresholds, the increment of 10 between the two thresholds may be selected. The potential scores that may be given for each question are: 0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, 100.

The thresholds for each question are defined sequentially. This means that the criteria for all lower levels of implementation must be met for a country to respond that it has reached a specific level of implementation for each question. **Bold** text in the thresholds helps the reader differentiate between thresholds.

The thresholds are indicative and are meant to guide countries in choosing the most appropriate responses, i.e. selected responses should be a reasonable match, but do not have to be a perfect match, as each country is unique.

Instructions on how to calculate the overall indicator 6.5.1 score are provided in section 5.

Narrative responses: for each question, there are two free-text fields: "Status and progress" and "Way forward". The type of information that countries may find useful to consider includes:

Status and progress: e.g. refer to relevant activities/initiatives/laws/policies/plans/strategies or similar; comment on the degree of implementation as it relates to the threshold descriptions; barriers/enablers; and reflect on progress (e.g. between reporting rounds: baseline in 2017, 2nd round in 2020, and current round in 2023). Where possible, provide a brief explanation of why the score is different to the previous round, including reflecting on recent rates of implementation of relevant activities.

Way forward: e.g. already planned or recommended activities to advance implementation of that aspect of IWRM, including identifying barriers and enablers. Include draft interim target-setting for each question where appropriate (e.g. consider actions or recommendations for making progress). Any actions or recommendations provided in this field are neither binding nor comprehensive, but may be used as inputs to country planning processes.

Specific additional guidance is provided in each field for each question. Experience from previous reporting shows that the free-text responses to each question are important, as they: increase the robustness, transparency and objectivity of the indicator scores; facilitate stakeholder consensus on each question score; help countries track progress between reporting periods; and help countries to analyse what is required to reach the next threshold.

In each field, enter the narrative response by replacing "xxx". It is recommended that the guidance text is left in the free-text fields during the stakeholder consultation process, but that this guidance text is deleted before final submission.

[1] If the country judges the question to be 'not applicable', you can enter 'n/a'. However, the survey has been designed to be relevant to all countries, and an 'n/a' response is unlikely.

Climate change considerations: For five questions (1.1c, 2.1b, 2.1e, 3.1e, and 4.1b), there is an additional free text field to provide information on how relevant aspects of water resources management and climate change adaptation/mitigation are coordinated. Recognising that climate change cuts across all aspects of water resources management, considerations of climate change are also encouraged in the free text fields of all questions.

Progress and differences since previous reporting rounds

172 countries established a baseline for indicator 6.5.1 in 2017/18, with 171 countries reporting in the second round in 2020. This is the third round of data collection. Where available, countries should refer to the previous survey responses, available here: http://iwrmdataportal.unepdhi.org/country-reports. Countries are encouraged to consider progress, or lack of progress, since previous rounds, in the 'Status and progress' fields, and give reasoning for differences in scores. Countries are welcome to use and update free text responses used in previous surveys. For Word versions of previous surveys, please contact the **IWRM Help Desk: iwrmsdg651@un.org**.

The current survey version is highly comparable, though not identical, to previous versions. Some minor amendments have been made following a review process, and noteworthy changes are described in footnotes for relevant questions. A summary of changes is provided in the SDG indicator 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide.

Data collection and submission

A broad stakeholder engagement process is encouraged to complete the survey. This helps to increase stakeholder participation and ownership of water management and decision-making processes, and makes the completed survey a more robust and useful diagnostic tool for further discussions and planning. SDG 6.5.1 Focal Points are asked to fill in the Reporting Process Form in Annex C to increase transparency and stakeholder confidence in the results at all levels. The extent and mode of stakeholder engagement is up to each country, and further guidance is provided in the Monitoring Guide. Coordination with Focal Points for other SDG indicators is encouraged where feasible and relevant.[2]

The Focal Point is responsible for the Quality Assurance and formal submission of the completed survey to the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), as described in section 6 of the Monitoring Guide.

Upon request, the SDG 6.5.1 IWRM Help Desk, hosted by UNEP (iwrmsdg651@un.org) will provide support to Focal Points and colleagues on matters such as interpretation of questions and thresholds, the appropriate level of stakeholder engagement in countries, and submitting the final indicator scores.

[2] Monitoring of 6.5.1 is being done as part of the UN-Water initiative on integrated monitoring of SDG 6 (IMI-SDG6). Support is provided in collaboration with UN-Water members and partners. For a list of questions that relate to other SDG indicators (mainly in section 3), please see Annex 3 of the Monitoring Guide.

Part 2 – The survey

1 Enabling environment

This section covers the enabling environment, which is about creating the conditions that help to support the implementation of IWRM. It includes the most typical policy, legal and planning tools for IWRM[3]. Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation. **Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds**.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

1. Enabling Environment							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
1.1 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) at the national level?							
a. National water resources **policy,** or similar.		Development **not started** or not progressing.	**Exists**, but not based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by government and starting to be used by authorities to guide work.	Based on IWRM, being **used** by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.	Policy objectives consistently **achieved.**	Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Score	90						
Status and progress: EU water directives (Water Framework Directive 2000, Flood Directive 2007), basin related, all water uses and flood protection, Basin management plans and flood risk management plans every 6 years, national and transboundary, regular monitoring of implementation Water Framework Directive information about the latest reporting cycle: https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/die-wasserrahmenrichtlinie-gewaesser-in-deutschland, https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/e1fd69a6ac8a4bdbae7df4b5b9f062bb/page/Oberfl%C3%A4chengew%C3%A4sser/ Water Framework and Flood Directive reports and maps: https://www.wasserblick.net/servlet/is/1/ National Biodiversity Strategy 2007 (Federal Government) https://www.bmuv.de/fileadmin/Daten_BMU/Pools/Broschueren/nationale_strategie_biologische_vielfalt_2015_bf.pdf Information about the further development of the strategy are available here: https://www.bfn.de/neuauflage-der-nationalen-strategie-zur-biologischen-vielfalt National Sustainability Strategy 2017 (Federal Government) https://www.bundesregierung.de/resource/blob/975226/455740/59d87155d212cff2a4d62c2c4e419cb6/2017-06-20-langfassung-n-en-data.pdf?download=1 Following the National Water Dialogue, the National Water Strategy was adopted by the Federal Cabinet in March 2023. For the first time, the National Water Strategy unites water-related measures in all relevant sectors: agriculture and nature conservation, administration and transport, urban development and industry. For the first time, all stakeholders are integrated: federal, state and local authorities, the water industry and all water-using economic sectors and groups. National Water Strategy 2023 (Federal Government) https://www.bmuv.de/fileadmin/Daten_BMU/Download_PDF/Binnengewaesser/nationale_wasserstrategie_2023_en_bf.pdf							

[3] For examples of good practices of policies, laws and plans, please see the tools, case studies, and resources in the Global Water Partnership (GWP) IWRM ToolBox.

Way forward: Implementation of National Water Strategy through cooperation and coordination between different actors at different levels of governance.

b. National water resources **law(s)**.		Development **not started** or not progressing**.**	**Exists**, but not based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by government and starting to be applied by authorities.	Based on IWRM, **being applied** by the majority of relevant authorities**.**	Based on IWRM and all laws are being **applied** across the country.	Based on IWRM and all laws are **enforced** across the country, and all people and organizations are held accountable.
Score	90						

Status and progress: : Different national water acts, on federal and regional level, e.g.:
National Water Act https://www.gesetze-im-internet.de/whg_2009/
Water Discharges Act
Different ordinances on surface water, ground water, fertilizers etc. In this publication, we provide information on the structure of the German water sector, including the legal framework and the responsible bodies: https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/water-resource-management-in-germany

Way forward: New challenges will have to be taken into account in the coming years also in legislation, like the effects of climate change, e.g. water availability, less discharges in rivers affecting aquatic ecosystems, spread of invasive species.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. National integrated water resources management (IWRM) **plans**, or similar.	Development **not started** or not progressing**.**	**Being prepared**, but not approved by government.	**Approved** by government and starting to be implemented by authorities.	Being **implemented** by the majority of relevant authorities.	Plan objectives consistently **achieved**.	Objectives consistently achieved, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Score 90						

Status and progress: River basin management plans and programmes of measures according to the EU Water Framework Directive, basin related, 10 river basins, mostly international.
Integrated flood risk planning according to EU-Flood Risk Management Directive and marine protection according to EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive, both coordinated with river basin management plans.
Water Framework Directive information about the latest reporting cycle:
https://www.umweltbundesamt.de/publikationen/die-wasserrahmenrichtlinie-gewaesser-in-deutschland,
https://experience.arcgis.com/experience/e1fd69a6ac8a4bdbae7df4b5b9f062bb/page/Oberfl%C3%A4chengew%C3%A4sser/
Water Framework and Flood Directive reports and maps:
https://www.wasserblick.net/servlet/is/1/

Climate change considerations: Water is an element of the German strategy for Adaptation to climate change. Appropriate measures to respond to the impacts of climate change on the water balance are included in the National Water Strategy. The German strategy for Adaptation to climate change was adopted in 2008.
https://www.bmuv.de/download/deutsche-anpassungsstrategie-an-den-klimawandel The strategy is currently being reviewed and further developed. An important step in this process will be the development of climate adaptation targets defined by indicators.

Way forward: Repeat cycle of planning according to EU Framework Directives.

1.2 What is the status of policies, laws and plans to support IWRM at other levels?							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Sub-national[4] water resources **policies** or similar.	Score 90	Development **not started** or delayed in most sub-national jurisdictions.	**Exist** in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM.	Based on IWRM, **approved** by the majority of authorities and starting to be used to guide work.	Based on IWRM, being **used** by the majority of relevant authorities to guide work.	Based on IWRM and policy objectives consistently **achieved** by a majority of authorities.	Based on IWRM and objectives consistently achieved by all authorities, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Status and progress: Regional water acts and policies in the 16 German federal states. Model for integrated water resource management Rhine-Main: https://umwelt.hessen.de/sites/umwelt.hessen.de/files/2022-02/leitbild_irwm.pdf Adapting to climate change and hydrological extremes in the region Berlin – Brandenburg: https://www.spreewasser-n.de/en/ Basic concept for water supply in 2030 (Saxonia): https://publikationen.sachsen.de/bdb/artikel/38631 Water supply concept until 2040 (Berlin): https://www.berlin.de/sen/uvk/umwelt/wasser-und-geologie/grundwasser/wasserversorgungskonzept-bis-2040/ Drinking water supply concept of the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: https://www.regierung-mv.de/Landesregierung/lm/Umwelt/Wasser/Trinkwasserversorgung/ Water supply concept for Lower Saxony: https://www.umwelt.niedersachsen.de/startseite/themen/wasser/wasserversorgungskonzept-niedersachsen-210626.html							
Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen							
b. Basin/aquifer management plans[5] or similar, **based on IWRM**.	Score 100	Development **not started** or delayed in most basins/aquifers of national importance.	**Being prepared** for most basins/aquifers.	**Approved** in the majority of basins/aquifers and starting to be used by authorities.	Being **implemented** in the majority of basins/aquifers.	Plan objectives consistently **achieved** in majority of basins/aquifers.	Objectives consistently achieved in all basins/aquifers, and periodically **reviewed** and revised.
Status and progress: 16 federal states have established river basin management plans and programmes of measures concerning their shares of national and international river basins. Plans are updated – if needed – every six years. Regular monitoring. These plans are coordinated with flood risk planning and marine protection planning.							
Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen.							

[4] Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national policies, please answer this question by considering how national policies are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response.

[5] At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or other reasons. This question only refers to these basins/aquifers. These basins/aquifers are likely to cross administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 1.2c refers specifically to transboundary arrangements for basins/aquifers shared by countries.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Arrangements for transboundary water management.[6] Score 100	Development **not started** or not progressing.	**Being prepared** or negotiated.	Arrangements are **adopted**.	Arrangements' provisions are **partly implemented**.	Arrangements' provisions are **mostly implemented**.	The arrangements' provisions are **fully implemented**.
Status and progress: See German answers on indicator 6.5.2. Six international river basin conventions and commissions. One international cooperation (Ems) on the basis of exchange of ministerial letters. See www.iksr.org, www.meuse-maas.be, www.iksms-cipms.de, www.icpdr.org, www.ikse-mkol.de, www.mkoo.pl, www.ems-eems.de 4 bilateral commissions on mainly water bodies at the borders with The Netherlands, Poland, Czech Republic and Austria. These bilateral commissions have no secretariats and no presence on the internet. However, some results are publicly accessible, such as the annual reports of the German-Polish Border Waters Commission on the quality of German-Polish border waters: https://www.wasserblick.net/servlet/is/110115/ Cooperation with neighbouring countries on marine protection issues concerning land based sources within OSPAR (North-East Atlantic) and HELCOM (Baltic Sea).						
Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen						
d. Sub-national water resources **regulations**[7] (laws, decrees, ordinances or similar).[8] Score 100	Development **not started** or delayed in most sub-national jurisdictions.	**Exist** in most jurisdictions, but not necessarily based on IWRM**.**	Based on IWRM, **approved** in most jurisdictions, and starting to be applied by authorities in some jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM, **some** regulations **being applied** in the majority of jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM and **all regulations being applied** in the majority of jurisdictions.	Based on IWRM and all regulations being applied and **enforced** in all jurisdictions, and all people and organizations are held accountable.
Status and progress: Water acts and ordinances of the 16 German federal states. Too many to list. All available via the websites of the 16 federal states' environment ministries						
Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen						

[6] For 'transboundary' definition, see Annex A. All transboundary level questions should reflect the situation in most of the 'most important' transboundary basins/aquifers, which should be listed in the 'status and progress' field. An 'arrangement' should be a formal commitment, and may be referred to as a bilateral or multilateral agreement, treaty, convention, protocol, joint declaration, memorandum of understanding, or other arrangement between riparian countries on the management of a transboundary basin/aquifer. Arrangements may be interstate, intergovernmental, inter-ministerial, interagency or between regional authorities. They may also be entered into by sub-national entities.

[7] Sub-national includes jurisdictions not at national level, such as: states, provinces, prefectures, counties, councils, regions, or departments. In cases where there are no explicit sub-national regulations, please answer this question by considering how national regulations are being implemented at sub-national levels. Responses should consider the highest, non-national level(s) as appropriate to the country. In the status description, please explain which level(s) are included in the response.

[8] This question has replaced question 1.2d from the baseline survey instrument, which was for federal countries only.

2 Institutions and participation

This section is about the range and roles of political, social, economic and administrative institutions that support the implementation of IWRM. It includes institutional capacity and effectiveness, cross-sector coordination, stakeholder participation and gender mainstreaming. The 2030 Agenda stresses the importance of partnerships that will require public participation and creating synergies with the private sector.

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds. Please refer to the glossary for any terms that may require further explanation.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

2. Institutions and Participation							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
2.1 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at the national level?							
a. National **government authorities**[9] for leading IWRM implementation.		**No** dedicated government authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear roles and responsibilities to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[10] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Score	90						
Status and progress: Federal Government Ministries (Environment, Transport, Agriculture etc.) supported by their national agencies. Same ministries on the level of the 16 German federal states supported by agencies of the federal states. District, county and municipal water authorities. Implementation of the EU Water Framework Directive and other EU water law provides the framework for IWRM planning. River basin management plans and related programmes of measures as well as monitoring provisions are evaluated in six year cycles by the above mentioned authorities, mainly on federal states' level.							
Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen.							

[9] 'Government authorities' could be a ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.

[10] 'Capacity' in this context is that the responsible authorities should have the required knowledge and technical skills, including planning, rule-making, project management, finance, budgeting, data collection and monitoring, risk/conflict management and evaluation. Beyond having the technical capacity, authorities should also have the financial capacity to actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. Coordination between national government authorities representing **different sectors**[11] on water resources policy, planning and management. Score 80	**No information** shared between different government sectors on water policy, planning and management.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available between different sectors.	**Communication:** Information, experiences and opinions on water resources, policy, planning and management are **shared between** different sectors.	**Consultation:** Opportunities for different sectors to **take part** in water resources policy, planning and management processes.	**Collaboration:** Formal **arrangements** between different government sectors with the objective of agreeing on collective decisions on important issues and activities relating to water resources planning and management.	**Co-decisions and co-production:** Coordination through jointly agreed upon processes and power is shared between different sectors on joint policy, planning and management activities.

Status and progress: EU law is transposed jointly into national German law involving all relevant ministries/sectors. Implementation in practice requires cross sector cooperation and coordination. This happens on all relevant levels. E.g. by cooperation between environment and transport with regard to waterways, or cooperation between agriculture and environment concerning fertilizers, nutrients, pesticides. Relevant sectors/ministries/authorities are regularly involved in drafting river basin management plans and programmes of measures according to the EU Water Framework Directive. Overarching is the new National Water Strategy, which has been developed by involving all relevant stakeholders. It is a strategy of the Federal Government, i.e. supported by all Federal Ministries. https://www.bmuv.de/download/nationale-wasserstrategie-2023

Relevant sectors will be involved in the implementation of this holistic strategy.

Climate change considerations: Climate change aspects are considered within the National Water Strategy, in river basin management plans according to the EU Water Framework Directive and in the draft of the new Federal climate adaptation law, which regulates development of relevant strategies and concepts in Germany

Way forward: Enhancing exchange among authorities

c. Public participation[12] in water resources policy, planning and management at national level. Score 90	**No information** shared between government and the public on policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to the public.	**Communication:** Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public in relation to policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly **use** information, experiences and opinions of the public in relation to policy, planning and management of water resources.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[13] established, and regularly used, for the public to take part in relevant water resources policy, planning and management processes.	**Representation:** Formal representation of the public in government processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities in relation to water resources.

[11] Relates to coordination between the government authorities responsible for water management and those responsible for other sectors (such as agriculture, aquaculture, energy, climate, water supply and sanitation, tourism, municipal use, mining and industry, environment etc.) that are dependent on water, or impact on water (including surface water / groundwater considerations).

[12] 'The public' includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is addressed separately in the next question, and vulnerable groups are addressed separately in question 2.2c.

[13] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

Status and progress: Implementation of relevant EU and national law.
Public participation in licencing of bigger water uses and hydromorphological changes.
Public participation in river basin management and flood risk and marine management processes.
Public participation in EIA and SEA.
Public participation in elaboration of National Water Strategy.
General public, stakeholders concerned (from all sectors).
Acknowledged observers in river basin commissions.
Special stakeholder dialogues on different issues.

Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
d. Private sector[14] **participation** in water resources development, management and use. Score 80	**No information** shared between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Information** made available between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Communication** between government and private sector about water resources development, management and use.	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly involve the private sector in water resources development, management and use activities.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[15] are established, ~~and~~ regularly used, and rooted in the transparent and accountable involvement and partnership of the private sector.	**Representation:** Effective private sector involvement in water resources development, management and use is established in a transparent way and with proper accountability mechanisms[16] in place.

Status and progress: Some targeted cooperation, e.g. stakeholder-specific dialogues on Federal and federal states' level (National Water Strategy, agriculture, industry etc.)
For example: From 2018 to 2020, the National Water Dialogue took place to identify challenges for water management and identify targets. This was an important step in the preparation of the National Water Strategy. This process involved 300 experts from various water-using sectors, including the private sector. https://www.bmuv.de/themen/wasser-und-binnengewaesser/nationale-wasserstrategie/nationaler-wasserdialog
All draft legal acts in the water sector are consulted with stakeholders, also from the private sector. Private sector is involved with observer status in several national river basin associations and international river basin commissions.

Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen

[14] Private sector includes for-profit businesses and groups. Private sector actors may include water users (from across sectors, e.g. agriculture, food and beverage, energy, manufacturing, mining, etc.); water and sanitation service operators; water-related technology providers; and the financial providers participating through investments in water initiatives (definition adapted from Sustainable Water Partnership (2017)). It does not include government, civil society or public academic institutions. While this question is mainly focused at the national level, please respond at the level that is most relevant in the country context. Please explain this, including differences between implementation at different levels, in the 'Status and progress field.

[15] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for private sector participation.

[16] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Developing IWRM capacity.[17]		**No** capacity development specific to water resources management.	**Occasional** water resources management capacity development, generally limited to **short-term** / ad-hoc activities.	**Some long-term** capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, but geographic and stakeholder coverage is **limited**.	**Long-term** capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **adequate**.	Long-term capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented, with **effective** outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **very good**.	Long-term capacity development initiatives on IWRM are being implemented with **highly effective** outcomes, and geographic and stakeholder coverage is **excellent.**
Score	80						

Status and progress:
Some examples:
Within the NWS: Use citizen science for supplementary monitoring
Development and implementation of citizen science projects and tools, as well as corresponding capacity building as a new way of involving local communities in water conservation to supplement official monitoring. The aim is to encourage local residents to engage with water issues. Stakeholders are involved in drafting river basin management plans and programmes of measures according to the EU Water Framework Directive since its coming into force. Information, consultation and active involvement.

Climate change considerations:
- A lot of easily accessible information on Federal and federal states' websites. Interactive databases or information on up to date information, one example is Undine https://undine.bafg.de/ or https://undine.bafg.de/index_en.html (English version), including date on run-off and temperature.
- A public platform on low water and drought data is in development (NIWIS), see https://www.bafg.de/DE/01_Leistungen/01_Beratung/BMU/NIWIS/niwis_node.html

Way forward: Work in progress. No changes foreseen

[17] IWRM capacity development: refers to the enhancement of skills, instruments, resources and incentives for people and institutions at all levels, to improve IWRM implementation. Capacity needs assessments are essential for effective and cost-effective capacity development. Capacity development programmes should consider gender balance and disadvantaged/minority groups in terms of participation and awareness. Capacity development is relevant for many groups, including: local and central government, water professionals in all areas - both public and private water organisations, civil society, and in regulatory organisations. In this instance, capacity development may also include primary, secondary and tertiary education, and academic research concerning IWRM.

2.2 What is the status of institutions for IWRM implementation at other levels?							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Basin/aquifer level[18] **organizations**[19] for leading implementation of IWRM.	Score 100	**No** dedicated basin authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[20] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Status and progress: See answers to 1.2 above and German answers to SDG 6.5.2 indicator. For all 10 river basin districts relevant for Germany national or international cooperation associations or basin commissions exists since a long time. Partly due to EU basin related water law, but partly since decades like the national and international cooperation in the Rhine basin.							
Way forward:							
b. Public participation[21] in water resources policy, planning and management at the **local level.**[22]	Score **80**	**No information** shared between government and the public on policy, planning and management at the local level.	**Information** on water resources, policy, planning and management is made available to the public at the local level.	**Communication:** Government authorities **request** information, experiences and opinions of the public**.**	**Consultation:** Government authorities regularly **use** local level information, experiences and opinions of the public.	**Collaboration: Mechanisms**[23] established, and regularly used, for the public at the local level to take part in relevant policy, planning and management processes.	**Representation:** Formal representation of the public in local authority processes contributing to decision making on important issues and activities, as appropriate.
Status and progress: Municipal councils, local water projects involve local people, legal provisions with regard to water uses' licencing Examples of the involvement of regional stakeholders are the "Water 2.0 networks" in Lower Saxony (https://www.lbeg.niedersachsen.de/startseite/boden_grundwasser/klimawandel/netzwerke_wasser_20/netzwerke-wasser-20-173749.html) and the "Regio Wasser Boden network" (https://www.regionet.sachsen.de/) in Saxony.							
Way forward: No changes foreseen.							

[18] At the basin/aquifer level, please include only the most important river basins, lake basins and aquifers for water supply or for other reasons. These basins/aquifers likely cross-administrative borders, including state/provincial borders for federal countries. The basins may also cross national borders, but this question refers to management of the portions of basins within each country. Question 2.2e refers specifically to transboundary management of basins/aquifers shared by countries.

[19] Could be organization, committee, inter-ministerial mechanism or other means of collaboration for managing water resources at the basin level.

[20] For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 13. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

[21] 'The public' includes all interested parties who may be affected by any water resources issue or intervention. They include organizations, institutions, academia, civil society and individuals. They do not include government organizations. The private sector is dealt with separately in question 2.1d.

[22] Examples of 'local level' include municipal level (e.g. cities, towns and villages), community level, basin/tributary/aquifer/delta level, and water user associations.

[23] Mechanisms can include policies, laws, strategies, plans, or other formal operational procedures for public participation.

		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Participation of vulnerable groups in water resources planning and management.[24]		Participation of vulnerable groups **not explicitly addressed** in laws, policies, or plans.	Vulnerable groups **partially addressed,** but no explicit procedures in place.[25]	**Some procedures in place**, but limited budget and human capacity for implementation.	Transparent procedures in place, with **moderate participation** of vulnerable groups (moderate budget and human capacity).	**Regular participation** of vulnerable groups (sufficient budget and human capacity, and participation is monitored through accountability mechanisms[26]).	**Meaningful[27] and regular participation** of vulnerable groups, as appropriate, and participation is monitored through accountability mechanisms.
Score	60						
Status and progress: Article 3 (3) of the German Constitution: "No person shall be favoured or disfavoured because of sex, parentage, race, language, homeland and origin, faith or religious or political opinions. No person shall be disfavoured because of disability." In Germany legal provisions e.g. on non-discrimination, on handicapped people and with regard to gender issues are in place. Public in general can participate in licencing procedures. Barrier free access to documents and information is provided as far as possible. Access to water and sanitation services is not a problem in Germany. Access is not regulated in German law.							
Way forward: Due to climate change we need to have a closer look on vulnerable groups like older people e.g. during heat waves. Funding is e.g. provided for climate adaptation managers in municipalities.							

[24] Vulnerable groups: groups of people that face economic, political, or social exclusion or marginalisation. They can include, but are not limited to: indigenous groups, ethnic minorities, migrants (refugees, internally displaced people, asylum seekers), remote communities, subsistence farmers, people living in poverty, people living in slums and informal settlements. Also referred to as 'marginalised' or 'disadvantaged' groups. While women are often included in definitions of 'vulnerable groups', in this survey gender issues are addressed separately in question 2.2d. The score given for this question should reflect the situation for the majority of the vulnerable groups. This question has been added since the baseline to capture an element of stakeholder participation which is important in the context of 'leave no-one behind' – one of the key principles of Agenda 2030.

[25] 'Procedures' can include operational processes to, for example, raise awareness, reduce language barriers, and facilitate interaction with specific vulnerable groups.

[26] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

[27] 'Meaningful' implies voices of vulnerable groups are heard, contribute to decision-making, and influence outcomes. It follows the UN Statement of Common Understanding on Human Rights-Based Approaches to Development Cooperation which provides for "Participation and Inclusion: … all peoples are entitled to active, free and meaningful participation in, contribution to, and enjoyment of civil, economic, social, cultural and political development in which human rights and fundamental freedoms can be realized."

		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
d. Gender mainstreaming in water resources management.[28]		No gender mainstreaming in water resources management.	Gender mainstreaming mechanisms and practices in water resources management **being developed**	Gender mainstreaming mechanisms **exist** (but limited implementation, budget or monitoring)**.**	Gender mainstreaming **objectives**[29] **partly achieved** (activities implemented and partially monitored and funded).	Gender mainstreaming objectives **mostly achieved** (activities adequately monitored and funded).	Gender mainstreaming objectives **consistently achieved** and effectively address gender issues (activities and outcomes reviewed and revised and based on relevant accountability mechanisms[30]).
Score	80						

Status and progress:

Article 3 (2) of the German Constitution: "Men and women shall have equal rights. The state shall promote the actual implementation of equal rights for women and men and take steps to eliminate disadvantages that now exist."

Gender mainstreaming has to be taken into account in all legislation activities.
No special provisions with regard to water resources management, all genders have rights to participate in legislation procedures, licensing procedures etc.

Way forward: No changes planned..

[28] Gender mainstreaming is about fully integrating gender perspectives in water planning, management, and decision-making, in a cross-cutting manner. Gender mainstreaming mechanisms can include frameworks, practices and tools aimed at achieving gender objectives related to women's participation, voice and influence in water resources management. See "Gender mainstreaming" in Annex A (Glossary), which contains links to the Gender Checklist (to support discussion on this topic), and a report on gender mainstreaming in water resources management. Gender mainstreaming mechanisms may originate within the water sector or at a higher level, but if they are primarily addressed at a higher level, then there should be evidence of gender mainstreaming within the water sector to achieve scores in this question. Any differences between implementation at national, local or transboundary levels can be explained in the 'Status and progress' field.

[29] Gender mainstreaming objectives ultimately refer to equal participation and influence in water resources management at all levels. Ways of monitoring this include (please identify any of these or similar in the 'Status and progress' field): 1) Presence of Gender Focal Point responsible for gender policy and gender concerns in authorities that deal with water resources; 2) Gender parity in decision-making processes at all levels (e.g. in meetings or board members/committee members); 3) Presence of gender-specific objectives and commitments in strategies, plans and laws related water policy; 4) Presence and role of local women's groups/organizations receiving technical and/or financial support from government/non-government organizations involved in water resources management activities; 5) Budget allocation, and procedures for collection and analysis of sex-disaggregated data of local populations, when planning for water-related programmes / projects, including infrastructure; 6) Presence of measures for improving gender parity and equity in human resources (HR) policies of authorities. Source: adapted from UNESCO WWAP Toolkit on Sex-disaggregated Water Data, 2019.

[30] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Organizational framework for transboundary water management.[31] Score 100	**No** organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management.	Organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management **being developed**.	Organizational framework(s) for transboundary water management **established**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **partly fulfilled**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **mostly fulfilled**.	Organizational framework(s)' mandate is **fully fulfilled**.
Status and progress: See answers to 1.2 above and reporting on SDG 6.5.2 indicator. Germany is part of international organisations (6) or bilateral commissions (4) with regard to all river basins and water bodies at the frontier shared with neighbouring or basin countries, e.g. for the Rhine www.icpr.org or the Danube www. icpdr.org.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
f. Sub-national[32] **authorities** for leading IWRM implementation.[33] Score 100	**No** dedicated sub-national authorities for water resources management.	Authorities **exist**, with clear mandate to lead water resources management.	Authorities have clear mandate to lead IWRM implementation, and the capacity[34] to effectively lead IWRM plan **formulation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead IWRM plan **implementation**.	Authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic monitoring and **evaluation** of the IWRM plan(s).	Sub-national authorities have the capacity to effectively lead periodic IWRM plan **revision**.
Status and progress: See answers to 1.2 above. The 16 German federal states and their water authorities deal with IWRM. Federal states cooperate in national river basins or the German parts of international river basins in river basin associations, see for example www.fgg-elbe.de. EU Water Framework Directive requires IWRM planning in river basin management plans and programmes of measures in six year cycles accompanied by monitoring and regular evaluation.						
Way forward: No changes.						

[31] An organizational framework can include a joint body, mechanism, authority, committee, commission or other institutional arrangement. Refers to international basins/aquifers.
[32] Sub-national can include, but not limited to: provincial, state, county, local government areas, council. In this case, sub-national should not include basin/aquifer levels as this is dealt with in question 2.2a. Answer this question for the highest sub-national level(s) that are relevant in the country, and specify what these are.
[33] This question has replaced question 2.2f from the baseline survey, which was for federal countries only. This is in recognition of the fact that many countries have sub-national authorities for water resources management, even if they are not federal countries.
[34] For the definition of 'capacity' in this context, see footnote 13. Beyond having the capacity, authorities must also actually be leading the implementation of these activities.

3 Management instruments

This section includes the tools that enable decision-makers and users to make rational and informed choices between alternative actions. It includes management programmes, monitoring water resources and the pressures on them, knowledge sharing and capacity development. Many of the questions in this section relate to other SDG 6 targets and indicators (see 6.5.1 Monitoring Guide), and coordination between different SDG reporting processes is encouraged where feasible.

Terminology used in the questions:

- **Limited, Adequate, Very good, Excellent:** Are terms used describe the status, coverage and effectiveness of the management instruments assessed in this section. Respondents should apply their own judgement based on the 'best-practice' descriptions of management instruments in the glossary, the section introduction, and through footnotes. For example, 'adequate' may imply that the basic minimum criteria for that particular management instrument are met. Please provide qualifying information to the question score in the 'Status description' cell immediately below each question.
- **Management instruments:** Can also be referred to as management tools and techniques, which include regulations, financial incentives, monitoring, plans/programmes (e.g. for development, use and protection of water resources), as well as those specified in footnotes on questions and thresholds below.
- **Monitoring:** collecting, updating, and sharing timely, consistent and comparable water-related data and information, relevant for science and policy. Effective monitoring requires ongoing commitment and financing from government. Resources required include appropriate technical capacity such as laboratories, portable devices, online water use control and data acquisition systems. May include a combination of physical data collection, remote sensing, and modelling for filling data gaps.
- **Short-term / Long-term:** In the context of management instruments, short-term includes ad-hoc activities and projects, generally not implemented as part of an overarching programme with long-term goals. Long-term refers to activities that are undertaken as part of an ongoing programme that has more long-term goals/aims and implementation strategy.
- **Accountability mechanisms:** refer to mechanisms that increase Transparency, Accountability, and Participation, and strengthen Anti-corruption (TAP-A. See also Annex A: Glossary). For each question in this section, it is suggested that TAPA-related mechanisms should "exist", as relevant, to achieve a score of 80 or 90 ("High" threshold), and should be "effective" to achieve a score of 100 ("Very high" threshold).

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

3. Management Instruments						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
3.1 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at the national level?						
a. National monitoring of water availability[35] (includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country). Score 90	**No** national monitoring systems in place.	Monitoring systems established for a **limited** number of **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Long-term** national monitoring is carried out but with **limited** coverage and limited use by stakeholders.	**Long-term** national monitoring is carried out with **adequate** coverage but limited use by stakeholders.	Long-term national monitoring is carried out with **very good** coverage and adequate use by stakeholders.	Long-term national monitoring is carried out with **excellent** coverage and excellent use by stakeholders.
Status and progress: Monitoring of groundwater quantity and surface water flow. Long-term statistics on overall water availability and water uses. Data on groundwater resources are available at the level of the federal states. For example - Brandenburg (https://apw.brandenburg.de/?th=ZR_GW_ME&feature=legend&showSearch=false), - Lower Saxony (https://www.grundwasserstandonline.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/Start), - Baden-Württemberg (https://www.lubw.baden-wuerttemberg.de/wasser/guq-messungen#karte) or - Bavaria (https://www.gkd.bayern.de/de/grundwasser/oberesstockwerk).						
Way forward: a better aggregation of data at the national level is needed						
b. Sustainable and efficient water use management[36] from the national level, (includes surface and/or groundwater, as relevant to the country). Score 90	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across different water users and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across different water users and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across different water users and the country, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across different water users and the country, and are **highly effective**.
Status and progress: Water saving technologies in households and industry. Very small water losses in pipes. Average use is 125 l/person (2022) a day in households and small businesses. Long-term statistics on water use show declining trends in the use categories "industry" and "energy production", stable or slightly increasing trends in "households" and, at a low level, increasing trends in "agriculture". During the dry summers in recent years, water stress was observed in some regions.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[35] See definition of monitoring in Terminology at the beginning of section 3.

[36] Management instruments include demand management measures (e.g. technical measures, financial incentives, education and awareness raising to reduce water use and/or improve water-use efficiency, conservation, recycling and re-use), monitoring water use (including the ability to disaggregate by sector), mechanisms for allocating water between sectors (including environmental considerations). Coordination with SDG indicator 6.4.1 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Pollution control[37] from the national level. Score 90	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across sectors and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across sectors and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across sectors and the country, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across sectors and the country, and are **highly effective**.
Status and progress: Monitoring of the chemical status of groundwater and surface water on regional and international level. Regular. Event driven specific monitoring programmes for special substances.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
d. Management of water-related ecosystems and biodiversity[38] from the national level. Score 80	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country. Environmental Water Requirements (EWR) analysed in some cases.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are **effective**. EWR analysed for most of country.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage across different ecosystem types and the country, and are **highly effective**. EWR analysed for whole country.
Status and progress: EU and national water and nature conservation law. River basin management plans, cooperation between water and nature conservation authorities, win-win-measures like dyke relocations or revitalisation of floodplains						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[37] Includes regulations, water quality guidelines, water quality monitoring, economic tools (e.g. taxes and fees), water quality trading programmes, education, consideration of point and non-point (e.g. agricultural) pollution sources, construction and operation of wastewater treatment plants, watershed management. Coordination with SDG indicator 6.3.2 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

[38] Water-related ecosystems include rivers, lakes and aquifers, as well as wetlands, forests and mountains. Management of these systems includes tools such as management plans, the assessment of Environmental Water Requirements (EWR), and protection of areas and species, to ensure ecosystem functions and services. Monitoring includes measuring extent and quality of the ecosystems over time. Consider coordination with SDG indicator 6.6.1 Focal Point and results, as well as with the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework (under the Convention on Biological Diversity), when answering this question.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
e. Management instruments to reduce impacts of water-related disasters[39] from the national level.	**No** management instruments being implemented.	Use of management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects or similar.	**Some** management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** coverage of at-risk areas.	Management instruments are implemented on a **long-term** basis, with **adequate** coverage of at-risk areas and groups.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **very good** coverage of at-risk areas and groups, and are **effective**.	Management instruments are implemented on a long-term basis, with **excellent** coverage of at-risk areas and groups, and are **highly effective**.
Score 80						

Status and progress: Flood risk management plans.
Plans on national, regional and local level in case of water-related disasters like floods or extreme rainfall.
The National water strategy provides many actions are aimed to prevent and deal with drought and water scarcity.

Climate change considerations: Climate change is considered as an additional amount in the construction of coastal protection dykes and, in some federal states, also in the construction of river dykes. For example, the "climate dyke" in Lower Saxony: https://www.nlwkn.niedersachsen.de/jb2021/Niedersaechsischer_Klimadeich/klimawandel-und-kustenschutz-ein-entscheidender-meter-mehr-niedersachsischer-klimadeich-und-verdopplung-des-vorsorgemasses-201169.html
A preliminary climate assessment is available in the context of planning of measures under the Water Framework Directive. These describe which categories of measures contribute to adaptation to climate change and which measures can be affected in their effectiveness through climate change. (https://www.lawa.de/documents/lawa-blano-massnahmenkatalog_1594133389.pdf)

Way forward: Activities to be better prepared for droughts, which have increased in the past years.

[39] 'Management instruments' can cover: understanding disaster risk; strengthening disaster risk governance; investing in disaster risk reduction; and enhancing disaster preparedness. 'Impacts' include social impacts (such as deaths, missing persons, and number of people affected) and economic impacts (such as economic losses in relation to GDP). 'Water-related disasters' include disasters that can be classified under the following: Hydrological (flood, landslide, wave action); Meteorological (convective storm, extratropical storm, extreme temperature, fog, tropical cyclone); Climatological (drought, glacial lake outburst, wildfire); and severe pollution events. Coordination with SDG indicator 11.5.1 Focal Point and results is encouraged when answering this question.

3.2 What is the status of management instruments to support IWRM implementation at other levels?						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Basin management instruments.[40] Score 90	**No** basin level management instruments being implemented.	Use of basin level management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects.	**Some** basin level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **adequate** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with **effective** outcomes and **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Basin level management instruments implemented on a more long-term basis, with **highly effective** outcomes and **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage.
Status and progress: Basin related management and flood risk managements in all basins (national and international)						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
b. Aquifer management instruments.[41] Score 90	**No** aquifer level management instruments being implemented.	Use of aquifer level management instruments is **limited** and only through **short-term** / ad-hoc projects.	**Some** aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, but with **limited** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **adequate** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **effective** outcomes and **very good** geographic and stakeholder coverage.	Aquifer level management instruments implemented on a more **long-term** basis, with **highly effective** outcomes and **excellent** geographic and stakeholder coverage.
Status and progress: Groundwater bodies or aquifers are included in the river basin management plans and in the bilateral coordination with other countries. Rather few agreements only on groundwater.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[40] Basin and aquifer management: involves managing water at the appropriate hydrological scale, using the surface water basin or aquifer as the unit of management. This may involve basin and aquifer development, use and protection plans. It should also promote multi-level cooperation, and address potential conflict among users, stakeholders and levels of government. To achieve 'Very high (100)' basin and aquifer management scores, surface and groundwater management should be integrated.

[41] See previous footnote on basin management instruments, which also applies to aquifers.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Data and information sharing <u>within</u> countries at all levels.[42]	**No** data and information sharing.	**Limited** data and information sharing on an **ad-hoc** basis.	Data and information sharing arrangements **exist** on a more **long-term** basis between major data providers and users.	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented** on a more **long-term** basis**,** with **adequate** coverage across sectors and the country.	Data and information sharing arrangements implemented on a more **long-term** basis**,** with **very good** coverage across sectors and the country.	All relevant data and information are online and freely accessible to all. Appropriate measures are in place to ensure data integrity[43].
Score 90						
Status and progress: River basin management is based on data and information sharing among the 16 federal states. Joint provisions on monitoring programmes. Regular data exchange or data compilation centralised in certain basins. Collection of data in Federal agencies for special reporting obligations and information of the public on water issues.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
d. Transboundary data and information sharing <u>between</u> countries.	**No** data and information sharing.	**Limited** data and information sharing on an **ad-hoc** or informal basis.	Data and information sharing arrangements **exist**, but sharing is **limited.**	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented adequately.**	Data and information sharing arrangements **implemented effectively.**[44]	All relevant data and information are online and accessible between countries.
Score 80						
Status and progress: River basin management is based on data and information sharing. Mostly on the basis of the basins international level), more aggregated on EU-level. Joint monitoring programmes in international basins, joint assessments of results						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[42] Includes more formal data and information sharing arrangements between users, as well as accessibility for the general public, where appropriate.

[43] Data integrity is the maintenance of, and the assurance of, data accuracy and consistency over its entire life-cycle.

[44] E.g. institutional and technical mechanisms in place that allow for exchanging data as agreed upon in agreements between riparians (e.g. regional database or information exchange platform with a river basin organization including technical requirements for data submission, institutionalized mechanisms for QA and for analysing the data, etc.).

4 Financing

This section concerns the adequacy of the finance available for water resources development and management from various sources.

Finance for investment and recurrent costs can come from many sources, the most common being central government budget allocations to relevant ministries and other authorities. Other sources include fees and tariffs levied on water users, polluter fees or grants from philanthropic or similar organisations. In-kind support should not be included as it is not easily measurable but can be mentioned in the 'Status and progress' field. Finance from Official Development Assistance (ODA) specifically for water resources should be considered part of the government budget. Note that the level of coordination between ODA and national budgets is tracked by the 'means of implementation' SDG indicator 6.a.1: "Amount of water- and sanitation-related official development assistance that is part of a government-coordinated spending plan", as part of reporting on Target 6.a: "By 2030, expand international cooperation and capacity-development support to developing countries in water- and sanitation-related activities and programmes, including water harvesting, desalination, water efficiency, wastewater treatment, recycling and reuse technologies".

Please take note of all footnotes as they contain important information and clarification of terms used in the questions and thresholds.

Enter your score, **in increments of 10**, from 0-100, or "n/a" (not applicable), in the yellow cell immediately below each question. Enter free text in the "Status and progress" and "Way forward" fields below each question as advised in the Introduction in Part 1. This will help achieve agreement among different stakeholders in the country, as well as help monitor progress over time. Suggestions for the type of information that may be useful are provided. You may also provide further information you think is relevant, or links to further documentation.

4. Financing							
		Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
4.1 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at the national level?							
a. National budget[45] for water resources **infrastructure**[46] (investment and recurrent costs).		**No budget** allocated in national investment plans.	**Some budget** allocated but only partly covers planned investments.	**Sufficient budget** allocated for planned investments but insufficient funds disbursed or made available**.**	Sufficient budget allocated and **funds disbursed for most** planned programmes or projects.	Sufficient funds disbursed for investment and recurrent costs, and **being utilised in all** planned projects. Accountability mechanism(s)[47] in place.	Budget **fully utilised** for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Score	80						
Status and progress: Monitoring, infrastructure devices (e.g. for flood protection), licensing of all water uses, river basin management are paid mainly out of the regional budgets of the 16 federal states (taxes, fees, EU funds) and the Federal budget (international cooperation, waterways, supra-regional flood protection).							
Way forward: Increase resources for implementation of measures.							
		Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
b. National budget for **IWRM elements**[48] (investments and recurrent costs).		**No budget** allocations made for investments and recurrent costs of the IWRM elements.	**Allocations** made for **some** of the IWRM elements and implementation at an early stage.	Allocations made for **at least half** of the IWRM elements but insufficient for others.	Allocations for **most** of the IWRM elements and some implementation under way.	Allocations include **all** IWRM elements and implementation regularly carried out (investments and recurrent costs). Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Score	80						

[45] Allocations of funding for water resources may be included in several budget categories or in different investment documents. Respondents are thus encouraged to examine different sources for this information. When assessing the allocations respondents should take account of funds from government budgets and any co-funding (loans or grants) from other sources such as banks or donors.

[46] Infrastructure includes 'hard' structures such as dams, canals, irrigation schemes, flood control, stormwater drainage etc., as well as 'soft' or 'green' infrastructure and environmental measures such as catchment management, sustainable drainage systems etc. The focus should be on infrastructure related to 'broader' water resources management, as opposed to infrastructure for drinking water supply or sanitation services (WaSH) (noting that WaSH financing is covered in the GLAAS surveys). Any differences in budget between water resources and WaSH infrastructure should be explained in the 'status and progress' field. Budgets should cover initial investments and recurrent costs of operation and maintenance.

[47] See description of "accountability mechanisms" in Annex A: Glossary.

[48] 'IWRM elements' refers to all the activities described in sections 1, 2 and 3 of this survey that require funding, e.g. policy, law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity development, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc.

Status and progress: Law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity building, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring are tax financed activities on the national level whenever the competence for the task is on the national level.
Climate change considerations: Climate change considerations are largely mainstreamed in the above.
Way forward: No changes foreseen.

4.2 What is the status of financing for water resources development and management at other levels?						
	Degree of implementation (0 – 100)					
	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
a. Sub-national or basin budgets for water resources **infrastructure**[49] (investment and recurrent costs). Score 80	**No budget** allocated in sub-national or basin investment plans.	**Some budget** allocated in sub-national or basin investment plans but only partly covers planned investments.	**Sufficient budget** allocated for planned investments in sub-national or basin investment plans, but insufficient funds disbursed or made available.	Sufficient budget allocated and **funds disbursed for most** planned programmes or projects.	Sufficient funds disbursed**,** for investment and recurrent costs, and **being utilised in all** planned projects. Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Budget **fully utilised**, for investment and recurrent costs, post-project evaluation carried out, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: See answer to 4.1 above – whenever the competence for the task is on the regional or local level, then the activities are tax-financed on this level.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
b. Revenues raised for IWRM elements.[50] Score 80	**No revenues** raised for IWRM elements.	**Processes in place** to raise revenue but **not yet implemented**.	**Some revenue raised,** but generally not used for IWRM activities.	Revenues raised cover **some** IWRM activities.	Revenues raised cover **most** IWRM activities. Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Revenues raised **fully cover** costs of IWRM activities. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: The revenues of the wastewater charges (and the water abstraction fees) can be used additionally by the 16 German federal states for financing measures to improve water status within IWRM.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[49] Refer to footnotes 47 and 48, from question 4.1a.

[50] For 'IWRM elements', see above footnote. **Level**: revenues are likely to be raised from users at the local, basin, or aquifer levels, though may also be raised at other sub-national or national levels (please indicate which level(s) in the status and progress field). **Revenue raising** can occur through public authorities or private sector, e.g. through fees, charges, levies, taxes and 'blended financing' approaches. E.g. dedicated charges/levies on water users (including household level *if* revenues are spent on IWRM elements); abstraction & bulk water charges; discharge fees; environmental fees such as pollution charges, Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) schemes; and the sale of secondary products and services.

	Very low (0)	Low (20)	Medium-low (40)	Medium-high (60)	High (80)	Very high (100)
c. Financing for transboundary cooperation.[51] Score 100	**No specific funding** allocated from the Member State (MS) budgets nor from other regular sources.	MS **agreement** on country share of contributions **in place** and in-kind support for the cooperation organisation/arrangement.	**Funding less than 50%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	Funding **less than 75%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	Funding **more than 75%** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.	**Full funding** of that expected as contributions and by regulation.
Status and progress: German obligatory contributions to international river basin commissions, voluntary contributions with regard to joint studies or workshops etc..						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						
d. Sub-national or basin budgets for **IWRM elements**[52] (investment and recurrent costs). Score 90	**No budget** allocations at sub-national or basin level for investments and recurrent costs of IWRM elements.	**Allocations** made for **some** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level and implementation at an early stage.	Allocations made for **at least half** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level but insufficient for others.	Allocations for **most** of the IWRM elements at sub-national or basin level and some implementation under way.	Allocations include **all** IWRM elements and implementation regularly carried out (investments and recurrent costs). Accountability mechanism(s) in place.	Planned budget allocations for all elements of the IWRM approach at sub-national or basin level **fully utilised**, budgets reviewed and revised. Accountability mechanisms are effective.
Status and progress: Federal Government pays contributions to the budget of international river commissions, co-finances transboundary studies or projects. Federal states co-finance transboundary projects with neighbouring countries or in the basins.						
Way forward: No changes foreseen.						

[51] In this question "Member States (MS)" refers to riparian countries that are parties to the arrangement. "Contributions" refers to the annual share of funds agreed from MS national budgets to support the agreed TB cooperation arrangement. Regular funds obtained from for example, water user fees (e.g. hydropower charges) and polluter-pays fees based on existing regulation are also considered as sustainable funding. As variable and unsustainable, donor support should not be considered in the scoring, but may be referred to in the 'Status and progress' and 'Way forward' fields.

[52] 'IWRM elements' refers to all the activities described in sections 1, 2 and 3 of this survey that require funding, e.g. policy, law making and planning, institutional strengthening, coordination, stakeholder participation, capacity development, and management instruments such as research and studies, gender and environmental assessments, data collection, monitoring etc. This question has been added since the baseline survey, acknowledging the importance of funding being available at more 'operational' levels.

5 Indicator 6.5.1 score

How to calculate the indicator 6.5.1 score

Please complete the table below as follows:

1. Calculate the average score of each of the four sections by averaging all question scores in each section, rounded to the nearest whole number.
   Example: Section average of 41.5 should be rounded to 42. Section average of 70.2 should be rounded to 70. If 'not applicable' is selected for any question, this should not be included in the indicator calculations, and therefore will not affect the average score. However, questions with a score of '0' (zero) should be included.
2. Calculate the average of the four section scores (whole numbers) to give the overall score for indicator 6.5.1, **rounded to the nearest whole number**.
   Example: Calculating final IWRM score from four section scores: (81+ 63 + 47 + 58)/4 = 62.25. Final 6.5.1 score (rounded to a whole number) = 62.

   Please note an automated calculation template is available here if required.

Section	**Average Scores** (all values rounded to nearest whole number)
Section 1 Enabling environment	94
Section 2 Institutions and participation	85
Section 3 Management instruments	87
Section 4 Financing	85
Indicator 6.5.1 score **= Degree of IWRM* implementation (0-100)***	**88**

* Use rounded section average scores (to the nearest whole number), to calculate the indicator score, and round this to the nearest whole number.

Interpretation of the score

The score indicates the 'degree of implementation of integrated water resources management', on a scale of 0 to 100, with 0 signifying 'very low' implementation, and 100 signifying 'very high' implementation. However, the true value of the survey to countries lies within the scores, 'status and progress' and 'way forward' fields for each question, as this helps to identify which actions need to be taken to move towards a greater degree of implementation of IWRM.

Annex A: Glossary

Accountability mechanisms: provide ways for all partners to hold each other to account on the specific, measurable, time-bound actions they have committed to. In the context of this survey, they may include activities that increase Transparency, Accountability, and Participation, and strengthen Anti-corruption (TAP-A). Together, these form a framework for integrity.[53] For example, in relation to the financing questions in section 4, 'accountability mechanisms' typically include mechanisms that make data and information on budgets and expenditures publicly available, and enable participatory budgeting and monitoring of expenditure where appropriate. Such mechanisms should include functions to identify and address corruption and mismanagement.

Authorities: could be ministry or ministries, or other organizations/institutions/ departments/agencies/bodies with a mandate and funding from government.

Basins: Includes rivers, lakes and aquifers, unless otherwise specified. For surface water, the term is interchangeable with 'catchments' and 'watersheds'.

Federal countries: Refers to countries made up of federated states, provinces, territories or similar terms.

Gender mainstreaming: Gender mainstreaming is about fully integrating gender perspectives in water planning, management, and decision-making, in a cross-cutting manner. It is not just about increasing women's representation on committees, or having a general national legal framework on gender equality, although those actions may be part of the overall framework. The dedicated Gender Checklist can be used as a discussion tool to help stakeholders to agree on the score for question 2.2d, and to inform the 'status and progress' and 'way forward' responses to that question. The Gender Checklist is derived from the report - Advancing towards gender mainstreaming in water resources management – which presents examples of some specific mechanisms, practices, and tools that have been developed and used by countries in order to progress with gender mainstreaming in water resources management. These have been grouped into six categories: (1) advocacy, high-level commitment, changing prevailing norms and stereotypes; (2) legislative and policy framework and governance; (3) human capital, financial resources, institutions, and support organisations; (4) women's participation and parity; (5) monitoring activities to track and assess progress; (6) awareness raising, capacity development, and education.[54]

IWRM: Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) is a process that promotes the coordinated development and management of water, land and related resources in order to maximise the resultant economic and social welfare in an equitable manner without compromising the sustainability of vital ecosystems. IWRM is not an end in itself but a means of achieving three key strategic objectives:

- efficiency to use water resources in the best way possible;
- equity in the allocation of water across social and economic groups;
- environmental sustainability, to protect the water resource base, as well as associated ecosystems.

National (level): Refers to the highest level of administration in a country.

Sub-national / state (level): refers to levels of administration other than national. For federal countries, these are likely to be provinces or states. Non-federal countries may still have sub-national jurisdictions with some responsibility for water resources management, e.g. regions, counties, departments.

Programmes: Nation-wide plans of action with long-term objectives, for example to strengthen monitoring, knowledge sharing and capacity development, with details on what work is to be done, by whom, when, and what means or resources will be used**.**

Transboundary: Refers to surface and groundwater basins that cross one or more national borders. Only the most important transboundary basins or aquifers that are regarded as significant, in terms of economic, social or environmental value to the country (or neighbouring countries), need to be included in this survey. It is up to countries to decide which ones these are. Where feasible, basins/aquifers included in this survey should be cross-referenced with those included in 6.5.2 reporting, and the focal point for 6.5.2 should be consulted in this process. In the absence of 6.5.2 data or national databases, global databases on transboundary river basins (http://twap-rivers.org/indicators/), and transboundary aquifers, may be referred to. If you include a national (sub-basin) as part of a larger transboundary basin, please also include the name of the larger basin. When answering transboundary questions, the majority of most important basins/aquifers must meet the criteria described in each threshold to achieve the score for that threshold.

Stakeholders: In this survey, stakeholders are the main groups important for water resources management, development and use. Examples of stakeholders in each group are given in footnotes as they appear in the survey.

Water Resources Management is the activity of planning, developing, distributing and managing the optimum use of water resources. Ideally, water resource management planning considers all the competing demands for water and seeks to allocate water on an equitable basis to satisfy all uses and demands. An integrated approach (see IWRM) is needed to ensure water resources management is not isolated within sector silos resulting to inefficiencies, conflicts and unsustainable resource use.

[53] Source: Water Integrity Network: Integrity Walls. https://www.waterintegritynetwork.net/integrity-walls-tap/

[54] Mainstreaming gender in resources management supports a range of targets in the SDGs, including under Goal 5 on achieving gender equality and empowering all women and girls (e.g. SDG Target 5.5). Furthermore, question 2.2d also addresses the call for gender disaggregated data in the 2030 Agenda (e.g. SDG Target 17.18).

Annex B: Key priorities and targets for IWRM implementation

1) What are the **priority action areas**[55] to advance IWRM implementation overall in the country? Include priorities/actions that are ongoing, already planned, and/or those that may be emerging based on the survey results. Where relevant, please also note the status of implementation of the priorities/actions (e.g. giving some indication of necessary follow-up).
   Answer: Implementation of activities and objectives under the National Water Strategy
2) **Target setting**

The intention of the table below is to encourage discussion among stakeholders on the likelihood of reaching the global targets[56], or on the need to establish national targets. It can also be used to inform regional and global processes about whether countries feel they are on track to meet the global targets or not, and if they prefer to set national targets. Scores may be the same in both columns. It is also possible to only complete one column, and/or to only provide scores for the overall indicator (bottom row). I.e. use the table as is most useful.

Section	Business-As-Usual (BAU) projected score for 2030*	National target for 2030**
Section 1 Enabling environment		
Section 2 Institutions and participation		
Section 3 Management instruments		
Section 4 Financing		
Indicator 6.5.1 score = Degree of IWRM implementation (0-100)		

* approximate score (or range), based on reporting in 2017, 2020, 2023, current rates of progress, and stakeholder judgement. A simple calculation template is provided in the calculation template (see 'Projections-Targets' worksheet), if useful.

** potential 'realistic' score by 2030, if certain measures are put in place, for example as described in question 1 of this annex. Please indicate if these are existing targets, or informal targets defined during this monitoring process.

3) **Additional comments on target-setting:**
   Answer: National targets are defined in the overall policy instruments (e.g. National Water Strategy).
4) **Additional general comments** (e.g. related to the: status/challenges of IWRM implementation; country context; threats to water resources; impacts of climate change, or other):
   Answer:

[55] Priority action areas: could include any of the aspects covered in this survey, or others. E.g. improving cross-sectoral coordination; raising the profile of the importance of IWRM implementation at the highest planning and financing levels (advocacy); developing or implementing laws, strategies, plans, programmes, projects; improving revenue raising; improving monitoring and evaluation of implementation; increasing institutional capacity at national/basin/aquifer level; improving transboundary cooperation, etc.
[56] Average scores of 91 or above ('very high' category), for each of the four dimensions and the overall indicator score.

Annex C: 6.5.1 country reporting process form

To increase transparency and confidence in results, please provide a brief overview of the reporting process. e.g. main actors involved; meetings/workshops held; other means of gathering inputs from stakeholders; iterations of drafts and finalisation/approval processes. Also note the main challenges/strengths of the process. Use as much space as needed. If you have completed a full Stakeholder Consultation report, please provide a brief summary here, and refer to that report.

Focal Point affiliation	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection
Brief process overview: We have established a standardized process for reporting on indicator 6.5.1 through consultation between the Federal Environment Ministry and the Federal Environment Agency. As we conduct regular/continuous consultation processes with various actors (e.g., Federal states, local Governments, service providers and other stakeholders) on specific policy processes, adding consultations on 6.5.1 reporting would overload these already existing stakeholder processes. In the previous reporting cycles, reporting guidelines were quite light. This year a lot of additional information was requested which significantly outstretched the efforts planned for 6.5.1 reporting. There is a risk that stricter interpretation of reporting guidelines will present an increased reporting burden, especially for Member States with smaller administrations or reduced capacities. Any main points of difference in stakeholder opinion in answering the survey questions?: Additional comments on the survey or supporting materials, if any:	

Stakeholder groups	**Level of engagement** (mark with 'X')			**Additional information** (e.g. which stakeholder organisations were involved, how they contributed or were engaged, or any challenges faced)
	Low (given opportunity to contribute)	**Medium** (some input)	**High** (discussion/ negotiation)	
National water agencies		X		Federal Ministery fro the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection, German Environment Agency
Other public sector agencies				
Sub-national water agencies				
Basin/Aquifer agencies				
Water User Associations				
Civil society				
Private sector				
Vulnerable groups				
Gender expertise				
Research/academia				
Transboundary expertise				*(e.g. Focal Point for SDG 6.5.2 and/or other)*
Other SDG focal points				*(e.g. Focal Points from other indicators)*