

Asian Development Bank and Water Resources Management in Central Asia



May 2008

ADB

RETA6163: Improved Management of Shared Water Resources
Outcomes

Achievements	Significance	Works that remain
(1) Draft Syr Darya Framework Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant milestone in cooperation, if approved. • Demonstrated the potential of country-driven approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not yet approved, with no visible impacts on water management problems on the ground.
(2) C-T Joint River Commission	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First bilateral river basin management approach, that is now operational. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach not yet expanded to other countries/basins. • The commission not yet sustainable.
(3) Other workshops, conferences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided useful knowledge sharing opportunities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Limited knowledge dissemination to the outside stakeholders.

RETA6163: Improved Management of Shared Water Resources

How money was used

Expense Items	Disbursed	Remark
SIC-ICWC and National WGs	\$226,400	Cost effective, but broad support from participating countries questionable.
Consultants	\$182,099	Incl. \$115,000 for international team leader whose contract was terminated.
Country Support	\$166,668	For the C-T JRC.
Seminars	\$45,894	Was not as demand driven as hoped for.
Equipment	\$40,699	For the C-T JRC.
C-T W. Group	\$22,425	For the C-T JRC.
Total	\$684,186	

RETA6163: Improved Management of Shared Water Resources Issues and lessons learned (1)

	Issues	Lessons	Remarks
1.	Country working groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multi-sector working groups enabled broad-based discussions of issues. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was a good practice.
2.	Cooperation among the countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in the key participants made it difficult to sustain earlier agreement. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agreements reached should have been recorded as binding. Such agreement should have been endorsed by the higher authorities.
3.	Technical secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Absence of “honest broker” (non regional team leader) made some countries to feel the RETA works less transparent/unbiased. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A good consultant is hard to find. Still, an international team leader should have been kept to maintain direct link with the countries. An independent technical secretariat representing all the countries should have been established.

RETA6163: Improved Management of Shared Water Resources Issues and lessons learned (2)

	Issues	Lessons	Remarks
4.	Participants and their relation to the higher authorities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussions/agreement can reach to the ICWC, but it was difficult to go beyond. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There should have been an explicit link beyond ICWC for approval of the collective agreement among the ICWC members.
5.	Knowledge sharing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link with other regional cooperation bodies was not direct. Sharing/dissemination of knowledge did not go beyond the work groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ICSD and EC-IFAS should have participated as a full member. More wider publication and information dissemination should have been implemented.

Deepening water challenges in the region

1. Water – energy nexus	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Deepening energy crisis makes the collaborative management of water more difficult.• Independent initiatives for hydropower development need more collaborative discussions among the riparian countries.
2. Demand for water and food	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Increasing food grain prices and population increase pressure on water, both within countries (sectors) and among the countries.
3. Climate change adaptation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Climate changes are expected to increase the extreme climate events (disasters) and make prediction of dry season flows more difficult, calling for greater collaboration among the countries in the basins.

Is there a need for another ADB RETA?

Pros	Cons
<p>Challenges are increasing, but donor-assisted cooperation initiatives are not increasing.</p>	<p>The issue is not the amount of donor assistance, but the commitment and willingness among the countries to cooperate. This has not been fully demonstrated.</p>
<p>ADB's special attention and focus on country-driven cooperation is unique and required.</p>	<p>The country-driven approach is slow, and depend on the political will of the higher authorities.</p>
<p>Progress of the earlier RETA needs to be followed up.</p>	<p>Before considering to build on the earlier RETA, the countries need to demonstrate the use of the RETA outcomes, particularly the Syr Darya Framework Agreement.</p>

Possible outcomes of the new RETA – Realistic?

Possible Topics

1. Development of common knowledge/analytical tools
2. Continue working on the framework agreements
3. Facilitating improved regional cooperation
4. Support for joint river commissions
5. Any other?

Possible outcomes of the new RETA (1)

Issues	Outcomes	Remark
1. Common analytical tools	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydromet data collection/sharing • Simulation model (scenario analyses) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missing flows in the Amu Darya • Participation of hydromet depts needed
2. Revised agreements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More on the Syr Darya? • What about the Amu Darya? 	
3. Improved regional cooperation mechanism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of water sector project proposals • Proposal for new regional institution • C-T Joint River Commission • Workshops 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Secretariat's review (transboundary aspects) of project designs submitted voluntarily by the countries

Possible outcomes of the new RETA (2)

	Issues	Outcomes	Remark
4.	Joint River Commissions	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Continued (time bound) support for C-T JR commission• Identification of other JR management approach	
5.	Any other?		

Implementation Arrangements (1)

	Proposed	Remarks
1. Participating countries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KGZ, TAJ, KAZ, UZB and TUR. • AFG as observer (but could be a full member as and when it desires to become). 	
2. Country level participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Through multi-sector national working groups (NWGs), headed by the country Focal Points. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NWG members approved by the State. • Each NWG FPs represent country at the SC.
3. Regional cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RETA Steering Committee (SC) as key venue. • The SC decisions to be endorsed by the higher authorities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The link between the SC members (NFPs) and their higher authorities should be consistent among the countries.

Implementation Arrangements (2)

	Proposed	Remarks
4. Technical secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish a secretariat for coordination and administration/execution of technical works. An international team leader recruited to head the secretariat (intermittent inputs). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who should be the staff of secretariat: consultants or country representatives? Operational cost could be funded under the RETA. Where should be the secretariat located? In rotation, or in a fixed place? Possibility to use CACILM secretariat (dual charge)?
5. Task-specific consultants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruited by ADB on task specific assignments according to the TOR submitted by the secretariat. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualified local/regional institutes can be engaged, but the 'balance' among countries needs to be maintained. How?

Implementation Arrangements (3)

	Proposed	Remarks
6. Link with other regional cooperation mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Encouraged strongly. They should be invited to the meetings and conferences.• The technical outputs of the RETA should also be reviewed and commented.	
7. Link with other donor supported initiatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Encouraged strongly. Countries are encouraged to identify the opportunities.• Technical secretariat is tasked to submit concrete proposals.	

Next Step

1. Agreement/decision on:
 - The need for a new ADB RETA
 - RETA's key outputs
 - Key implementation arrangements
 - Location of secretariat
 - How the secretariat should be staffed
 - Decision making mechanism
2. Will all countries participate?