

Program workshop

Global Review
“The Economics of Water and Beyond”
16-09-2021

Contents

Overview of participants of the workshop	1
Program of the workshop	2

Overview of participants of the workshop

1. Roy Brouwer ([UWaterloo](#): Executive Director Water Institute)
2. Richard Damania ([WB](#) Sustainable Development Vice Presidency: Chief Economist)
3. Joyeeta Gupta ([UvA and IHE Delft](#): Professor Environ. and Dev. in the Global South)
4. Lars Hein ([WUR](#): Professor Ecosystem Services and Environmental Change)
5. Petra Hellegers ([WUR](#): Professor/Chair of the Water Resources Management Group)
6. Xavier Leflaive ([OECD](#): Principal Administrator Water Team)
7. Aromar Revi ([IIHS](#): Director IIHS)
8. Mark Smith ([IWMI](#): Director General IWMI)

Team NL Government

1. Kitty van der Heijden (Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA): Director General International Cooperation) – opening words only
2. Dirk Jan Koch (MoFA: Chief Science Officer)
3. Maarten Gischler (MoFA: Senior Water Advisor)
4. Omer van Renterghem (MoFA: Senior Policy Advisor Water and Environment)
5. Vincent van Roon (MoFA: Policy Officer Water)
6. Niels Vlaanderen (Ministry of Infrastructure and Water Management: Coordinator International Water Affairs)
7. Lenne Smeets (MoFA: Intern Water)

Program of the workshop

Date: September 23rd 2021, 14:00 – 16:30 hours CEST

Location: Online

Moderator: Dirk-Jan Koch

Workshop objectives

Overall: clarify the scope of the Global Review “The Economics of Water and Beyond” (working title), and its envisaged contribution to transformation of the way societies/economies use, share and govern water – and all benefits derived from it – within a broader climate-water-biosphere system.

1. Clarify scope of the Review
 - What makes it unique?
 - Three integrated work streams: 1) the Economics of Water – building on Dasgupta, revealing the cost of inaction vs action, developing a “social cost of water” parameter, 2) Communication and Societal Dialogue for Change, 3) Action toward Societal Transformation
2. Clarify process design for the review
 - Team of 4/5 joint lead authors, ensuring balance between work streams / 1 lead institution (?)
 - Necessary support structure for the Review (secretariat, research teams, advisory board, network with convening power)
 - Identify mile stones for an 18 months period

Workshop inputs

1. This workshop outline
2. Draft scoping document for the review

Workshop deliverables (to be drafted after workshop, shared by September 28)

1. Draft Terms of Reference (1 pager)
2. Revised scoping document for the review (annex to deliverable no. 1)

Workshop program

Time	Activity	Topics
14:00 – 14:05	Welcome and Opening – Kitty van der Heijden, DGIS (TBC)	<i>Welcome, background of initiative</i>
14:05– 14:15	Who is who round of introductions	
14:15 – 14:20	Today’s workshop - objectives/deliverables – moderator	
14:20 – 14:45	<p>Scope of the Review – Maarten Gischler <i>Why a need for a Global Review? Why now?</i></p> <p><i>What feature will give the review its added value?</i> - Cost of inaction vs benefits of action? - “Social cost of water” parameter, C-analogy? - Bridging knowledge – societal transformation - Other?</p> <p>3 integrated work streams:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Economics of Water</i> 2. <i>Societal Dialogues and Communication for Change: bridging science-society</i> 3. <i>Action Agenda for Transformation – political economy</i> 	<p>Objective 1</p> <p><i>Would it fill a relevant gap? Is it unique? Is it actionable? Is it feasible?</i></p> <p><i>Is this a coherent set? Discuss in this sequence?</i></p>
14:45 – 15:00	<p>Work stream 1: Economics of Water <i>Is it meaningful to apply Dasgupta framework and make it specific to water?</i> <i>Will that deliver cost of inaction/benefits of action?</i> <i>Can a “social cost of water” parameter (Stern for water) be developed?</i> <i>Need to go beyond classical cost-benefit economics into political economy, governance, values</i></p> <p><i>Process – should review deliver separate component reports (“bite size” parts) as inputs for dialogues and then synthesize in final report?</i> <i>What component reports would be relevant?</i></p>	<p>Objective 1</p> <p><i>Does scoping document ask relevant questions?</i></p>
15:00 – 15:15	<p>Work stream 2: Societal Dialogues and Communication <i>How to envision societal dialogues that use (preliminary) results from work stream 1 as input, and then feed outcomes back into work stream 1 (2-way iterative and complementary process)?</i></p> <p><i>- Are levers of change a good entry point for dialogue? What levers? What dialogues should we wish for? With which groups? In which geographies?</i> <i>- Or cost of inaction as entry point for dialogue?</i></p>	<p>Objective 1</p> <p><i>Does scoping document ask the right questions?</i></p> <p><i>Convening power</i></p>

<p>15:15 – 15:30</p>	<p>- What dialogue around the final synthesis report?</p> <p>How to enhance quality of dialogue?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Challenging core myths/narratives that drive unsustainable water practices/role of leaders - Challenging theories of change that have not worked - Embracing contestation/discomfort. - Not one-off dialogues, but series of 2 or 3 with same group? <p>What is the deliverable? Contributions to be integrated in final report? Separate component report?</p> <p>How to integrate communication?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “All of society approaches” are increasingly being advocated; - Water narratives show large divergence. - How to successfully communicate findings of author group to different stakeholders, and the latter’s feedback and suggested pathways for action back to authors? <p>Work stream 3: Action Agenda for Transformation</p> <p>The action agenda tends to be the weak work stream in reviews like this: brilliant science does not translate into action (fast enough). Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Are policy recommendations and political economy afterthoughts? - Are theories of change not robust? - Are divides between disciplines not bridged, or between technocracy and society? 	<p>Is crowd sourcing visuals, graphics, narratives an option?</p> <p>Objective 1</p> <p>What would make this review different and actionable?</p> <p>Does scoping document ask the right questions?</p>
<p>15:30 – 15:40</p>	<p>10 minute break</p>	
<p>15:40 – 15:55</p> <p>15:55 – 16:05</p> <p>16:05 – 16:15</p>	<p>Team effort of 4-5 authors to ensure balance across work streams (not just one prima donna)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Formation of team of lead authors - Group of young contributing authors who do most of the work - Formation of Advisory/Sounding Board from public, private, and knowledge sectors as sparring partners who challenge authors and provide feedback <p>Secretariat role / convening role</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Coordination across work streams: curating the science and evidence, dialogues and communication, agenda for action - Where to place secretariat function(s)? Part in lead institution, part in NL Ministry? - Interface with other relevant initiatives and UN process - Mobilizing partners <p>Mile stones in the process toward March 2023 (and beyond)</p>	<p>Objective 2</p> <p>Diversity, Representation of Global South, young and old, etc.</p> <p>Objective 2</p> <p>Objective 2</p>
<p>16:15 – 16:25</p>	<p>Final reflections of participants (?)</p>	

16:25 – 16:30	Closing of the workshop - moderator	Did we achieve objectives? What are next steps? 28 September new version of Scoping doc, plus a 1 page ToR
16:30 – 17:00	<i>Optional time in case of overrun workshop and/or to discuss any remaining pressing issues</i>	