Review of draft monitoring methodologies for SDG 6 global indicators – **Summary of feedback and responses – 6.4.2**

About the review

Between April and November 2016, the draft monitoring methodologies for SDG 6 global indicators were pilot tested at scale in five countries (Jordan, the Netherlands, Peru, Senegal, and Uganda), with the objective to collect feedback on technical feasibility, usefulness for policy making, institutional models for implementation, and capacity requirements.

In addition, between August and October 2016, UN-Water carried out an external review of the draft monitoring methodologies, to collect feedback from country and international experts.

The objective of both of these exercises was to improve the methodologies and inform the process of global rollout of the methodologies starting in 2017.

Below follows a summary of the feedback received for a specific indicator and the response from the indicator's custodian agency(ies).

Summary

Indicator: 6.4.2

Custodian agency/agencies: FAO

Table of Contents

List of sources of feedback

Feedback and responses

Target Team and external review feedback

Feedback	Response
The indicator should be computed at sub-national level, particularly in basin or sub-basin units. The sub-national values should be aggregated by weighting, using one of the following parameters: area, TWW, by TRWR, by (TRWR – EFR) or by population	This suggestion has been accepted. Indications in this sense are given in the methodology paper and in the training preparation
If TWW and TRWR cannot be provided for subnational units by the countries themselves, it would be no problem extracting those values from global hydrological model output with a spatial resolution of 0.5° if spatial units >20,000 km2 are defined	Countries are free to use models. That can be done particularly in the context of a ladder approach, as proposed by countries (NL). We will work to support those countries that will choose this path
It is not useful to consider long-term averages of TWW (water withdrawals). It is suggested to use temporal averages of TWW over approx. 5 years from the very beginning	
It is suggested to determine TRWR as 20-year averages.	All these issues over the averages are flawed by the fact that usually data are lacking. We will discuss these points when we will have more clear idea on data availability
Temporal disaggregation – stress may occur in particular months of the year and it is important to be aware of that in order to reduce the stress during the dry season	This is not really the purpose of the indicator. SDG are synthesis indicators, while supplementary indicator may be used to provide analytical information
For the calculation of environmental flow requirements, the indicator should provide more concrete guidance to ensure countries apply most recent scientific methodologies.	This will be done, and it will require a collaborative effort within the GEMI team

POC countries feedback

Feedback	Response
Spatial disaggregation at sub-country (basin) level is needed	Included
Separate surface and ground water would be useful	This is mainly a data issue. No problem if data are available
This indicator is useful for policy decisions	
Data on environmental flow requirements are usually missing at national level	

Capacity building and institutional support for monitoring is needed (also for 6.4.1)	
The combined use of statistics, remote sensing and models would provide more reliable results	The ladder approach is supported. We will elaborate and provide further guidance during this year
FAO support has been competent and effective. Guidelines should be refined and more detailed – also 6.4.1	A more refined manual will be produced by the end of this year. For 6.4.1, it will also depend on the process of the tier status