

Key feedback received	Response & Rationale
<p><b>Inclusion of sub-basins or portions</b> of transboundary basins to be covered by operational agreements in the calculation.</p>	<p>Methodology revised accordingly; this will allow monitoring the change in areas covered especially in the case where there is no operational arrangement at the level of the assessed basin in its entirety.</p>
<p>The <b>regularity of meetings and of exchange of information</b> should be specified</p>	<p>A minimum frequency of meetings, “at least once per year”, was included in the text of the methodology</p>
<p>Inclusion of additional factors to <b>assess the quality of transboundary cooperation</b></p>	<p>Not included in the methodology; methodology based on the four criteria of arrangements’ operationality of customary international water law; will be discussed in the roll-out</p>

Key feedback received	Response & Rationale
<p>Have only <b>part of the four criteria to assess operationality</b> of arrangements applied, to track the process of transboundary cooperation</p>	<p>Not included. To partially use the 4 criteria would require the indicator to be expressed as an index and not a proportion of area. IAEG-SDGs has expressed its reluctance towards indicator expressed as index.</p>
<p><b>Alternative metrics</b> to basin area (volumetric)</p>	<p>Not included; Volumetric assessment will require more data</p>
<p>Effective cooperation without an agreement in place; section to explain the implications of the values of the indicator; when no activities in the shared basin is cooperation essential?</p>	<p>Not included</p>

## Key feedback received

## Response & Rationale

Details on technical steps to be taken, institutional arrangements and resources and capacity mobilization in testing the monitoring methodology of the indicator

Not included but **will be used for roll-out** with aspects and challenges to strengthen the step-by-step approach to be presented in the technical webinar and tutorial.