

1.1 Knowledge, skills and organisational capacity - To strengthen practitioners' skills and knowledge, foster meaningful engagement and enhance cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary and inter-organisational planning and delivery.

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are rare in water-related organisations in the region. Engineering or technical skills dominate organisational skills. Limited formal training opportunities exist, emphasis on practical skills and experience. Organisational knowledge and capacity is regularly lost due to staff turnover.</p> <p>2. Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are available in the key water-related organisation in the region, but limited to a few individuals. Engineering or technical skills dominate organisational skills. Formal education and training supports professional capacities. Organisational knowledge and capacity is often lost due to staff turnover.</p> <p>3. Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are actively maintained and updated across the key water-related organisation in the region. Engineering skills are complemented by other disciplinary skills (for example, landscape and ecology). Some connection(s)/alliance(s) with knowledge brokering organisation(s) is/are in place.</p> <p>4. Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are influenced by science, actively maintained and updated across the key water-related organisation in the region. Regular connection(s)/alliance(s) with knowledge brokering organisation(s) is/are in place. Multi-disciplinary skills are common (for example, landscape and ecology, social and urban design). This extends to embedding multidisciplinary skills into key decision-making positions/groups.</p> <p>5. Integrated water-related skills and knowledge are influenced by science, actively maintained across the key water-related organisation in the region. A strong learning culture means knowledge and skill needs are regularly reassessed and updated. Multi-disciplinary skills are common (for example, landscape and ecology, social and urban design, architects) and applied to projects and decision-making. Organisations support (e.g. fund) research and knowledge brokering programs (such as, capacity building programs).</p>	<p>Science influence Are there contacts and partnerships with research organisations, do organisations invest in research and capacity building programs to fill their gaps?</p> <p>Capacity What are the skills and knowledge required for water sensitive management and governance? What is the level of skill and knowledge available in the various organisations? How are internal skills assessed and what measures are in place to update knowledge and skills?</p> <p>Learning culture How important is keeping skills and knowledge up to date for the organisations relative to other activities (e.g. as can be judged from budget or otherwise resource allocation)? How do organisations deal with gaps in skills and knowledge - to what degree do they have a learning culture?</p>	<p>Interviews or surveys within organisations</p> <p>Policy documents</p> <p>Programs and activities for skill and knowledge development</p> <p>Annual reports - regarding resources allocated to skill and knowledge development</p> <p>Organisational chart - presence of people with responsibility to organise the maintenance and updating of skills and knowledge</p> <p>Partnerships with universities and other research institutes</p>

1.2 Water is key element in city planning and design – To improve urban planning decisions, processes and practices to support water sensitive outcomes.

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Water policy and management beyond essential services are rarely considered in matters of urban planning and design. Water servicing for informal settlements happens as needed and does not take into account impacts on broader city planning.</p> <p>2. General policy on sustainable urban water management is in place but there is a lack of focus on integrated urban and water system planning. Regulation exists but is not enforced.</p> <p>3. Urban planning policy acknowledges the role of water systems and the services they provide. Urban planning generally involves some coordination with utility service providers. Some individual advocacy of water sensitivity in the physical form and layout of urban development. Preliminary practical guidance is emerging. Urban developments experiment with water sensitive urban design. Regulation enforcement is starting to mature.</p> <p>4. Urban planning policy acknowledges the role of water systems in supporting liveability and sustainability. Formal collaborative processes for integrated urban and water planning are established. Urban planning and design standards and guidelines include some specific water sensitive related incentives and requirements. Urban developments incorporating water sensitive urban design elements are becoming commonplace. Monitoring and evaluation of planning and performance outcomes is in place.</p> <p>5. Water system planning is fully integrated in urban planning and design. Formal collaborative governance structures with clearly defined roles and responsibilities are mandated and embedded in practice. Urban design guidelines address the critical role of water in achieving liveability, sustainability, resilience and productivity goals Comprehensive policy and regulation incorporating clear and specific water-related objectives/performance requirements and incentives is in place. Urban developments incorporating water sensitive urban design are the norm. Monitoring and evaluation of planning and performance outcomes is in place.</p>	<p>Water system planning In what ways are the following things taken into account in water system planning processes and approaches?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the long term • integration with the built form • planning and building controls <p>Monitoring and evaluation How are the review processes for urban planning decisions and practices undertaken and what evidence exists for improvements in practices as a response to these processes?</p> <p>Evaluation frameworks What are the processes and approaches in place to take different sectoral/stakeholder priorities into account?</p> <p>Policy and strategy Is there evidence of cross-sectoral commitment to integrate water management in broader urban planning and design? How is liveability, sustainability and resilience planning embedded in water and urban policies and practice?</p> <p>Legislation and regulation Do statutory planning requirements mandate water sensitive practices are incorporated into land use planning and urban design?</p>	<p>Strategies that formally acknowledges the role of water.</p> <p>Urban design guidelines and policy documents, project proposals and strategic plans.</p> <p>Statutory and strategic planning and policies.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation of projects.</p>

1.3 Cross-sector institutional arrangements and processes – To ensure institutional processes support robust, effective, transparent and stable cross-sectoral arrangements, with joint accountability between all sectors, organisations and levels on how water sensitive goals should be achieved.

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Relevant institutional arrangements and processes are lacking, ad hoc or in continuous flux. Organisations act on their own and no input with other stakeholders is sought at any stage of any project. Organisational responsibilities are unclear, especially in regards to urban water management and environmental regulation.</p> <p>2. Some relevant institutional arrangements and processes are present. Coordination between organisations is sometimes sought if strictly necessary or externally enforced.</p> <p>3. Relevant institutional arrangements and processes are mostly transparent and embedded in policies and strategies. Some collaboration is typically occurring at some stage of most projects. Some structures and processes are in place to promote integrated outcomes across organisations, such as collaboration platforms and work groups.</p> <p>4. Relevant institutional arrangements and processes are fully transparent and thoroughly embedded in policies and strategies. Organisations monitor, evaluate and adapt these processes and arrangements according to changing circumstances and new insights. Agencies are required to share information, and transparency supports platforms for coordination and inter-agency networks. Collaboration with relevant stakeholders in some stages of all projects is sought. Several ongoing partnerships are established to drive particular integrated initiatives.</p> <p>5. Relevant institutional arrangements and processes are mandated in policy and planning frameworks and thoroughly embedded in organisational strategies. Organisations monitor, evaluate and adapt these processes and arrangements according to changing circumstances and new insights. Agencies are required to share information and full transparency ensures coordination across inter-agency networks. Collaboration with relevant stakeholders in all stages of all projects occurs. Collaborative work is undertaken across policy portfolios (e.g. energy, transport, health etc.). Many ongoing partnerships are established with joint accountability common e.g. targets, KPIs, shared investment or maintenance responsibilities.</p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation What is the review and reporting process for institutional coordination and inter-agency arrangements and what evidence exists that demonstrates an improvement in practice as a response to these processes?</p> <p>Policy and strategy What policy supports cross sector collaboration? Is work undertaken across policy portfolios? How well are the organisations equipped and organised to deal with matters that go beyond the boundaries of what they are directly responsible for (e.g. jurisdiction or property wise)?</p> <p>How do organisations deal with externalities and responsibilities around boundary-crossing issues, e.g. do they have joint strategies, investment proportional to ultimate beneficiaries etc.?</p> <p>To what degree does policy within the sector address boundary issues (such as, jurisdictional, property, ecological, organisational and disciplines) and externalities (such as joint strategies, shared KPIs and targets, pricing and off sets)?</p> <p>Networks Who gets involved and at what stages? What are the interdisciplinary and cross-silo collaborations involved in project planning and execution? Are collaborative arrangements formal or informal? e.g. Managing Directors group once a month, formal - collaborative group, informal interactions between stakeholders e.g. phone calls, emails, meetings, preparing reports etc.</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation What is the review and reporting process for institutional coordination and inter-agency arrangements and what evidence exists that demonstrates an improvement in practice as a response to these processes?</p>	<p>Interviews or surveys within organisations to ascertain the more informal or ad hoc approaches and arrangements</p> <p>Policy documents (for guidelines regarding project planning and collaboration)</p> <p>Project proposals and plans (for overview of the actual stakeholders and experts involved)</p> <p>Policy documents and regulations to assess the level of formal embedding of such approaches and arrangements</p> <p>Formal structures - permanent and indefinite - e.g. project-based collaboration and ultimately funding/investment arrangements</p>

1.4 Public engagement, participation and transparency – To actively pursue meaningful involvement and empowerment of citizens in decision-making processes.

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Public not or hardly informed of sector activities due to citizen antipathy, lack of opportunity or lack of institutions that support participating in water governance.</p> <p>2. Public is informed around certain sector activities but limited opportunity for participation and influence. Some sections of the community are managed to minimize risk rather than foster participation. No formal citizen engagement nor transparency policy in place.</p> <p>3. Public participate in some areas of water governance, for example, through participation in public meetings, surveys and consultations undertaken on key issues or areas of interest.</p> <p>4. Formal citizen engagement and transparency policies are in place. Citizens participate actively in water governance, for example through reference groups, committees and collaborative initiatives. The public is routinely involved and engaged in collaboration and there is ongoing dialogue with the public about issues of interest.</p> <p>5. Ongoing and frequent citizen engagement activities, reaching in principle all people in the relevant area. These communication and engagement activities are part of formal policy. Citizens participate actively in water governance, for example through reference groups, committees and collaborative initiatives. Active liaisons between community organisations and formal water governance organisations (utilities, councils) exist and citizens play important leadership roles in water governance. The public is routinely engaged in collaborations and empowered to shape decisions in the water sector. There is ongoing dialogue with the public about the water sector priorities and activities.</p>	<p>What organisational policies and programs are in place for public engagement?</p> <p>How is the public informed about sector activities? What are the strategies, methods etc. in place to advise the public about sector activities?</p> <p>Are the engagement activities reaching the groups of people in the relevant areas? What IAP2 levels are engagement activities aimed at?</p> <p>Are ongoing communication networks and platforms between the water sector and the public established?</p>	<p>Review council policy and record details about transparency, and communication and public engagement activities.</p> <p>Examples of ongoing communication hubs, networks and platforms, established to support communication between the water sector and the public e.g. online forums, smartphone apps, regular public meetings, water events, community discussion groups etc. Refer to the IAP2 participation spectrum - https://www.iap2.org.au/resources/iap2s-public-participation-spectrum</p> <p>Reports on effectiveness of public engagement</p>

1.5 Leadership, long-term vision and commitment – To articulate a water sensitive vision and narrative linked to broader city aspirations that drives innovation and water sensitive practices across all sectors and government levels.

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Leadership principles are based on fundamental water issues and basic service provision (water security and human health). No recognition of the broader value of water (e.g. water sensitive principles and practices). Leadership of organisations does not support such an agenda.</p> <p>2. Individual champions advocate individual elements of water sensitive principles and practices but lack senior support and therefore have limited opportunity to initiate change.</p> <p>3. Champions advocate water sensitive principles and practices. They have some influence organisationally, with several leaders supporting the water sensitive agenda and endorsing investment in initiatives to drive change.</p> <p>4. Several senior leaders advocate for water sensitive principles and practices. Organisations commit to a water sensitive vision in policy and strategy, embedding long-term broad aspirations for water's role in delivering liveability, sustainability, resilience and productivity outcomes. Ongoing funding is made available to deliver programs and initiatives that will support achievement of the water sensitive vision. Incentives exist to promote water sensitive practice.</p> <p>5. Several senior leaders advocate for water sensitive principles and practices. Organisations commit to a water sensitive vision in policy and strategy, embedding long-term broad aspirations for water's role in delivering liveability, sustainability, resilience and productivity outcomes. Ongoing funding is made available to deliver programs and initiatives that will support achievement of the water sensitive vision. Incentives exist to promote water sensitive practice. Organisations provide sector-wide leadership to drive and support other organisations to implement changes that will help the city at large achieve a water sensitive vision.</p>	<p>Vision and narrative Does a water sensitive vision and/or narrative exist? Is it widely recognised and embedded across other sectors?</p> <p>What is the level of endorsement and commitment to liveability, sustainability and resilience?</p> <p>Policy and strategy Is a water sensitive vision aligned with liveability, sustainability and resilience present in official policy documents?</p> <p>Incentives What awards or other signs of recognition exist for water leadership?</p> <p>Revenue, funding & investment Is reliable and dedicated funding available to support a water sensitive vision?</p> <p>Leadership and capacity Who can be considered leaders or champions of the water-sensitive cause?</p> <p>What leadership and power positions do these people hold? How well are they represented and how much influence can they exert onto key projects and initiatives?</p>	<p>Interviews or surveys, within the organisations and in the sector and community</p> <p>Organisational charts</p> <p>Supporting policies (leadership commitment) for supporting structures for water leadership- Dept. of Planning, formal and informal structures to support leadership</p> <p>Policy documents</p> <p>Annual reports</p>

1.6 Water resourcing and funding to deliver broad societal value – To create revenue, funding and investment models to drive dedicated investments in water sensitive practices, including non-market values

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. Water-related resourcing and funding based on no business case or little analysis (e.g. purely political influence).</p> <p>2. Water-related resourcing and funding, including external grants, are subject to simple cost reasoning (cheapest option).</p> <p>3. Water-related resourcing and funding, including external grants, are subject to financial analysis with some consideration given to broader societal or environmental outcomes. Budget is allocated on an ad hoc basis to support water sensitive practices.</p> <p>4. Water-related resourcing and funding, including external grants, are integral part of a broader societal cost-benefit analysis (consideration is consistently given to broader societal or environmental outcomes). Budget is allocated consistently to support water sensitive practices.</p> <p>5. Water-related resourcing and funding, including external grants, are integral part of a broader societal cost-benefit analysis (consideration is consistently given to broader societal or environmental outcomes, as well as more abstract benefits (e.g. inter-generational equity). Considerable budget is consistently allocated to supporting water sensitive practices. In-house innovation funds support ongoing learning and innovation.</p>	<p>Cost-benefit analyses Are considerations of broad societal values made explicit in planning and investment decision-making (based on economic analysis - total community benefit/cost rather than solely on a financial analysis basis)? What evidence exists?</p> <p>How well are water-related resourcing and funding portfolios geared towards delivering broad societal value, e.g. through social value business cases and funding allocation mechanisms for water practices supporting liveability, sustainability and resilience?</p> <p>Revenue, funding and investment What are the resourcing and funding allocations that testify of an intent to deliver broad societal value (e.g. liveability, sustainability and resilience considerations rather than cost efficiency reasoning for example)?</p> <p>What proportion of the total budget and resourcing do these resourcing and funding allocations amount to? How well-embedded are these funding and resourcing allocations?</p>	<p>Interviews or surveys within organisations</p> <p>Policy documents and project documentation to assess how broad societal value (e.g. liveability, sustainability and resilience considerations) are taken into account when making resourcing and funding allocation decisions</p> <p>Annual reports to assess this resourcing and funding relative to total budget and resourcing</p> <p>Policy documents (for guidelines regarding project planning and funding)</p> <p>Project proposals and plans (to assess how structural and embedded this resourcing and funding is)</p>

1.7 Equitable representation of perspectives – To ensure inclusiveness and representation of relevant different perspectives in the governance arrangements and decision-making in the water sector (including, gender, race, age, mental or physical disability, groups who are minorities/disadvantaged/marginalised etc.).

Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources
<p>1. No representation by groups who experience marginalisation or disadvantage. Opposition to any change in status quo regarding equitable representation.</p> <p>2. Low degree of representation, no policy for improvement. Representatives have little power.</p> <p>3. Some positions of power held by representatives who experience marginalisation or disadvantage. Equity policy in place and maintained.</p> <p>4. Reasonable level of representation of relevant different perspectives (i.e. reflecting societal averages) in positions of power. Equity policy is in place, maintained and considered an important asset.</p> <p>5. High level of representation of relevant different perspectives (i.e. reflecting societal averages) including across power positions. Equity policy is in place, maintained and considered an important asset. Organisation(s) take(s) pride in being equitably represented and is recognised as such.</p>	<p>How well are the different perspectives (e.g. regarding gender, ethnicity, indigenous people, age, mental or physical disability etc.) included in the governance arrangements and decision-making?</p> <p>How does this translate in representation and positions held within the organisations?</p> <p>How much is this part of official policy and the identity of the organisations?</p>	<p>Interviews or surveys within organisations</p> <p>Policy documents</p> <p>Organisational chart</p>