CRC for Water Sensitive Cities

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.

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Science influence To foster meaningful engagement between research and industry whereby robust partnerships generate reliable, trusted and interdisciplinary outcomes and form the basis for adapting existing industry practice. **Capacity** To strengthen practitioners' skills and knowledge to enable cross-sectoral, multidisciplinary and inter-organisational project planning and delivery. **Learning culture** To create an active learning culture within organisations that embraces learning through experimentation and reflexivity with new insights actively shared and discussed across multiple sectors.	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. 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. 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. 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. 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).	**Science influence** Are there contacts and partnerships with research organisations, do organisations invest in research and capacity building programs to fill their gaps? **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? **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?	Interviews or surveys within organisations Policy documents Programs and activities for skill and knowledge development Annual reports - regarding resources allocated to skill and knowledge development Organisational chart - presence of people with responsibility to organise the maintenance and updating of skills and knowledge Partnerships with universities and other research institutes	**Hierarchy** 1. Engineering or technical skills dominate water sector organisations 2. Some broader IWM skills but only in a few individuals 3. Broader skills compliment engineering but limited knowledge sharing and research investment 4. Multidisciplinary skills common, important to decision making and backed up by good knowledge-sharing 5. Strong learning culture backed up by investment in research and capacity building **Examples** **Definitions** Formal training opportunities: university degrees, diplomas, short courses **Common Q and A's / Notes** This indicator has a practitioner focus, not the community (community knowledge etc. is covered under Community Capital goal). It applies to all institutions in the water sector in the geographic area – not just the host institution (e.g. council) **Must mention**

CRC for Water Sensitive Cities

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

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Integrated urban and water planning To equip water system planning processes to integrate effectively with urban planning processes. **Monitoring and evaluation** To actively monitor and evaluate urban planning decisions and practices to improve planning processes and water sensitive outcomes. **Evaluation frameworks** To develop comprehensive evaluation framework that incorporates different priorities and trade-offs as part of integrated planning. **Policy and strategy** To develop policy that supports collaboration across water and planning. **Legislation and regulation** To mandate water sensitive land use planning and urban design requirements in statutory planning regulation that are outcome oriented, flexible and coordinated between sectors.	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. 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. 3. **Urban planning policy acknowledges** the role of water systems and the services they provide. **U**rban 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. 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. 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.	**Water system planning** In what ways are the following things taken into account in water system planning processes and approaches? • the long term • integration with the built form • planning and building controls **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? **Evaluation frameworks** What are the processes and approaches in place to take different sectoral/stakeholder priorities into account? **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? **Legislation and regulation** Do statutory planning requirements mandate water sensitive practices are incorporated into land use planning and urban design?	Strategies that formally acknowledges the role of water. Urban design guidelines and policy documents, project proposals and strategic plans. Statutory and strategic planning and policies. Monitoring and evaluation of projects.	**Hierarchy** • Water policy and management beyond essential services are rarely considered in matters of urban planning and design • Increasing recognition in urban planning and design, of the role of water systems in supporting liveability and sustainability. • Increasing coordination and collaboration in urban and water planning. • Increasing urban planning and design standards, policy and regulation with water-related requirements **Examples** **Definitions** **Common Q and A's** **Must mention** Think about beyond water supply, also how planning can support flood protection

CRC for Water Sensitive Cities

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.

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Monitoring and evaluation To actively monitor and evaluate relevant institutional processes that support robust, effective, transparent and stable cross-sectoral arrangements. **Policy and strategy** To develop policy that coordinates and provides joint accountability between all sectors and levels of government on how water sensitive goals should be achieved. **Networks** To develop strong, responsive and active networks that are highly valued and exist across different sectors, organisations and levels.	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 and environmental regulation. 2. **Some** relevant **institutional arrangements** and processes are **present**. **Coordination between organisations** is **sometimes** sought if strictly necessary or externally enforced. 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. 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. 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 partnership**s are established **with joint accountability** common e.g. targets, KPIs, shared investment or maintenance responsibilities.	**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? **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)? 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.? 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)? **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. **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?	Interviews or surveys within organisations to ascertain the more informal or ad hoc approaches and arrangements Policy documents (for guidelines regarding project planning and collaboration) Project proposals and plans (for overview of the actual stakeholders and experts involved) Policy documents and regulations to assess the level of formal embedding of such approaches and arrangements Formal structures - permanent and indefinite - e.g. project-based collaboration and ultimately funding/investment arrangements	**Hierarchy** 1. Organisations work in silos; absence of enabling structures and processes 2. Coordination occurs if necessary or enforced for specific projects; some associated enabling structures and processes are in place 3. Collaboration occurs in some stages of most projects; associated enabling structures and processes are in place 4. Collaboration occurs in all projects, supported by structures and processes; partnerships are sought to drive particular integrated initiatives 5. Collaboration is mandated in policy and planning frameworks; ongoing partnerships drive integrated agendas **Examples** Major water-related strategies are typically developed with some kind of collaborative process such as cross organisation or sector committees The Melbourne Region Flood Management and Drainage Strategy is developed with multi agency collaborative governance. The Water Act in Victoria requires some strategies to be developed through collaborative processes. **Definitions** **Common Q and A's** **Why is transparency important?** To ensure priorities and constraints are made explicit in aid of fruitful collaboration **Questions about what is meant by transparency** – Does FOI count? And why is inter-org collaborational transparency so important? Does it matter how they work with other entities? - rating 2 example: referral arrangements for planning - need to focus on joint accountability aspects of 4 and 5 when determining those higher ratings **Must mention**

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

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Citizen engagement To actively pursue meaningful involvement and empowerment of citizens in decision making processes. **Policy and strategy** To develop policy that supports communication and engagement activities with citizens.	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. 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. 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. 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. 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.	What organisational policies and programs are in place for public engagement? How is the public informed about sector activities? What are the strategies, methods etc. in place to advise the public about sector activities? Are the engagement activities reaching the groups of people in the relevant areas? What IAP2 levels are engagement activities aimed at? Are ongoing communication networks and platforms between the water sector and the public established?	Review council policy and record details about transparency, and communication and public engagement activities. 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 Reports on effectiveness of public engagement	**Hierarchy** 1. Public is not informed about water sector activities and don't care 2. Public is informed, generally to minimise risk, but limited opportunity for participation 3. Public participates through responding to consultation activities 4. Active public participation through collaborative activities 5. Public is empowered to make and shape decisions and take leadership roles **Examples** This indicator has some general alignment with the IAP2 framework of public participation: Inform, Consult, Involve; Collaborate; Empower Citizen juries may be directly involved in recommending service levels and expenditure programs. Advisory Committees and reference groups are common vehicles for consultation. **Definitions** **Common Q and A's / Notes** This indicator is about core water governance principles, structures and processes, not community-led stewardship activities such as volunteering and community organisation participation (covered in Community Capital) Why is it important to have higher levels of engagement? Sharing ownership and support of outcomes ; increase public support and endorsement for initiatives that will deliver water sensitive outcomes, even if higher cost; willingness to pay for higher rates to achieve public benefits Importance of engaging at early stage of projects in order to qualify as collaboration. Late-stage engagement is not as powerful. Talking with community on their level – feeling shut out by jargon? Providing content that allows people to engage? **Must mention**

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.

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Vision and narrative To articulate a water sensitive vision and narrative that endorses the liveability, sustainability and resilience water agenda and is embed across sectors and linked to broader city aspirations. **Policy and strategy** To develop policy that is coherently aligned to the water sensitive vision and underpins a widely shared understanding of the role of water in a city which embraces all principles of water sensitivity in a locally contextual way. **Incentives** To establish an awards and recognition program for excellence in water leadership. **Revenue, funding & investment** To provide commitment to a water sensitive vision through dedicated funding initiatives. **Leadership and capacity** To drive innovation and water sensitive practices across all sectors and government levels.	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. 2. **Individual champions** advocate for individual elements of water sensitive principles and practices but **lack senior support** and therefore have **limited opportunity** to initiate change. 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. 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. 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.**	**Vision and narrative** Does a water sensitive vision and/or narrative exist? Is it widely recognised and embedded across other sectors? What is the level of endorsement and commitment to liveability, sustainability and resilience? **Policy and strategy** Is a water sensitive vision aligned with liveability, sustainability and resilience present in official policy documents? **Incentives** What awards or other signs of recognition exist for water leadership? **Revenue, funding & investment** Is reliable and dedicated funding available to support a water sensitive vision? **Leadership and capacity** Who can be considered leaders or champions of the water-sensitive cause? 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?	Interviews or surveys, within the organisations and in the sector and community Organisational charts Supporting policies (leadership commitment) for supporting structures for water leadership- Dept. of Planning, formal and informal structures to support leadership Policy documents Annual reports	**Hierarchy** 1. No recognition of water sensitive agenda, and potential hostility from organisational leaders 2. Individual champions advocate water sensitive principles and practices but lack opportunity to drive change 3. Champions, including several senior leaders, advocate water sensitive principles and practices and drive change initiatives 4. Organisations commit to a water sensitive vision in policy and strategy, invest in change initiatives and provide incentives 5. As 4, plus organisations provide sectoral leadership in driving change towards a shared water sensitive vision **Examples** **Definitions** Water sensitive principles and practices: integrated water cycle management; holistic approach to planning and designing water systems, the built form and urban landscapes; fostering community water stewardship; water servicing to deliver liveability, sustainability, resilience and productivity outcomes Organisational/Senior leaders: management, executive and board roles Champions: Advocates of new approaches and solutions that may challenge old ways of doing things **Common Q and A's / Notes** The scale is about leadership, vision and commitment for water sensitivity – not water in general. E.g. A score of 1 does not mean an absence of leadership, it means an absence of leadership for water sensitive practices **Must mention**

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

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Cost-benefit analyses To direct investment towards the highest value option that considers and quantifies externalities and non-market values of water services. **Revenue, funding and investment** To create revenue, funding and investment models to drive dedicated investments in water sensitive practices.	1. Water-related resourcing and funding based on **no business case** or little analysis (e.g. purely political influence). 2. Water-related resourcing and funding, including external grants, are subject to **simple cost reasoning** (cheapest option). 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. 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. 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.	**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? 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? **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)? 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?	Interviews or surveys within organisations 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 Annual reports to assess this resourcing and funding relative to total budget and resourcing Policy documents (for guidelines regarding project planning and funding) Project proposals and plans (to assess how structural and embedded this resourcing and finding is)	**Hierarchy** 1. Water investment based on minimal analysis, no business case 2. Water investment based on least cost 3. Water investment based on financial analysis and some consideration of broader social and environmental outcomes; ad hoc budget to support water sensitive practices 4. Water investment based on integrated cost-benefit analysis that consistently accounts for of broader social and environmental outcomes; consistent budget to support water sensitive practices 5. As 4, plus cost-benefit analysis accounts for long-term outcomes; considerable budget to support water sensitive practices, including in-house innovation funds **Examples** Water sensitive investments: green infrastructure projects, stormwater harvesting schemes, urban greening strategy or policy, community owned and operated water infrastructure, community education programs, recycled water schemes, internal staff trainings **Definitions** **Common Q and A's / Notes** **Must mention**

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.).

Objectives	Rating Scale	Guiding questions	Suggested data collection sources	Facilitator guiding questions and notes
Policy and strategy To develop policy that requires equitable representation of groups who experience marginalisation or disadvantage in senior positions and boards. **Leadership** 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, minority groups, etc.).	1. **No representation** of groups who experience marginalisation or disadvantage. Opposition to any change in status quo regarding equitable representation. 2. **Low degree** of **representation**, **no policy** for improvement. Representatives have **little power**. 3. **Some positions of power** held by people who experience marginalisation or disadvantage. **Equity policy** in place and **maintained**. 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**. 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.	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? How does this translate in representation and positions held within the organisations? How much is this part of official policy and the identity of the organisations?	Interviews or surveys within organisations Policy documents Organisational chart	**Hierarchy** Based upon degree to which marginalised or disadvantaged groups are represented in positions of influence. 1. No representation of marginalised or disadvantaged groups 2. Low representation, low power, no policy for improvement 3. Some positions of power held, equity policy maintained 4. Reasonable level of representation in positions of power, equity policy valued 5. High level of representation in positions of power, equity policy valued, pride in equity practices demonstrated **Examples** Reflecting societal averages – e.g. Means that less than 50/50 male/female (as an example) is a minimum threshold for a 4. **Definitions** Diversity: Gender, ethnicity, age, mental/physical ability Power: Influence, leadership, impact (e.g. board, executive, senior management) **Common Q and A's / Notes** Why is this indicator important? Diversity of perspectives leads to better processes, better decisions and better outcomes Need to emphasise the leadership and governance aspect of this indicator. This is not about how many people overall in an organisation are diverse, but how diverse is the leadership. **Must mention**