

# Turkey Water Governance Workshop and Rating Session Preliminary Results

## Approach

The Regional Water Governance Benchmarking (ReWaB) assessment process in Turkey was split into two sessions, separated by several months. The Workshop was held at the Midi Hotel in Ankara on 6 July, and the Rating Session was held in Ankara on 27 October 2009.

## Workshop

The Workshop was the first one held in any of the target countries and was used to explain and discuss water governance concepts and to explore alternative ways of assessing functional coverage of the five water resource Standard Functions. Participants were selected on the basis of their organizations, bearing in mind the need to achieve balance. The five standard strata, used for selecting participants in some later workshops had not yet been fully articulated at that point. However applying the strata after the fact yields the following distribution.

Strata	Number of participants
Water resources	8
Irrigation	6
Other water using sectors	9
National policy makers	4
Advisors	6

A participant list is shown in Annex 1.

## Agenda

The agenda for the Workshop is shown below.

- 9:00 – 9:30 Opening – Deputy Director General, DSI
- 9:30 – 10:00 Presentation on water governance and discussion – Dr Mark Svendsen, IRG
- 10:00 – 10:30 Reactions to water governance concept – Mrs Ayla Efeoglu and Prof. Dr. Aysegül Kibaroglu
- 10:30 – 10:45 Coffee/tea**
- 10:45 – 11:15 General discussion on approaches to assessing higher level water governance functions
- 11:15 – 11:30 Review of actors and water governance functions and explanation of task – Dr Mark Svendsen and Dr Huseyin Gundogdu
- 11:30 – 12:30 Individuals fill in *O&F Matrix*
- 12:30 – 1:30 Lunch – open buffet**
- 1:30 – 1:45 Review of matrix exercise
- 1:45 – 2:30 Group *O&F Matrix* exercise: 4 or 5 mixed groups of 5-8 people discuss and fill in matrix together
- 2:30 – 2:45 Coffee/tea**
- 2:45 – 3:15 Panel: Private sector perspectives on water governance

3:15 – 3:45 Guided discussion on matrix differences – Hasan Ozlu

3:45 – 4:00 Discussion of next steps and closing

The opening portion of the Workshop featured a description of the water governance concept and a pair of reactions to it from alternative perspectives. The centerpiece of the Workshop comprised two different approaches to assessing responsibility for the water resource Standard Functions in Turkey. In the first approach, individuals were asked to fill in a detailed matrix individually. The detailed matrix consisted of both functions and sub-functions. In the second approach, groups of participants were asked to discuss the functions and complete a matrix of the five functions only as a group. The second approach was much more successful than the first and this approach was adopted for use in all other countries in the program. The results of the second exercise are reported later in this report.

## **Rating Session**

The purpose of the Rating Session was to assess national water governance performance. Twenty-seven people participated and provided responses to survey questionnaires. Two international ReWaB project members (Dr. Lautze and Dr. De Stefano) and one Turkish colleague (Dr. Gundogdu) were present.

People were invited to the workshop with the aim of achieving roughly equal representation in five strata. Actual participation is shown at right. A participant list is shown in Annex 2.

<b>Strata</b>	<b>Number of participants</b>
Water resources	5
Irrigation	4
Other water using sectors	8
National policy makers	3
Advisors	7

The rating session followed the agenda provided below. The role of a Turkish-speaking colleague who was familiar with the concepts and approaches of the project (Dr. Gundogdu) was very important in keeping the activities on track and facilitating the discussion between the participants and international team members. The translation of the questionnaires and the background material into Turkish also contributed importantly to the success of the rating exercise.

## **Agenda**

9:00 - 9:30 Registration and coffee/tea  
9:30 - 9:40 Welcome by Akif Ozkaldi, DDG , DSI  
9:40 -10:30 Introduction (project, water governance, features of water governance) to the rating session and Q&A in English and Turkish (Jonathan Lautze)  
10:30 - 10:45 Benchmarking components: organizations, processes & effectiveness (Lucia De Stefano)  
**10:45 - 11:00 Coffee break**  
11:00 - 12:30 Instructions and completion of the Water Governance Challenges  
**12:30 - 13:30 Lunch**  
13:30 - 14:30 Functional effectiveness instructions and scoring  
**14:30 - 14:45 Coffee Break**  
14:45 - 15:30 Concluding discussion of results, methods, and next steps

The Rating Session consisted of three main parts: (1) an introduction to the project and the concepts of water governance, (2) rating exercises and (3) the collection of feedback from the participants on the project and the applied approach. Water governance concepts, and the benchmarking approach utilized by the ReWaB project, were discussed actively in the first part. During the rating exercises, participants were divided into small groups who functioned well and enabled participants to better understand the purpose of exercises and hear different perspectives on water governance issues. Useful feedback was received during the final session.

## Preliminary Results

The following text and tables show preliminary results of the Workshop and Rating Session. More detailed analysis of the results and a comparative assessment across countries will be undertaken in the future, once data from other countries is available.

### ***Organizations and Functions Matrix***

The *Organizations and Functions Matrix* examines the extent to which major organizations in Turkey influence water resources functions. The major functions are organizing and building capacity in the water sector (Organizing), planning strategically (Planning), allocating water (Allocating), developing and managing water resources (Developing), regulating water resources and services (Regulating). In each of these five functions, participants assigned a score assessing the degree to which an organization influences decisions on a particular function. The scale ranged from 1 through 5, with 1 being the lowest level of influence and 5 being the highest. Five groups of 3 to 6 participants each completed this exercise. Shown below are the scores, averaged across all five groups.

Organizations	Functions				
	Organizing	Planning	Allocating	Developing & Managing	Regulating
Agriculture Ministry	2.0	2.2	1.0	2.2	2.2
Courts	1.0	1.0	1.8	1.2	1.8
DSI	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	4.8
Energy Ministry	2.8	2.8	1.8	2.6	2.4
Energy Regulatory Agency	2.0	1.4	1.8	1.4	2.0
Environment Ministry	3.8	3.2	2.2	3.0	4.6
Health Ministry	1.6	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.8
Iller Bank	2.0	1.6	1.0	1.6	2.2
State Planning Organization	3.0	4.0	1.2	2.6	2.2
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, GD of Energy, Water, and Environment	2.2	2.0	1.4	2.0	1.6
Irrigation Union Association	2.2	1.6	1.8	2.0	3.2
Municipalities	1.6	2.0	2.0	2.2	2.6
Parliament	3.8	2.6	1.4	2.2	1.6
Special Provincial Administration (SPRD)	1.4	1.2	2.4	2.4	2.2
Environmental NGOs	1.6	1.6	1.0	1.2	1.4
Universities	2.4	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.8
Irrigation Cooperatives Association	2.2	2.0	1.0	1.2	2.4
Pressurized Irrigation Industries Association	1.8	2.0	1.0	1.2	1.2
Hydroelectric Power Industry Association	1.8	1.8	1.0	1.4	1.6

### ***Water Governance Decision-making Challenges***

The first rating exercise focused on assessment of selected features of water governance decision making in Turkey in the context of five generic water sector challenges: (1) increasing demand for drinking water, (2) declining groundwater levels, (3) strategic planning for a national water policy, (4) regulating water

quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways, and (5) matching supply and demand in agriculture (see Annex 3).

The decision-making features that were assessed were

- Participation
- Transparency
- Integrity
- Rule of law
- Responsiveness

A set of between 2 and 5 questions were used to elicit a characterization of each feature for a particular challenge. Shown below are the aggregate scores for each feature in each challenge. Also shown are the averages by challenge and by feature. The scale ranged from 1 to 4, with 1 being the lowest level of the feature and 4 being the highest level.

	Participation	Transparency	Integrity	Rule of Law	Responsiveness	Average
<b>Challenge1: Drinking Water</b>	2.38	2.26	2.72	2.93	3.00	2.66
<b>Challenge2: Ground Water</b>	2.51	2.37	2.50	3.23	2.72	2.67
<b>Challenge3: Planning</b>	2.34	2.16	2.42	3.21	3.23	2.67
<b>Challenge4: Water Quality</b>	2.59	2.25	2.40	3.06	3.33	2.72
<b>Challenge5: Matching supply- demand</b>	2.82	2.31	2.45	3.30	2.90	2.76
<b>Average</b>	2.53	2.27	2.50	3.15	3.04	

At a broad level, the results indicate two things. First, the strength of the five water governance features was relatively consistent across the specific challenges, suggesting water governance in Turkey is dealt with fairly uniformly across a range of water management issues. Second, rule of law and responsiveness come through as stronger water governance decision-making features relative to participation, transparency and integrity. True understanding of these scores, however, will only come once they are placed in context through comparison with other countries or at different points in time.

### ***Functional Effectiveness***

Functional effectiveness questions were used to assess how effectively water resources Standard Functions were carried out in practice (see Annex 4). Participants were asked to assign a score for the present as well as one point in the past (year 2000). The results, shown below averaged for all participants, indicate that overall effectiveness is almost identical between now and year 2000. However, some differences are noticed for particular questions. The usefulness of effectiveness ratings will only be

evident in comparison with values for other countries or over time. A four-point scale (1 through 4) was used, where 4 indicates high effectiveness and 1 indicates low effectiveness.

Question	Year 2000	Today
Roles and responsibilities of each department or agency are clearly defined	3.60	3.54
Policy goals for the water sector are clearly defined	3.08	3.19
The water sector is provided with sufficient funds to function properly	2.72	2.81
National governmental agencies consult each other when <u>taking decisions</u> that impact multiple sectors	2.92	2.85
National governmental agencies cooperate <u>in the implementation</u> of their policies where appropriate	2.84	3.04
Regional governmental agencies are consulted when decisions that affect their region are taken	3.04	3.00
Governmental agencies are staffed with sufficient and trained personnel to perform the assigned tasks	3.36	3.19
Future water supply and demand forecasts are based on good quality data	2.76	2.96
Water resources data are collected regularly, continuously throughout the country	2.88	2.98
Current strategies for long-term matching of supply and demand have been effective at matching supply and demand	2.72	2.62
Rules and procedures for assigning and recording water rights are clearly defined and functioning	3.09	3.04
Rules and procedures for transferring water rights are clearly defined and functioning	2.72	2.84
Disputes among water users are resolved effectively	2.56	2.62
Government agencies are effective at forecasting seasonal supply and demand and matching the two	2.86	2.95
Government agencies effectively operate and maintain public water infrastructure	3.00	3.09
Current incentives and sanctions (including water pricing) are effective at achieving long and short term supply/demand matching	2.63	2.56
Government agencies are effective at enforcing withdrawal limits that are established	2.83	2.76
Official water quality standards in waterways are met	2.40	2.14
Aquatic ecosystems are protected to the level specified by the government	2.33	2.44
Average	2.86	2.87

## Annex 1: Workshop Participant List

First Name	Surname	Organization & Department (English)
Akif	Özkaldı	General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works (DSI)
M. Erta	Taşkınsoy	DSI, Department of Water Supply and Sewage Disposal
Ela	Ekin	DSI, Department of Design and Construction
Zülal	Öztürk	DSI, Department of Geotechnical Services and Groundwater
Erol	Büyükkiraz	DSI, Department of Operation and Maintenance
Ayşe	Turhan	DSI, Legal Advisory Office
Salim	Fakioğlu	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Ayla	Efeoğlu	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Murat	Hatipoğlu	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Nihat	Ataman	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Hasan	Özlü	DSI 5. World Water Forum Coordination
Hüseyin	Gündoğdu	DSI, Second Regional Directorate
Melike	Ekici	DSI, Foreign Relation Office
Yağmur	Dönmez	DSI, Foreign Relation Office
A. Hamdi	Sargın	DSI, Department of Geotechnical Services and Groundwater
M. Ali	Tokgöz	University of Ankara, Agricultural Faculty, Dept. Of Agricultural Structures and Irrigation
Y. Ersoy	Yıldırım	University of Ankara, Agricultural Faculty, Dept. Of Agricultural Structures and Irrigation
Erol	Biçkıcı	Ministry of Health, Water safety Branch Directorate
Sevta	Çağlar	General Directorate of The Bank of Provinces
Nüvit	Soylu	Center for Irrigation Cooperative Association
Özlem	Yılmaz	General Directorate of Electrical Power Resources Survey and Development Administration
Faruk	Umar	Water User Associations' Union (Kadıköy Water User association-Adana)
Ayşeğül	Kıbaroğlu	Middle East technical University (ODTU) International Relations
A. Gökhan	Saygılı	Hydropower Plants Businessmen's Association of Industry
Galena	İş	World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF-Turkiye)
Abdurrahman	Güngör	Pressured Irrigation Industrialists Association
Mark	Svendsen	IRG
Aylin	Evin	The Energy Market Regulatory Authority
Zeynep	Günaydın	General Directorate of Energy
Mahmut	Emirdoğan	Ankara Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Administration
Halime	Bedirhanoğlu	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Ahmet	Aladağ	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Sema	Kale	Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs, General Directorate of Agricultural Research
Altay	Altınörs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Jonathan	Lautze	IWMI
Faisal	Rifai	ETIC

Guest from Egypt

## Annex 2: Rating Session Participant List

First Name	Surname	Organization & Department (English)
A. Avni	Unal	General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works (DSI), Dept. Of Technology
Ugur	Aydın	General Directorate of State Hydraulic Works (DSI), Dept. Of Technology
Salim	Fakioğlu	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Ozlem	Senol	DSI, Foreign Relation Office
Ela	Ekin	DSI, Department of Design and Construction
A. Hamdi	Sargin	DSI, Department of Geotechnical Services and Groundwater
Yasemin	Gokyel	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Erol	Büyükkiraz	DSI, Department of Operation and Maintenance
Nadide	Demir	DSI, Department of Operation and Maintenance
Ayşe	Turhan	DSI, Legal Advisory Office
Hüseyin	Gündoğdu	DSI, Second Regional Directorate
Melike	Ekici	DSI, Foreign Relation Office
Yağmur	Dönmez	DSI, Foreign Relation Office
Ubeyd	Sezer	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
M. Erta	Taşkinsoy	DSI, Department of Water Supply and Sewage Disposal
Nihat	Ataman	DSI, Department of Investigation and Planning
Alp	Sekmen	General Directorate of The Bank of Provinces
M. Ali	Tokgöz	University of Ankara, Agricultural Faculty, Dept. Of Agricultural Structures and Irrigation
Erol	Bıçkıcı	Ministry of Health, Water safety Branch Directorate
Ibrahim	Gurer	Gazi University, Faculty of Engineering, Dept of Civil Engineering
Osman N.	Ozdemir	Gazi University, Faculty of Engineering, Dept of Civil Engineering
Galena	İş	World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF-Turkiye)
İrfan	Beyaz	Ankara Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Administration
Mehmet	Ozer	Ankara Metropolitan Water and Sewerage Administration
A. Gökhan	Saygılı	Hydropower Plants Businessmen's Association of Industry
Faruk	Umar	Water User Associations' Union (Kadiköy Water User association-Adana)
Özlem	Yılmaz	General Directorate of Electrical Power Resources Survey and Development Administration
Sevil	Atlı	Pressured Irrigation Industrialists Association
M. Ali	Tokgöz	University of Ankara, Agricultural Faculty, Dept. Of Agricultural Structures and Irrigation
Armağan	Serdaroğlu	Ankara Governership, Special Provincial Administration
Mustafa	Diren	General Directorate of Electrical Power Resources Survey and Development Administration
Ahmet	Aladağ	Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Nüvit	Soylu	Center for Irrigation Cooperative Association
Jonathan	Lautze	IWMI
Lucia	De Stafano	Oregon State University

## **Annex 3: Key Challenges**

### **Key Challenge 1: Increasing demand for drinking water**

To satisfy increased drinking water demand, there are options to increase overall use of surface water, groundwater and desalinated water and to re-allocate water from existing uses. There are also options to increase efficiency of water use. Key decisions must be made in selecting the appropriate mix of these and other options.

### **Key Challenge 2: Declining groundwater levels**

To reduce groundwater water table decline, there are several options. For example, you can recharge the aquifer by adding surface water, you can reduce withdrawal per hectare, and you can reduce withdrawal per hectare and cease irrigation extension. Selecting the appropriate balance of these and other measures requires that key decisions be made.

### **Key Challenge 3: Strategic planning for a national water policy**

Generally, governments define and develop their national water-related priorities in national water policy documents and mid- to long-term water resources plans. Different approaches can nonetheless be utilized to in the process of identifying and ordering the priorities, goals and objectives contained in national water policies and long-term water resource plans. Please consider the process of developing water policies and plans.

### **Key Challenge 4: Regulating water quality in rivers, aquifers and waterways**

Ensuring water quality is important to minimize adverse health effects, to ensure the quality of agricultural production and to sustain healthy aquatic ecosystems. Decision-making related to regulation of water quality includes the definition of quality standards, the formulation and application of rules to meet those standards (e.g. the establishment of pollutants emission permits), the implementation of projects to reduce pollution and the enforcement of the laws to limit pollution.

### **Key Challenge 5: Matching Supply and Demand in Agriculture**

The agricultural sector withdraws and consumes the vast majority of water in most countries. At the beginning of the irrigation season decisions need to be made about how to share the available water among existing agricultural water users (private small and large farms, irrigation districts or government irrigation projects). These decisions are a major challenge since demand often exceeds supply.

Please consider the process of allocating water to the different agricultural water users within the constraints of the annual availability of water resources.

## **Annex 4: Functional Effectiveness Assessment**

Thinking broadly about the ministries and departments involved in managing water resources in your country, please consider how well the following list of key water resources functions are performed. Please consider also how well the functions were performed currently as well as how well they were performed at one point in the past (year 2000).

Please use the following rating scale and place a number in each of the boxes in the matrix shown below. As you can see, a higher score reflects a higher level of performance.

4 Yes, in all or almost all cases

3 Generally yes, but not in all cases

2 Only in some cases

1 No, in all or almost all cases

NA No answer/I do not know