

AWS Standard v2.0 Draft 1.0 Consultation  
New Delhi, India 7<sup>th</sup> June 2018  
Feedback

**Theme 1: Users of the Standard and suggested improvements to Guidance**

1. The simplification of language, removal of repetition and the reworking of criteria and indicators have made the flow easy, reduced the complexity and made the Standard easier to follow for both Implementers and Auditors.
2. Members agreed on the inclusion of sector and region-specific guidance and suggested to include some working regional and sectoral examples in guidance.
3. The introduction of text on how to use the Standard is a welcome step.

**Theme 2: Impacts and Theory of Change**

1. The new theory of change is clearer, elaborate and provide stronger linkage to Standard.
2. The participants rejected the inclusion of adding cultural aspects in theory of change as culture comes under social theme. There is no need to have a separate cultural theme.
3. A data template to support implementation and implementers is a welcome step and would be very useful for Implementers to check their progress.
4. M&E template is must for the success of any project and so for the AWS Standard as well.

**Theme 3: Step 1 Commitment**

1. Removal of Step 1 and its inclusion into step 2,3 and 6 is a welcome step as commitment is needed throughout the implementation of Standard. Having a separate step of commitment doesn't make any sense. The commitment should be reflected at all steps.
2. The commitment/ policy should be signed at Corporate level as top-down approach is found to be effective in getting the work done. It is also aligned with ISO Standard.
3. There was a suggestion to include a proper procedure of communication from corporate to site level as there are cases when the commitments from corporate level don't reach to site level.
4. Commitment to local community and to cultural and indigenous values was acceptable by the members.

**Theme 4: Stakeholder Engagement**

1. There was consensus on removal of sphere of influence concept and enhancing the focus on strengthening the stakeholder engagement.
2. The members agreed that the new model of level of engagement is better and easy to understand and would help in better uptake of engagements at local level.
3. There was also a suggestion to link the model to urgency and legitimacy as there may be some stakeholders who can have an urgent interest and government can have a legitimate interest so it's better to incorporate these two approaches as well to have a complete picture.
4. There was a suggestion to change level of influence to level of engagement.

**Theme 5: Catchments**

1. The reordering of criteria to have site level criteria first followed by catchment criteria is not supported by members. The site should understand the water availability, water risk, water balance etc. at the catchment and then come to the site to understand its impact at catchment

level. The site criteria first don't make sense scientifically. It should always be catchment first followed by site.

2. There was a consensus that the incorporation of Advanced Criteria & Indicators as Advanced Indicators under the relevant Core Criteria 2.1 – 2.7 - improve the understanding and reduce the complexity of the Standard.
3. The improved definition of catchment needs to consider risk, impact and ability to influence.
4. Defining the scope in catchment is very localised. The site should consider scientific methods in defining the scope but it is very difficult to have a standardised method to define the catchment. It can vary site to site.

#### **Theme 6: Agriculture: Smallholders and Group Certification**

1. There was a consensus that it is very difficult to apply some criteria in case of agriculture specially for small holders as they do not have the capacity to implement the standard.
2. There is a need to have separate guidance on group certification in case of smallholders.
3. Involvement of NGOs, Farmer Producer Organisations, KVVKs, Farmer cooperatives etc. can play a key role in case of smallholders.
4. There need to be a mechanism to setup a platform to bring all these stakeholders together and work for implementation.
5. Members supported the idea to have a separate working group for agriculture sector.

#### **Theme 7: Important water-related areas to Water-related High Conservation Values**

1. Not all members were aware of the concept of HCV. But there was a consensus that HCV is a better term than Important water-related areas as it reflects on conservation not just importance.
2. There were arguments on why only water-related HCV are included as cultural and social related HCV are equally important. There was a suggestion to include HCV 5 and 6 as well.

#### **Theme 8: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH)**

1. The idea to have WASH as the 5<sup>th</sup> outcome is rejected by the members.
2. There were arguments on WASH to include in the supply chain as implementers find it very difficult to monitor WASH across the supply chain. There is a need to define boundary of supply chain.
3. There was a suggestion to have WASH across the supply chain as advance indicator not as core indicator.
4. There is a need to define the WASH parameters. A separate working group on WASH is a welcome step. WBCSD has proposed to be the part of the working group.
5. There were suggestions to improve guidance on WASH as well.
6. Linking WASH to SDGs at this stage was rejected by the members. The suggestion was to first make the WASH indicators strong.

#### **Theme 9: Thresholds & Scoring**

1. There was a consensus that thresholds might restrict options, thus it should not be there.
2. However, there was a suggestion to have some pilot projects to check the feasibility.
3. Members agreed that scoring is complex in v1.0 and it needs to be revised to have clearer understanding.

**Theme 10: Indirect Water Use**

1. Implementers find it difficult and sometime beyond scope to calculate indirect water use. They require more specific guidance on how and to what extent they should calculate the indirect water use.

**Theme 11: Transparency**

1. Implementers agreed that it becomes difficult for them to name employees as the responsibilities of employees keep on changing.
2. There was a consensus on replacement of requirement to name employees with requirement for a general company structure.

**Theme 12: Water-related costs**

1. It is difficult for implementers to calculate social and environmental water related cost. The guidance needs an improvement with inclusion of proper methodology and some working examples.