



United Nations Global Compact

The CEO Water Mandate

Fourth Working Conference

August 16-18, 2009

World Water Week, Stockholm

MEETING SUMMARY



Table of Contents

Overview	3
Key Learnings and Outcomes	4
Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management.....	4
Water and Human Rights	4
Corporate Water Disclosure	5
Other Outcomes	5
Multi-Stakeholder Working Conference Summary	6
Objectives	6
Introductory remarks by Mr. Power.....	6
Overview of three current workstreams by Mr. Morrison.....	6
Session 1: Case Examples of Business Engagement in Water-Related Public Policy.....	8
Session 2: Review of the Guide to Business Engagement on Water Policy and Management.....	8
Facilitated Discussion on Water Policy and Management Engagement.....	9
Sessions 3 & 4: Endorser and Stakeholder Perspectives on Human Rights, Water, and Business.....	10
Day One Closing Remarks	12
Introductory remarks.....	12
Session 5: Fresh Water: What the World Thinks – Circle of Blue/GlobeScan Global Survey	13
Session 6: Report Out of London Coordination Meeting of Water Disclosure Initiatives	13
Day Two Closing Remarks	14
Public Informational Seminar Proceedings	15
Summary.....	15
UNEP Water Accounting Methods and Tools Proceedings	16
Summary.....	16
Key points from Mr. Sonnemann and Mr. Morrison.....	16
Considering the Differences Among Water Accounting Methods and Tools	17
Accounting for Water Quality / Industrial Effluent.....	17
Making the Links Among Water Use and Impacts.....	18
Endorser-only Meeting Proceedings	19
Summary.....	19
Appendix A: List of Working Conference Participants	22
Appendix B: Meeting Ground Rules for CEO Water Mandate Fourth Working Conference	25

Meeting summary prepared by the Pacific Institute, a non-profit sustainability policy research and advocacy center based in Oakland, California. (www.pacinst.org)





Overview

In July 2007, the UN Secretary-General in partnership with international business leaders and under the auspices of the UN Global Compact launched the CEO Water Mandate – an initiative established to better understand and advance water stewardship in the private sector. The Mandate was built upon six core elements considered to be critical in addressing corporate water management: Direct Operations, Supply Chain and Watershed Management, Collective Action, Public Policy, Community Engagement, and Transparency.¹

Following meetings in New York City (March 2008), Stockholm (August 2008), and Istanbul (March 2009), the UN Global Compact – with support from the Pacific Institute – convened the Mandate’s fourth working conference on August 16-18, 2009 – once again at the annual World Water Week in Stockholm. This workshop consisted of over 80 participants representing 20 endorsing companies, eight UN and government agencies, 13 civil society organizations, and various other organizations. In addition to the multi-stakeholder working conference, the Mandate held three other events: 1) a general informational session about the Mandate (open to all World Water Week registrants), 2) a seminar on a joint project of the Mandate and UN Environment Programme (UNEP) focusing on water accounting methods and tools for business, and 3) an endorser-only planning meeting.

The multi-stakeholder working conference’s overarching goal was to discuss, shape, and advance the initiative’s three primary current workstreams/areas of focus:

- 1) Business engagement with water policy and management;
- 2) Corporate water disclosure; and
- 3) Water and human rights.

The conference sought to build on prior Mandate discussions, to further share learnings on these issues and to determine how the initiative can move forward in regard to these topics.

The seminar on the joint UNEP-Mandate water accounting project brought together key stakeholders (i.e. Water Footprint Network, LCA practitioners, academia, civil society, and companies that have piloted water accounting methods) to inform them of the planned project research and allow them to better understand and explore commonalities and differences with regard to the objectives, scope, and approaches of existing methods for water accounting. The informational public session about the Mandate provided an opportunity to disseminate information on the initiative’s key characteristics, objectives, activities, and accomplishments and give attendees an opportunity to provide input into the Mandate’s future direction.

The endorser-only meeting served as a forum for companies to: 1) digest feedback from the multi-stakeholder working conference, 2) decide on how the initiative should pursue further activities relating to existing workstreams, and 3) determine next steps on the Mandate’s funding, recruitment efforts, potential partnerships, and future working conferences.

¹ To learn more about the CEO Water Mandate and its six elements, go to: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news_events/8.1/Ceo_water_mandate.pdf

Key Learnings and Outcomes

The working conference featured discussions on a number of complex, and at times contentious topics. Though meeting participants held a variety of sometimes opposing opinions on these issues, many common threads and key learnings emerged. Below is a list of some of these messages, as well as the major outcomes and next steps the Mandate agreed to pursue.

Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management

Most of the discussion on this topic centered on the Mandate's upcoming *Guide on Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management*. Numerous participants were confused about the boundaries of "water-related public policy" as defined in a draft annotated outline of the Guide. This stressed the need for the Guide to more clearly emphasize its broader interpretation of "water policy," which is inclusive of the enabling framework (e.g., water governance capacity), strategic intent (e.g., legislative purpose), and implementation of policy (e.g., on the ground water management programs). One of the recognized challenges of the Guide will be to make a document that is helpful to and practically applicable for companies, but also addresses the concerns of key external stakeholders such as NGOs, investors, local communities, and governments.

Addressing concerns of some participants regarding the nature of the Guide, it was clarified that while the Guide will not be a prescriptive document, it will include some "normative guidance" (i.e., "should, should not" language) that provides recommendations - not requirements – for engaging with governments more effectively and responsibly. Such guidance is intended as suggestions for good practice and in no way imply binding requirements of Mandate endorsers or other users of the Guide.

Steps must be taken to ensure the Guide does not act as (or be perceived as) a replacement to government regulation, or that companies' active engagement in the policy space opens a door allowing governments to shirk their regulatory obligations. In doing so the Guide will emphasize the roles and responsibilities of government, as well as the need for a robust and equitable government enabled regulatory framework as a key component of sustainable water management.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Mandate Secretariat will use the comments received during a public review period as well as during discussions in Stockholm in order to revise the Guide for Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management's annotated outline and will then use this as a basis to start drafting the core document.
- In support of this drafting process, the Mandate will establish the Working Group on Policy and Engagement. This group will feature Mandate endorsers as members and receive input from external stakeholders on an *ad hoc* basis. The Working Group will act as a preliminary sounding board for interested endorsers and other interested parties to provide input to the Guide's authors throughout the drafting process. This will help ensure that the Guide meets endorsers' needs, while adequately addressing issues considered critical by key external stakeholders.

Water and Human Rights

Endorser presentations and observations suggest an awareness that there is a corporate responsibility to conduct business operations consistent with a human right to water (several Endorser companies explicitly indicated acceptance of the existence of a human right to water irrespective of its current legal status).

Endorsers reside along a continuum with respect to their examination of the translation of this expectation into practical application. This examination, and any associated implementation, is complicated and



remains hindered by the absence of both analysis and experience guiding establishing corporate “responsibility boundaries” in the context of deriving corporate commitments and actions. NGO stakeholders probing the boundaries of corporate responsibility to respect (and act consistently with) the human right to water indicated a belief that social expectations, rather than legally derived obligations, are the driver for interpreting this obligation. In this regard “social license to operate” becomes as relevant as the business’ legal license to operate.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Mandate Secretariat will conduct an internal exercise to compile current and emerging practices from endorsing companies in respect to the human right to water. This “sharing of practice” exercise will inform an endorser discussion on this topic at the Mandate’s Fifth Working Conference and will eventually provide a basis for a future CEO Water Mandate work product (i.e., practical operational guidance) on water and human rights.
- It was agreed that considerations relating to water as a human right will be included in the Mandate’s *Guide on Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management*, as it is clearly a high priority public policy issue that has direct and practical relevance for businesses.
- The Mandate agreed it should continue to collaborate with the Institute on Human Rights and Business on this issue when convenient and strategic for both sides.

Corporate Water Disclosure

As demonstrated by the Circle of Blue-GlobeScan public opinion survey, people around the world view water as the planet’s top environmental problem - greater than air pollution, depletion of natural resources, loss of habitat, and even climate change. More than three-quarters of respondents believe that solving drinking water problems will require significant help from the private sector. Common metrics and harmonization of disclosure is critical in ensuring legitimate data are reported, facilitating public understanding, and promoting comparability among the different reporting entities. Synergies among corporate water disclosure initiatives exist and should be built on.

Outcomes and Next steps

- The Mandate affirmed its interest on developing guidance on more consistent and meaningful ways of disclosing qualitative water-related information. The Mandate Secretariat will compile and analyze the upcoming first round of endorsing companies’ Communication on Progress – Water reports, which will act as a basis for its future work product that provides guidance and offers criteria on reporting of the Mandate’s process-oriented elements.
- The initiative also confirmed its intention to build methods and guidance to support companies in better understanding relevant water-related information and reflecting the sustainability context into their water-related reporting.
- To accommodate the desire of some early endorsers (those who joined prior to October 2008) to synchronize their first Communication on Progress-Water, or “COP-Water” with their annual general COP for the UN Global Compact, the Mandate Secretariat -- upon written request by an endorsing company – agreed to grant an extension of the COP-Water for inclusion in the company’s next annual general COP.

Other Outcomes

- With support from UNEP, the Mandate Secretariat will complete its stocktaking exercise of existing water accounting methodologies and tools by the end of February 2010.
- The Fifth Working Conference of the CEO Water Mandate will be held in New York City at UN Headquarters in the first quarter of 2010.



Multi-Stakeholder Working Conference Summary

Objectives

- Discuss key issues relating to each focus area and identify common interests among companies, governments, civil society groups and local communities regarding how companies (and the CEO Water Mandate) can address them;
- Gain feedback from Mandate endorsers and key stakeholders on the scope, objectives, and approach for outputs in the three focus areas; and
- Explore options for increased participation and engagement in the initiative and its workstreams by key stakeholders from the private sector, government, civil society, and other interests.

Introductory remarks by Mr. Power

The workshop began with an introduction from Gavin Power (Head, CEO Water Mandate) who recapped the origins, mission, and approaches of the UN Global Compact and CEO Water Mandate; providing background on the Mandate's previous meetings, actions, and research leading up to this meeting; and outlining broad goals for the initiative moving forward.

Mandate Disclosure Policy

Much of Mr. Power's presentation outlined the initiative's policy on endorsing companies' disclosure of their performance regarding the Mandate's six elements. This disclosure is to be embodied within a "Communication on Progress - Water" (COP-Water), as an addition to the broader UN Global Compact COP report. These acts will serve as both a demonstration of a company's commitment to the initiative and its objectives, and also as a tool to facilitate internal and peer learning, stimulate dialogue, and promote collective action. These COPs must be publicly available and include:

- A statement of endorsement by the CEO
- A description of implementation actions
- Outcomes utilizing metrics

The Mandate's disclosure policy includes a delisting provision in cases where companies neglect to disclose water performance information or do not do so in good faith.

Broad goals for the initiative moving forward

In addition to advancing the Mandate's three current primary workstreams, Mr. Power also highlighted the initiative's need for:

- Closer collaboration with civil society, UN agencies, governments, and business "sustainability" groups alike
- Building business participation in order to achieve better regional and sectoral diversity, as well as to encourage participation among SMEs
- Specialized tools and guidance resources
- Aggregating and inviting social vetting of endorsers' COP-Water reports

Overview of three current workstreams by Mr. Morrison

Jason Morrison (Globalization Program Director, Pacific Institute) provided background for the Mandate's three workstreams which served as a starting point for explaining the objectives of this conference. Morrison noted that this conference was different from previous Mandate meetings in that it did not focus

specifically on one Mandate element, but rather tried to further develop existing areas of focus. Some key points regarding each workstream are listed below.

Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management

- This workstream was launched with a discussion paper co-authored by the Mandate and WWF² meant to introduce the concept of shared risk between the private and public sectors, and to stimulate conversation among Mandate endorsers and stakeholders at the Istanbul meeting.
- In Istanbul, endorsing companies requested the Mandate Secretariat draft a guidance document for understanding how companies can responsibly and effectively engage with policymaking and policy implementation.
- The Pacific Institute – the “operational arm” of the initiative - will co-draft the Mandate’s upcoming Guide on Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management with Stuart Orr (WWF – International), and possibly others.
- WWF is also spearheading a project on business engagement with water policy that compiles and analyzes case studies that better define current best practice in this area and promote better understanding of responsible policy engagement among the private sector.

Water and Human Rights

- Prior to Istanbul, the Mandate Secretariat – in collaboration with the Institute for Human Rights and Business (IHRB) – released a discussion paper that introduced some broad concepts on this issue in order to inform the meeting’s discussions.³
- In Istanbul, endorsers agreed to form a Working Group on human rights and water to continue discussions about this workstream and how to advance it.
- Since then, this Working Group has formulated three main proposals on ways forward:
 1. Human rights considerations should be included in the Mandate’s Guide on Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management.
 2. The Mandate should explore and consider a collective action/consensus approach on water and human rights.
 3. The Mandate should continue to collaborate with the Institute on Human Rights and Business on this issue when convenient and strategic for both sides.

Corporate Water Disclosure

- In October 2008, the Mandate released Phase One of its Transparency Framework⁴ which delineated basic disclosure expectations for endorsers and established a broad architecture for how the Mandate’s transparency element could be conceptualized and operationalized within the initiative.
- Phase Two of the Transparency Framework⁵ built on this work by:
 - Illustrating various forms of reporting approaches and related content, highlighting good practices and innovative approaches,
 - Identifying commonalities, differences, and gaps among corporate water reports
 - Summarizing and presenting the findings in a way that they serve as de facto guidance for corporate water reporting.
- In Istanbul, endorsers requested that the Mandate Secretariat move forward on drafting a guidance document to help better define good practice and criteria for reporting on the Mandate’s process-oriented metrics (e.g., Public Policy, Collective Action, and Community Engagement).

² To read the discussion paper on public policy engagement in full, see:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/Environment/ceo_water_mandate/From_Footprint_to_Public_Policy.pdf

³ To read the discussion paper on human rights in full, see:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/Environment/ceo_water_mandate/Business_Water_and_Human_Rights_Discussion_Paper.pdf

⁴ To read Phase One of the Transparency Framework in full, see:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/issues_doc/Environment/ceo_water_mandate/Transparency_Framework_Phase_One.pdf

⁵ To read Phase Two of the Transparency Framework in full (“Water Disclosure 2.0”), see:

http://www.unglobalcompact.org/docs/news_events/9.1_news_archives/2009_03_11/Water_Disclosure.pdf



- In the month leading up to Stockholm, the Mandate Secretariat helped coordinate a mapping exercise (in collaboration with UNEP, the Global Reporting Initiative, and the Carbon Disclosure Project) of initiatives currently working on corporate water disclosure. This mapping exercise was done to facilitate coordination among these initiatives and inform and validate the Mandate's work in this area while highlighting ways in which it can better align with existing initiatives.

Rob Greenwood (Vice President and Principal, Ross & Associates) – the meeting facilitator – followed Mr. Morrison's remarks by establishing ground rules and expectations for the meeting, and initiating short exercises to better understand the geographic and sectoral representation in the room. He also emphasized that - though under contract with the Pacific Institute – he is a neutral third-party who has no stake in the outcome of decisions and whose main role is to ensure that discussion is on topic and reflects an even balance. The ground rules for the meeting are summarized in Appendix B.

First Day Sessions

The first day opened with two sessions and a facilitated discussion regarding the Mandate's Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management workstream and more specifically its upcoming guidance document on the topic. The facilitated discussion gave the audience a chance to provide both high-level input and specific suggestions for the Guide.

Session 1: Case Examples of Business Engagement in Water-Related Public Policy

The first session focused on case examples of business engagement with water policy and management from representatives of endorsing companies and civil society stakeholders. Panelists were instructed to ground their comments with practical examples and experiences when feasible.

Some of the common threads among the panelists in regard to water policy engagement were:

- *Collective action:* Businesses, civil society, and other sectors working as a united front have a much better chance of effectively and equitably influencing policy and management than do the individual players working in isolation.
- *Regulatory consistency:* Companies often prefer a more robust - but consistently and fairly implemented - policy framework over one that is weak and erratically implemented.
- *Internal alignment:* The various components/departments of governments and companies alike often have different objectives and therefore can send different messages with respect to their engagement. Both sides must strive to promote internal alignment in order to be consistent in their engagement.
- *Patience:* Policy engagement works on a different timeline than other aspects of business. Companies must not expect immediate outcomes and understand their engagement through the lens of long-term objectives.

Session 2: Review of the Guide to Business Engagement on Water Policy and Management

The second session featured Jason Morrison (Globalization Program Director, Pacific Institute) giving an overview of a preliminary annotated outline of the Mandate's Guide drafted in preparation of this meeting. Morrison detailed the history of the Guide, outlined the tentative project plan, gave a broad overview of the topics it will address, and provided some of the key messages heard during the preliminary outline's public comment period.

The tentative project plan for the Guide is as follows:

- *July 7-September 4, 2009:* The Mandate Secretariat solicited public comments on a preliminary annotated outline for the Guide.
- *September – December 2009:* The Secretariat will begin drafting the body of the Guide referencing the comments received and outcomes from Stockholm as appropriate.



- *December 2009*: A first full draft of the Guide will be circulated for public comment.
- *June 2010*: A final version of the Guide incorporating comments received on the prior iteration is scheduled for release.

Some of the key messages heard during the public comment period included:

- *Comment period*: The public comment period for this Guide (originally though July 30) is too short to allow for detailed comments from many key stakeholders. In response, the Mandate Secretariat extended the deadline to September 4.
- *Business engagement is problematic*: Given a long history of policy capture (or perceived capture) by the private sector, the concept of facilitating business engagement with policy in general is problematic and raises skepticism among many stakeholders.
- *Transparency*: Communication and disclosure of all actions is critical to responsible policy engagement for both companies and governments alike.
- *Conflict of interest*: Corporate interests cannot be presumed to always align with the public interest.
- *Necessity of regulation*: This Guide must ensure that corporate engagement in the public policy space is not seen as a replacement for the need for government regulatory action. Governments must continue to pass strict regulation that ensures companies do not utilize an inequitable volume of water or otherwise do undue harm to the environment or local communities.

Facilitated Discussion on Water Policy and Management Engagement

Morrison's presentation provided the foundation for a subsequent facilitated discussion among all meeting participants on the Guide. Morrison invited criticism and comments (both general and specific), noting the Guide's authors intention to incorporate the key messages heard through the public comment period - as well as those heard in this discussion - into the Guide.

Morrison clarified a number of points regarding the Guide. He stressed that the Guide has taken a broad definition of "water policy," which is inclusive of the enabling framework (e.g., water governance capacity), strategic intent (e.g., legislative purpose), and implementation of policy (e.g., on the ground water management programs). He also made explicit that the Guide will not be prescriptive; it will include some "normative guidance" that provides recommendations - not requirements - for engaging with governments more effectively and responsibly.

Some of the common threads that emerged from attendees during this discussion were:

- *Balance of interests*: One of the key challenges of the Guide is making a document that is helpful to and practically applicable for companies, but also addresses the concerns of key external stakeholders from civil society, academia, etc.
- *Engagement with various government departments*: Having dialogue with a number of different departments within the same government encourages more holistic relationships with and understanding of government.
- *Working with trade associations*: Working more closely with trade associations on policy engagement will allow "leader" companies to share knowledge with those who know little about the topic, while connecting with a potentially more influential entity through which to engage. Some participants did indicate skepticism regarding trade association ability to take proactive stances in light of the typically diverse company perspectives they must accommodate.
- *Investment community*: Corporate strategy on policy engagement must address the needs of the investment community, who are increasingly interested in water.
- *Two-directional engagement*: Businesses engage with governments regarding policy, however governments also engage with business for their informational/data/resource needs. Companies need to know how to effectively and responsibly facilitate and address governments' engagement with business and understand what is being asked of them.



- *Perverse outcomes*: The Guide has potential to enable perverse outcomes – most notably policy capture. The Guide must include explicit steps for how to avoid such outcomes.
- *Inclusiveness*: Businesses should ensure that community interests are represented in key policy discussions.

Rob Greenwood provided final thoughts on this lengthy discussion, noting that it focused almost entirely on nuances rather than substantial deficiencies or general concerns. This suggested that the vast majority of participants believed the basic framework of the Guide to be satisfactory.

Sessions 3 & 4: Endorser and Stakeholder Perspectives on Human Rights, Water, and Business

In the next two sessions, discussion shifted to exploring the Mandate's workstream on water and human rights. Session 3 focused on presentations from endorsing companies regarding their formal policies or established practices in regard to water and human rights. Session 4 featured two panelists from civil society organizations that discussed key issues related to this topic, as well as the potential role of the Mandate with regard to advancing the human right to water. As with the water policy engagement discussion immediately prior, this exploration of water and human rights was concluded by a facilitated discussion among all meeting participants.

The main points coming out of these two sessions and the subsequent discussion included the following.

Basis for corporate actions on human right to water

Presentations and discussion indicated that “existing instruments” form a sufficient basis for companies to seek to conduct operations consistent with the human right to water. These instruments include:

- *UN Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights - General Comment #15*:⁶ The UN adopted this document which defines the human right to water and provides guidelines for the interpretation of this right.
- UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights
- *The Ten Principles of the UN Global Compact*:⁷ The Global Compact asks companies to embrace, support and enact, within their sphere of influence, a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labor standards, the environment, and anti-corruption. All Mandate endorsers are signatories to the Compact and these principles.
- *The Ruggie Framework*:⁸ This framework established by John Ruggie – Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General – established the “Protect, Respect, Remedy” framework, which calls for the private sector to “respect” human rights and have a system in place to monitor if their actions are responsible.

Endorser presentations and further participant observations during discussion suggest an awareness that there is a corporate responsibility to conduct business operations consistent with a human right to water (several endorsing companies explicitly indicated acceptance of the existence of a human right to water irrespective of its current legal status).

Human Right to Water Operational Definition

Corporate actions addressing the human right to water should be understood through and driven by the Ruggie Framework (“Protect, Respect, Remedy”). Furthermore, corporate actions on this issue should be framed by five basic tenets to which all people are entitled:

1. Safety
2. Sufficiency

⁶ To read UN General Comment #15, see:

[http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/0/a5458d1d1bbd713fc1256cc400389e94/\\$FILE/G0340229.pdf](http://www.unhchr.ch/tbs/doc.nsf/0/a5458d1d1bbd713fc1256cc400389e94/$FILE/G0340229.pdf)

⁷ For more on the Ten Principles of the UN Global compact, see:

<http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AbouttheGC/TheTENPrinciples/index.html>

⁸ To read the Ruggie Framework in full, see: <http://www2.ohchr.org/english/bodies/hrcouncil/docs/11session/A.HRC.11.13.pdf>

3. Acceptability
4. Physical Accessibility
5. Affordability

Expectations

The primary expectation of businesses on this issue is to “respect” human rights and “do no harm”. Fulfillment of human rights is government’s responsibility; corporate actions on human rights in no way absolve governments of this responsibility. Civil society organizations asked to probe the boundaries of corporate responsibility to respect (and act consistently with) the human right to water indicated a belief that social expectations, rather than legally derived obligations, are the driver for interpreting this obligation. They also stressed that the right to water must also include adequate sanitation services as a fundamental component to which all people are entitled.

Some suggestions from meeting participants of baseline expectations include:

- “Do no harm”
- Take no action that undermines governments’ ability to protect
- Establish corporate business principles in respect to human rights
- Define the corporate “sphere of influence” as beyond direct operations and inclusive of supply chain and broader watershed and community considerations.

Some potential aspirational goals mentioned by attendees include:

- An explicit and publicly announced corporate policy accepting the human right to water and committing to implementing corporate actions, establishing measurement capabilities, and reporting publicly on progress.
- Conduct measurements and social impact assessments of water use/discharges in direct operations and supply chain
- Full accountability (transparency and grievance mechanisms);
- Empowerment: addressing power imbalances, participation, voice, and capacity
- Development of clear standards with guidelines
- An independent mechanism to monitor compliance

Implementation

Endorser presentations and subsequent discussion indicated that the obligation to operate consistently with a human right to water is generally accepted (at least by those corporate representatives expressing an opinion). However, there is a continuum of endorser’s understanding of and ability to practically apply and implement this concept. Implementation remains hindered by the absence of both analysis and experience establishing “responsibility boundaries”. This lack of understanding and ability is embodied in a variety of ways, including (but certainly not limited to):

- Uncertainty about an appropriate baseline commitment due to the difficulty in interpreting the “due no harm” principle;
- The extent to which the obligation extends beyond ensuring domestic needs as a first priority to other economic water needs (e.g., agricultural uses);
- Wariness that companies will be expected to fill gaps left by insufficient public capacity to meet local community’s right to clean and safe water;
- The challenge of balancing trade-offs with respecting other economic, social, and cultural human rights (e.g., food production and economic livelihood); and
- The role of legal obligations versus CSR-based actions in setting a baseline for expectations.

Questions

The discussion also raised several questions that were left unanswered, including:

- Is “do no harm” sufficient to meet the corporate responsibility to respect?
- What are the “responsibility boundaries” of the “do no harm” principle?
- How can companies establish a grievance mechanism?



- How does the obligation for acting consistently with a human right to water differ between companies that use water and those that provide water services?
- What is meant by a rights-based approach? How does this differ from explicitly acknowledging the human right to water?

Day One Closing Remarks

The first day came to a close with a reflection on the day's discussions by Peter Gleick (President, Pacific Institute). Some of Dr. Gleick's key messages included:

General

- The day's dialogue was remarkable – thoughtful, polite, respectful, and sophisticated – while still addressing some of the most contentious and complex issues regarding corporate water stewardship. The Mandate has produced a remarkable evolution in participation, structure, products, and principles related to water stewardship and business.

Water Policy and Management Engagement

- There is a clear need for guidance on the issue of business engagement with water policy, and that guidance must address water-related risks. There are many forms of risk: regulatory, financial, environmental, human health, and reputational.
- Public policy is slow - but can be accelerated when there is a mutuality of interest, collaboration, and guidance on how to align different sectors through a discussion of shared risk and opportunity.
- Public policy around water is hard - it is difficult because of timing, language and focus, and differing capabilities of different actors.
- Policy engagement works in multiple directions – companies must be able not only to responsibly engage with governments, but also to effectively address governments' engagement with them.
- Dr. Gleick's recommendations for the Mandate moving forward were:
 - The Mandate must make audiences for the work clear, but also make sure that the complex, multi-directional issues are addressed.
 - More work is needed on determining how "prescriptive" this effort should be.
 - More work is needed on determining the scope of the effort.

Human Rights, Business, and Water

- There is no dispute (in his opinion) that water is a fundamental human right. However, there is still considerable uncertainty and confusion about what such a right means to different actors in terms of responsibilities and roles.
- The UN General Comment 15 offers good guidance in this respect, but more discussion is needed on the implications of a right to water for businesses. What are different sectors' responsibilities and roles in addressing and fulfilling the human right to water? What are companies' obligations in respect to the human right to water?
- There is a great opportunity for the Mandate to work on these issues (water policy and water as a human right, among other issues), clarifying related legal questions as well as addressing practical issues.

Second Day Sessions

Introductory remarks

The second day's discussions focused entirely on the Mandate's third current workstream: corporate water disclosure. Morrison once again provided introductory remarks, explaining that current disclosure on corporate water practices lacks applicable data and meaning. Most water use and discharge data are



aggregated and hide timing and location information – a key component in determining water-related risks and impacts. He also highlighted endorsers' wish for more defined reporting criteria on the Mandate's process-oriented elements (e.g., Collective Action and Community Engagement) and the initiative's intention to develop such guidance in the near future.

Session 5: Fresh Water: What the World Thinks – Circle of Blue/GlobeScan Global Survey

In the day's first session, Peter Swinburn (CEO, Molson Coors Brewing Company), Carl Ganter (Director, Circle of Blue), and Rob Kerr (Vice President, GlobeScan) presented a summary of their recent international public opinion survey on attitudes about fresh water sustainability, management, and conservation. Swinburn provided details on the impetus for, and overarching objectives of, the survey, while Ganter and Kerr delved deeper into its specific findings.

This 2009 study surveyed 1000 adults from 15 countries (both industrialized and emerging economies) around the world, while doing an in-depth interview of 500 people in seven countries: Canada, China, India, Mexico, Russia, the United States, and the United Kingdom.

This survey finds – among other things – that:

- People around the world view water as the planet's top environmental problem - greater than air pollution, depletion of natural resources, loss of habitat, and even climate change.
- 72% of all interviewees considered water pollution "very serious".
- 71% of all interviewees considered shortages of fresh water "very serious".
- Concern about water pollution and shortages has steadily increased in the last decade.
- Governments, water companies, and large companies are the three groups considered most responsible for ensuring access to clean water.
- 78% of interviewees believe that solving drinking water problems will require significant help from the private sector.

The ensuing discussion among meeting participants offered a number of key points and common threads, including:

- This survey and its finding that water is the chief environmental concern among the broad public worldwide underscores even further the need for thorough and meaningful corporate water disclosure.
- A survey of sustainability experts showed that they also believe water has or will in the near future move ahead as the most critical environmental issue.
- It is unclear whether the general public makes the connection between water pollution and impaired drinking water quality.
- This survey is quite important and could be even further advanced by:
 - Including more African and Australian data.
 - Building on the perception of water as an important ecological resource, not solely for human use.
 - Delving into people's opinion on the sources and causes of water problems.

Session 6: Report Out of London Coordination Meeting of Water Disclosure Initiatives

The final session of the multi-stakeholder workshop featured Sean Gilbert (Technical Development, Global Reporting Initiative) who provided a summary of proceedings from a July meeting held in London that convened representatives from a number of key initiatives addressing corporate water disclosure. It included representatives from the CEO Water Mandate/Pacific Institute, Global Reporting Initiative, Carbon Disclosure Project, Alliance for Water Stewardship, Ceres, Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, International Finance Corporation, Water Footprint Network, World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), World Economic Forum (WEF), World Wildlife Fund, and World Resources Institute.



Gilbert explained that the objective of this project – established by the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) - was to build a common view of the needs around disclosure, promote coordination and communication, and determine ways to make the collective work on disclosure most effective. In doing so, the meeting attempted to establish a common framework for understanding the different components and feedback loops required to ensure disclosure leads to actual changes in water management on the ground. It also attempted to determine where there is possible overlap or duplication of workstreams or major gaps in existing efforts.

Some of Gilbert's key points were:

- Water is one of the few environmental/social issues where there is potential to work back to a single group of common metrics, regardless of which lens you're looking through (e.g., risks, impacts) or which industry sector.
- Common metrics and harmonization of disclosure is critical in ensuring legitimate data are reported, facilitating public understanding, and promoting comparability among the different reporting entities.
- Potential synergies between disclosure initiatives exist and should be built on.
- Disclosure must draw on objective set of facts and situate them in terms of time, place, and audience.
- External stakeholders are often perceived as one group, however, in reality, there are a variety of different stakeholders with very different priorities, objectives, focus, and risks.
- Capacity building is a crucial component to ensuring that all components of the framework function effectively.

Gilbert's comments led to a facilitated discussion among meeting participants regarding this London meeting and the Mandate's disclosure workstreams. Some key points and questions raised in this discussion were:

- Disclosure serves two purposes: education and accountability. These ends often require different types of reporting to be effective. Companies reporting on water should be aware of this distinction and make sure that their reports address both of these objectives.
- Corporate water disclosure is important, but is not the only sustainability issue companies report. How can water disclosure be incorporated into the broader context of sustainability disclosure, highlighting the linkages between sustainability issues (e.g., water, energy, climate change, etc.)?
- Disclosure is often isolated from other business activities. How can companies be transparent and report in a way that is integrated and synergistic with other aspects of business?
- Mandate discussions on corporate water disclosure should include experts and practitioners of integrated water resources management (IWRM) to make sure overlaps between sectors and issues are recognized and all voices are heard.
- Investors are interested in knowing the business value of water-related risks. Standards, disclosure, and verification of economic value are crucial to this end.

Day Two Closing Remarks

Gavin Power (Head, CEO Water Mandate) ended the multi-stakeholder workshop with a few comments expressing his gratitude for all endorsers and external stakeholders who attended the meeting. He noted that this meeting set a new benchmark through which the Mandate can measure itself, noting that the often passionate discussion moved these workstreams forward. He closed by recognizing and thanking the organizations who sponsored this meeting: The Coca-Cola Company, GlaxoSmithKline, H&M, Molson Coors, Nestlé, and SABMiller.



Public Informational Seminar Proceedings

Objectives

- Share information about the CEO Water Mandate – its characteristics, objectives, current and planned activities, accomplishments to date, and aspirations with the broader public
- Relay and seek input on the findings and outcomes from the multi-stakeholder workshop

Summary

The Mandate's second public informational session (the first took place during the World Water Forum in Istanbul in March 2009) began with opening remarks from Gavin Power (Head, CEO Water Mandate). Mr. Power described the impetus of the initiative, its core characteristics and workstreams, and its goals from a UN Global Compact perspective. He emphasized the Mandate's commitment to ongoing transparency both for its endorsers and the initiative itself. Power closed by expressing his broad goals moving forward, namely:

1. Closer collaborations,
2. Building business participation, and
3. Developing specialized tools and guidance.

Next, Martin Ginster (Environmental Advisor, Sasol) gave his perspective on the Mandate's value proposition. Ginster provided background into Sasol – a Mandate endorser - and its need for improved water stewardship. He spoke at length about the Mandate's value in spurring thinking on “beyond the fence line” activities. He provided a case example of how engaging with local governments rather than upgrading their own operations – as they have done in the past – allowed them to save 100 times as much water at 1/100 of the cost. Ginster stated that they would not have thought to engage with local government without the Mandate's counsel.

Following this endorser perspective, Matthew Wenban-Smith (Co-Secretary, Alliance for Water Stewardship) provided one external stakeholder perspective on the Mandate's value. As a regular attendee of the initiative's working conferences, he stated that the meetings have been of the highest quality without exception. Among his main points were:

- Multi-stakeholder dialogue is necessary when discussing corporate water stewardship and that the Mandate is an important platform for such dialogue.
- The Mandate provides an opportunity for the various sectors to learn the complexities of corporate water practices and to meet with leading water-intensive companies.
- The Mandate should clarify the process by which it interacts with external stakeholders.
- Moving forward, the initiative's key challenges include:
 - Smoothly scaling up and involving more companies while maintaining innovation, learning, and sharing
 - Including SMEs – not just large companies – in the Mandate and its meetings.

UNEP Water Accounting Methods and Tools Proceedings

Objectives

- Discuss key issues and a preliminary research framework to inform the main body of project research.
- Allow for various stakeholders in the field to better understand the different methodologies in regard to their objectives, scope, and approaches.
- Encourage better harmonization and alignment between existing initiatives to prevent duplication of research.

Summary

With support from UNEP, the CEO Water Mandate Secretariat is spearheading the development of a stocktaking exercise that will map the state-of-play with regard to water accounting methodologies and supporting tools. The goal of this UNEP-Mandate workshop was to convene interested stakeholders to discuss key issues and a preliminary research framework, so as to inform the main body of project research. It featured presentations from experts on water footprinting, LCA, and ISO, among others.

The event began with a few initial remarks from Guido Sonnemann and Chizuru Aoki (UN Environment Programme) and Jason Morrison (Pacific Institute), who provided a brief description of the UNEP-CEO Water Mandate collaboration and its rationale, context, and objectives.

Key points from Mr. Sonnemann and Mr. Morrison

After providing some background on UNEP and its ties with the UN Global Compact, Sonnemann explained that this work is part of a larger UNEP project - the Water Footprint, Neutrality, and Efficiency (WaFNE) Umbrella Project. The overarching objective of this project is to enhance water efficiency and water quality management through the refinement of water accounting/ footprint and water neutrality methodologies with support of related management tools. It will test these methodologies' and tool's application in:

- High water impact and water dependent industry sectors, used by their financiers and investors in due diligence and stock picking exercises, as well as
- Water-stressed / scarce regions, used by public authorities in local water service and conservation operations.

He explained that over the \$3 million project's three-year span, it will have a number of key outputs including: methodologies, tools / guides, capacity platform, dialogue forums, country pilot tests / demonstrations, and awareness raising. It will facilitate the:

- Refinement and promotion of accounting methodologies and tools,
- Application of water accounting concepts in selected industry sectors,
- Introduction of these concepts to the financial sector, and
- Implementation of these concepts in various geographical contexts.

The UNEP-Mandate stocktaking exercise (drafted primarily by the Pacific Institute) will be among the first actions taken in this broader project. It will map the state-of-play with regard to water accounting methodologies and supporting tools in an attempt to:

- Elucidate commonalities and differences among emerging methods and practice,
- Identify gaps and challenges, and
- Inform where water accounting methods might benefit from harmonization and increased field testing.



In order to facilitate an objective assessment, the research project is emphasizing an iterative and inclusive data collection and analytical process, whereby key stakeholders (i.e., Water Footprint Network, LCA practitioners, academia, civil society groups, and companies that have pilot tested water accounting methods) will be proactively engaged throughout the project. The final analysis will be published as a CEO Water Mandate-UNEP report in December 2009.

Considering the Differences Among Water Accounting Methods and Tools

Following Morrison's and Sonnemann's introductory remarks providing background and context of this project, Stuart Orr (Freshwater Manager, WWF-International) – a member of the Water Footprint Network (WFN) - spoke at length contrasting water footprinting methods and LCA methods. He emphasized that both tools are unique and complimentary; both are very useful and for different reasons. For instance, Orr suggested that while LCA may be more suited for assessing water pollution impacts, water footprints may be more useful for collecting specific watershed data and assessing potential risks in those watersheds. Much of the conversation revolved around the concept of impacts. Orr pointed out that while water footprinting methods were born out of water resource professionals need for volumetric data (not impacts), impact assessments have always been a fundamental and critical component of LCA.

Some of the common threads from the subsequent discussion among meeting participants were:

- The terminology adopted for these methods must be useful for the people in this room, but also accessible and helpful for the layman.
- Water footprint methods are not closely related to carbon footprint methods; water footprinting emphasizes the importance of the specification of spatially- and temporally-explicit data, rather than aggregation.
- Both methods must make more explicit how to practically apply the assessment on the ground.
- It may be helpful to harmonize how data are collected and managed and how impacts are characterized between these two methods.

Accounting for Water Quality / Industrial Effluent

Two speakers presented on how to understand and account for water quality and industrial effluent. First, Sylvain Lhôte (Water for the World - Programme Manager, Borealis Polymers) presented his company's approach to water quality. He stressed that – like water quantity issues – water quality data has major gaps in availability, particularly outside of direct operations. Furthermore, water quality is often more complex than quantity concerns; one must account for chemical, biological, and physical elements of water often affected by dozens of different pollutants with differing impacts. Lhôte stressed that while blue and green water footprint methods are quite helpful and applicable, grey water footprint methods often widen the learning curve and gaps for industry. He added that a crucial component of water pollution accounting methods is the ability to keep data for different pollutants as separate components.

Next, Maitte Martinez Aldaya – a member of WFN and a researcher from the University of Twente – spoke about the grey water footprint methods and studies. She explained that the grey water footprint – in respect to corporate water use – is calculated as the volume of water that is required to dilute pollutants to such an extent that the quality of the water remains above agreed water quality standards. Calculating a grey water footprint requires estimating the abundance of different pollutants and selecting the pollutant with the highest dilution volume in order to determine necessary dilution volume. She stressed that pollution can possibly exceed the capacity of the environment to dilute water to reach legal limits. She also discussed specific methods for the calculation of grey water footprints found in a variety of different WFN studies.

Some key points and questions from the subsequent discussion among attendees included:

- A systematic way of determining which water quality standards to use seems to be missing or undefined.



- Pollutants persist and impact ecosystems and communities despite dilution.
- Not all pollutants are the same. Different pollutants have vastly different impacts. You cannot combine them all.
- Grey water footprint methods seem to be assessing impacts, rather than giving a pure number as with the green and blue water footprints. Why not express grey water footprint simply as volume of wastewater discharged?

Making the Links Among Water Use and Impacts

The next session featured two speakers who discussed the often difficult process of translating volumetric water use data into quantifiable impacts to the environment, economy, and communities. First, Sebastien Humbert (Ecointesys) – who is the convenor of the ISO Working Group on Water Footprinting – explained ISO’s current plan for its standard on water accounting methods. He stated that the standard’s key objectives are to ensure that emerging methods for water accounting and impact assessments are consistent among each other, consistent among other standards, and that communication is meaningful. The standard is not meant to achieve a ready-to-use method but to reach consensus on important elements for water accounting and impact assessment. It will consider and address regionally-specific issues such as water scarcity, development level, and other issues.

Brian Richter (Co-leader – Global Freshwater Team, The Nature Conservancy) – a member of the Alliance for Water Stewardship – spoke next on AWS’s understanding of and approach to addressing impacts. He stressed that impacts is a highly complex issue that requires human value judgments on what is considered an impact. He also emphasized that impacts must be assessed at the watershed level in order to determine how communities and ecosystems are affected by corporate water use and pollution. AWS will convene a series of roundtables with stakeholders from around the world in order to help determine how to move forward on the definition of impacts.

Key points from the ensuing discussion included:

- Water footprints and LCA are fundamentally different. LCA is essentially a pollution prevention tool attempting to inform product designers on how to minimize impacts. Water footprints are looking at the watershed level to see changes to hydrologic systems.
- A clarification of goals and terminology among the various methods – particularly in regard to impacts - is needed.
- ISO has already made the decision to move forward on their water accounting and impact assessment standards. The question now is how existing initiatives can collaborate in order to help harmonize methods and terminologies without further confusing this area.
- Though blue water has traditionally been the observed and analyzed water use, green water has substantial policy, risk, and climate change implications.

Endorser-only Meeting Proceedings

Objectives

- Digest proceedings from multi-stakeholder working conference
- Determine immediate next steps/action items/workstreams
- Determine the date/location/subject of the initiative's next convening
- Decide future governance matters and funding of the initiative

Summary

Following the second day of the multi-stakeholder workshop, representatives from endorsing companies convened once again to digest prior discussions and come to some conclusions about ways forward on the three workstreams and other next steps for the initiative. Considering the meeting's time constraints, the Mandate Secretariat provided proposals for next steps, which endorsers then discussed and modified.

Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management

Endorsing companies and the CEO Water Mandate Secretariat decided that the upcoming Guide (discussed in multi-stakeholder workshop meeting summary) would benefit from the creation of a working group (to be known as the Working Group on Policy Engagement). This group will feature representatives from endorsers as members and receive input from external stakeholders on an *ad hoc* basis. The working group will act as a preliminary sounding board for interested endorsers to provide input to the Guide's authors throughout the drafting process. This will help ensure that the Guide meets endorsers' needs, while adequately addressing issues considered critical by key external stakeholders. Participation will consist mostly of one-hour conference calls every 4-6 weeks in which members will have a chance to provide input on key elements of the Guide.

Endorsers also decided to change the title of the Guide (previously "Guide on Business Engagement with Water-Related Public Policy"). Participants indicated the title could be perceived as emphasizing lobbying actions, while downplaying business engagement in regard to implementation of policy - a critical component of the Guide. The Mandate Secretariat has proposed "Guide on Business Engagement with Water Policy and Management" as the new title and has used this title in this meeting summary, in order to prevent further confusion.

Human Rights, Business, and Water

In respect to the human rights workstream, endorsers agreed to the development of an internal exercise whereby the Mandate Secretariat compiles the current practice of endorsing companies in regard to the human right to water. This exercise will elucidate companies' perception of responsibility boundaries and best practice and get a sense of what companies are doing on the ground in regard to this topic. It will serve as the basis for a full-day endorser-only discussion at the next Mandate conference where endorsers share their practical experience and learnings. Though no definitive conclusions were reached, endorsers expressed the desire to pursue a major action item on the human right to water as soon as this internal exercise is completed.

Endorsers also determined that the existing Working Group on Water and Human Rights will continue to exist in order to facilitate the development of the internal research. Furthermore, endorsers expressed their desire to continue the Mandate's relationship with the Institute for Human Rights and Business to the extent that it is beneficial for both parties.



Corporate Water Disclosure

In regard to the Corporate Water Disclosure workstream, it was agreed that the Mandate Secretariat will compile and analyze the upcoming Communications on Progress – Water (COP-Water) reports required of endorsers who joined the Mandate roughly a year ago – particularly in regard to the qualitative or process-oriented elements (e.g. Collective Action, Public Policy, and Community Engagement). This analysis will look at current and emerging practices on these issues among endorsing companies and will serve as the basis for a future Mandate-branded guidance document on qualitative water reporting. The timeline for this future work is as of yet undetermined, however endorsers agreed to pursue it once this compilation and analysis is completed.

After some suggestions by endorsers, the Mandate Secretariat agreed to pursue a policy that would allow COP-Water reports to be integrated within endorsers' next broader UN Global Compact COPs.

Subsequent to the Stockholm meeting the Mandate Secretariat issued the following policy guidance:

The purpose of this email is to provide further information with respect to the reporting requirement of the CEO Water Mandate -- with special relevance for those companies that endorsed the Mandate prior to October 2008.

As previously communicated, the annual disclosure (Communication on Progress-Water, or "COP-Water") is required of all endorsers within one year from the date of joining the CEO Water Mandate. For companies that endorsed the Mandate prior to October 2008 (when the Transparency Policy was announced), the Mandate Secretariat has indicated that the first COP-Water is due by the end of September 2009.

During the recent Stockholm conference, some early endorsers (those who joined prior to October 2008) expressed the desire to synchronize their first COP-Water with their annual general Communication on Progress for the UN Global Compact.

To accommodate this desire, the Mandate Secretariat -- upon written request by an endorsing company -- will grant an extension of the COP-Water for inclusion in the company's next annual general Communication on Progress for the UN Global Compact. This is also consistent with the Transparency Policy which stipulates that the COP-Water should ideally be incorporated into existing annual sustainability reports. (A request for this extension should be sent to Mr Haeryong Nahm, UN Global Compact Office, at nahmh@un.org, by 15 September 2009.)

As a matter of on-going practice, companies that endorse the CEO Water Mandate will be required to submit their first COP-Water within one year from the date of joining, per the Transparency Policy. New endorsers are encouraged to integrate their first COP-Water into their annual general COP for the UN Global Compact and/or their annual sustainability report, even if that means the first COP-Water is done prior to a full 12 months in the initiative. Companies that choose not to integrate their first COP-Water in this fashion will be expected to produce a stand-alone COP-Water after one year in the initiative.

Next Steps

Following the discussion on how to advance the Mandate's three current workstreams, endorsers and the Mandate Secretariat discussed practical administrative and logistics issues. The conclusions reached in this discussion were:

- The Mandate's Fifth Working Conference will take place at UN Headquarters in New York City in the first quarter of 2010.
- The Mandate will also have a strong presence at the UN Leaders' Summit in June 2010 – however the exact form of this presence is yet to be determined.



- The full-day discussion on practical experience and learnings on human rights at the fifth working conference will be endorsers-only in order to allow endorsers and the Mandate Secretariat to explore this sensitive issue before they make any public statement.
- The Mandate Secretariat will release a forecast of the initiative's non-conference expenditures for the next year to endorsing companies within the next month.
- As in this past, the Mandate Steering Committee will review and approve all Mandate-branded documents before they are released to the public. Decisions in the Steering Committee are made by consensus first and by majority vote if consensus is not reached.
- The Steering Committee will change from the current system that replaces all members every year to a staggered membership that allows for some continuity.



Appendix A: List of Working Conference Participants

Affiliation	Name	Title
Endorsing companies and prospective endorsers		
The Coca-Cola Company	Denise Knight	Global Water Initiative Manager
The Coca-Cola Company	Greg Koch	Director - Global Water Stewardship
The Coca-Cola Company	Lisa Manley	Director - Environmental Communications
Coca-Cola Hellenic Bottling Company	Ulrike Gehmacher	Group Public Affairs & Communications Manager
Diageo plc	Gareth Collins	Environmental Manager, International Beer Supply
Dow Chemical Company	Peter Paul Van De Wijz	Global Government Affairs and Public Policy Expertise Leader
GlaxoSmithKline	Brett Fulford	Director of Strategic Projects
H&M	Henrik Lampa	Environmental Supply Chain Manager
H&M	Ingrid Schullström	Head of Corporate Social Responsibility
Hindustan Construction Company Limited	Mangesh Gupte	Deputy General Manager – Corporate Social Responsibility
Levi Strauss & Co.	Anna Walker	Worldwide Government Affairs and Public Policy
Marks and Spencer	Laila Petrie	Supplier Exchange Manager
Molson Coors Brewing Company	Barton Alexander	Global VP, Alcohol Policy and Corporate Responsibility
Molson Coors Brewing Company	Dan Lewis	Chief Public Affairs Officer
Molson Coors Brewing Company	Peter Swinburn	President and CEO
Nestlé S.A.	Claus Conzelmann	VP Safety Health and Environment
Nestlé S.A.	Christian Frutiger	Public Affairs Manager
Nestlé S.A.	Marianela Jimenez	Safety, Health & Environment Coordinator
Netafim	Naty Barak	Director of Global Corporate Responsibility
PepsiCo, Inc.	Dan Bena	Director of Sustainability, Health, Safety, and Environment
PepsiCo, Inc.	Emma Clarke	Sustainability Manager
PepsiCo, Inc.	Liese Dallbauman	Senior Manager - Water Stewardship
PricewaterhouseCoopers	Tania Campbell	Sustainability & Climate Change
PricewaterhouseCoopers	Jon Williams	Partner
Royal Dutch Shell plc	Joppe Cramwinckel	Senior Sustainable Development Advisor
SABMiller	Andy Wales	Group Head of Sustainable Development
Sasol	Martin Ginster	Environmental Advisor (Water and Cleaner Production)
Syngenta	Peleg Chevion	New Business Ventures Manager
Syngenta	Juan Gonzalez-Valero	Head of Corporate Responsibility
Unilever	Donna Jeffries	Water Expertise Group
UN agencies and government officials		
Inter-American Development Bank	Carlos de Paco	Principal Partnerships Officer
International Finance	Patrick Mullen	



Affiliation	Name	Title
Corporation		
UN Global Compact - Russia	Egor Voronin	Project Leader
UN Development Programme	Juerg Staudenmann	Water Governance Advisor for Europe/CIS
UN Environment Programme	Guido Sonnemann	Programme Officer for Innovation and Life Cycle Management, Sustainable
UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative	Susan Steinhagen	Program Officer - Biodiversity & Ecosystem Services
UNESCO IHE	Joop de Schutter	Deputy Director
USAID's Advancing the Blue Revolution Initiative	Kristina Kohler	Partnership Development Specialist
Civil society		
Bread for the World	Thorsten Kiefer	Legal Advisor
Circle of Blue	Carl Ganter	Director
Circle of Blue	Aaron Jaffe	Video Producer and Reporter
Circle of Blue	Keith Schneider	Senior Editor
Conservation International	Tracy Farrell	Senior Director of Strategic Projects
Conservation International	Conrad Savy	Biodiversity Analyst
Oxfam America	Chris Jochnick	Director, Private Sector Team
Pacific Institute	Peter Gleick	President
Save-the-Children	Elizabeth Dahlin	Secretary General
The Nature Conservancy	Jonathan Kaledin	Blue Water Certification Program Director
The Nature Conservancy	Karin Krchnak	Senior Advisor, International Water Policy
The Nature Conservancy	Brian Richter	Co-leader Global Freshwater Team
WaterAid	Duncan Wilbur	Private Sector Engagement Advisor
Water Advocates	John Oldfield	Executive Vice President
Water Advocates	Michaela Oldfield	Director of Operations & Special Projects
Water Witness International	Nick Hepworth	Senior Consultant
WWF International	Stuart Orr	Freshwater Policy Officer
WWF-UK	Robin Farrington	Water Policy Advisor
WWF-US	Chris Williams	Director, Freshwater Conservation
Other		
Alliance for Water Stewardship	Matthew Wenban-Smith	Co-Secretary
Arthur D Little	Melissa Barrett	Manager
Arthur D Little	David Lyon	Senior Manager – Sustainability and Risk
Business Action for Water	Jack Moss	Senior Water Advisor
European Water Partnership	Sabine von Wiren Lehr	Projects Coordinator
Freie Universitat Berlin	Nicole Kranz	Researcher
Future 500	Matt Turner	Director, Global Stakeholder Initiative
Global Water Challenge	Paul Faeth	President
GlobeScan	Rob Kerr	Vice President
International Water Management Institute	David Molden	Deputy Director General - Research
ISO Working Group on Water Footprinting	Sébastien Humbert	Chief Operation Officer - Scientific Director



Affiliation	Name	Title
LimnoTech	Wendy Larson	Senior Project Scientist
McKinsey & Co.	Lee Addams	Consultant
Pegasys Strategy and Development (Pty) Ltd	Guy Pegram	Managing Director
University of Twente	Maite Martinez Aldaya	Researcher on Multidisciplinary Water Management
Water Environment Federation	Paul Freedman	President Elect
Water Environment Federation	Matthew Ries	Managing Director, Technical & Educational Services
Water Environment Federation	Rebecca West	President
Water Footprint Network	Derk Kuiper	Executive Director
Water Footprint Network	Erika Zarate	Programme Officer
Water Stewardship Initiative	Michael Spencer	Co-Director
World Business Council for Sustainable Development	Anne-Leonore Boffi	Program Officer, Water
World Economic Forum	Valerie Aillaud	Associate Director
World Water Council	Danielle Gaillard-Picher	Forum Coordinator
Financial Sector		
APG All Pensions Group	Claudia Kruse	Governance & Sustainability Specialist
Norges Bank Investment Management	Loïc Dujardin	Analyst Corporate Governance
Norges Bank Investment Management	Magdalena Kettis	Head of Social and Environmental Corporate Governance
Robeco	Wilco van Heteren	Senior Engagement Specialist
Event organizers		
Pacific Institute	Jason Morrison	Globalization Program Director
Pacific Institute	Peter Schulte	Research Analyst
Ross and Associates	Rob Greenwood	Vice President and Principal
UN Global Compact	Gavin Power	Head, CEO Water Mandate



Appendix B: Meeting Ground Rules for CEO Water Mandate Fourth Working Conference

This CEO Water Mandate event offers a unique opportunity for endorsing companies and other key stakeholders to share approaches and emerging practices, build relationships and explore partnership opportunities, and generate enthusiasm and consider near-term strategies for this new public-private initiatives.

The day and a half-long Working Conference offers a mix of panel presentations and discussion opportunities intended to foster in-depth deliberations. Rob Greenwood, as facilitator, is a neutral third party with no stake in the outcome of discussions. Although under contract to the Pacific Institute, he works for the process and treats all meeting participants as equal “clients.” The organizing team puts forward the following streamlined ground rules for all meeting participants to guide conference deliberations:

- *Active, focused participation:* The conference is structured to encourage an active exchange of idea among participants. Voicing these perspectives is essential to enable meaningful dialogue. To that end, we encourage attendees to actively participate in the discussion and fold in their perspectives throughout the day.
- *Constructive input:* Meeting participants are encouraged to frame observations in terms of needs and interests, not in terms of positions; opportunities for finding solutions increase dramatically when discussion focuses on needs and interests.
- *Respectful interaction:* Conference participants are encouraged to respect each other’s values and legitimacy of interests. We further ask that you strive to be open-minded and integrate participants’ ideas, perspectives and interests.
- *Focused comments:* Our 1.5 day-long agenda is ambitious, with many topics to cover and numerous perspectives to fold in. Given the limited time, we ask that participants keep their comments as succinct and focused as possible and help ensure that all participants have an opportunity to contribute their thoughts to the dialogue.
- *Chatham House Rule:* To encourage free discussion, workshop participants are welcome to share discussion points with other non-attendees, but comments are not to be attributed directly to particular speakers or entities (Chatham House Rule).
- *Other:* To keep the meeting as effective as possible, we ask that you honor the following meeting management aspects:
 - Keep cell phones off
 - Use scheduled breaks, as possible
 - Wait to be recognized before speaking
 - Avoid side-discussions

We look forward to a productive dialogue and thank you for your participation.