

Case Study Manual

This document provides the main guidance for carrying out your Case Study during WAT-E2080 Water & Governance course. Do note that also the Reading Material as well as session slides (particularly the slides from Thu 13.1) provide plenty of useful information for the Case Study.

You are also strongly encouraged to use additional documents as your guidance, using them to develop your analysis and your methods further.

Case Study consists of three interlinked phases: 1. Governance analysis of your Case Study; 2. Preparing a Case Study Report; and 3. Presenting your Case Study.

This Manual provides information on all these phases. It also includes a short introduction to relevant methods as well as description of all five Case Studies.

1. Governance analysis of your Case Study	2
2. Case Study Report	6
3. Presenting your Case Study.....	7
4. Case Studies	8
4.1 Sustainable Development Goal SDG6.....	8
4.2 Mekong River Basin	9
4.3 EU water governance & EU-WFD	10
4.4. River Kokemäenjoki: flood risk management.....	11
4.5 Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority HSY	12

1. Governance analysis of your Case Study

The Case Studies explore water governance in different governance contexts and across different scales, from global to regional and local scale. Despite their differences, all Cases are analysed through the same kind of process, facilitating also comparison.

The **general aim** of the Case Study is to explore how the governance arrangement in your Case works and how well it is actually functioning (i.e. does it succeeds or fails to achieve its stated Governance Objective).

The governance analysis is done through **five interrelated steps** described below, organized according to our governance frame and its three key elements (institutions, actors, interactions).

Through these steps, you will 1) define your general Governance Context and related Governance Objective, 2) recognise the relevant key institutions, 3) identify and categorize the relevant key actors, 4) defining key interactions within and between institutions and actors, and 5) carry out critical analysis by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of your governance arrangement with the help of OECD water governance principles.

The first four steps form the so-called descriptive analysis of your Case Study, while the fifth step forms then the critical analysis of your Case Study. You should use around 80% of your time for descriptive analysis, and 20% to critical analysis.

Next pages provide a more detailed guidelines for each of the five steps. Do note, however, that the guidelines and the suggested methods are indicative only and you are encouraged also to use other, complementary methods in your analysis.



Step 1: Define the Governance Context (DL 20.1)

- Define and describe your Governance Context, including its Governance Objective (what the governance arrangement in your Case Study context is trying to achieve?)
→ The Governance Objective is usually defined with the help of key institution such as a policy, a strategy or a law of your Case Study (see Step 2 + Case Studies section)
- Describe the governance mode (hierarchical, network, market, hybrid, other) that your Case's governance arrangement is closest to
→ For governance modes, please see e.g. the article by Pahl-Wostl 2019, which is also the Reading Material for the first Reading Circle
- Describe the general aim of your Case Study
→ Build on the general description above, but link it to your specific Governance Context and related Governance Objective (see also Case Studies section)

Step 2: Recognise key institutions (DL 20.1)

- Conduct a policy review to identify key institutions, building on relevant documents and other material related to your Case Study.
→ Start with the key institution indicated in your Case Study, and use it as a basis to recognise other key institutions.
→ Focus is on formal key institutions, but pay also attention to other institutions mentioned in the relevant documents. These may include institutions that affect your governance case as well institutions that are affected by it.

Step 3. Identify and categorise key actors (DL 27.1)

- Identify key actors based on literature review, starting with the same documents you reviewed in the previous step and extending as required
→ Start by identifying actors through the four societal sectors: public, private, civil society and academia. After, you may specify these as needed: the level of detail in which the actors are presented depends also on the scale of your case.
Also note that the actors might differ depending on whether you focus on e.g., planning, decision-making, and/or implementation.
- Categorize the actors using the *impact-influence matrix* and *rainbow diagram*
→ These methods will help to further focus your literature review and structure the discussion within your group. Their results will also inform the critical analysis about the roles of different actors. You can explore e.g. if the actors most interested in achieving Governance Objective are the same than those with most power.

Step 4: Identify and analyse interactions (DL 3.2)

- Define the key governance process (typically a policy cycle) and the timeframe that is relevant for your governance case.
 - The governance process and timeframe should link to your Governance Objective, and they are most likely indicated in your main policy document.

The timeframe is likely to be at least a year, but it can be several years too: start with the big picture and specify as needed!
- Investigate interactions both within and between actors and institutions
 - To help in this, you may consider the key interactions during the policy cycle and its relevant phases (e.g. planning, impact assessment, decision-making, implementation) across the timeframe you have defined.
 - You may also identify the main events/actions/milestones during your defined governance process such as a policy cycle, and then describe the role and interactions of key actors and institutions in them.

Step 5: Critical analysis (DL 10.2)

The last step consists of critical analysis of your governance case. While using around 20% of your time for this step, it is also a particularly strong indication of how well you actually understand your governance case and its dynamics.

This step builds on the descriptive analysis carried out in the previous four steps, and it focuses on the following questions: Is the governance arrangement of your Case doing what it is supposed to do (i.e. meeting its Governance Objective)? Why or why not?

- Use the OECD water governance principles to facilitate this analysis
 - Go through all 12 principles and consider how well your governance case is performing in terms of each governance principle and related three dimensions (effectiveness; efficiency; trust & engagement), using the Governance Strength & Weaknesses picture presented in the lecture slides (13.1)
 - Also remember to provide your clear answer and justification for the questions indicated above (Is the governance arrangement of your Case doing what it is supposed to do i.e. meeting its Governance Objective? Why or why not?)

Case study as a research method

Case study is a specific way to carry out research, but during this course we do not have time to delve deeper into its different characteristics but give you above the main structure and aims for your Case Study.

You are, however, also encouraged to read relevant books that provide more information about case study as a research method. For example the book "Qualitative Methods in Business Research" by Eriksson & Kovalainen (2008) is available for Aalto students as e-book and includes a useful chapter on Case Study Research:

<http://methods.sagepub.com/book/qualitative-methods-in-business-research>

For more comprehensive introduction, you may read e.g. Robert K Yin's book "Case Study Research: Design and Methods". You may also have a look at this Finnish language introduction in Metodix: <https://metodix.fi/2014/05/19/aaltio-marjosola-casetutkimus>

To collect and analyse data for your Case Study, you will also be using qualitative research methods such as interviewing. For more information on that, have a look at the material available in Aalto's course 21E00011 Doing Qualitative Research (<https://mycourses.aalto.fi/course/view.php?id=23572>).

Also browse through the relevant books available through Aalto Learning Center, including the book by Eriksson & Kovalainen (2008) indicated above.

2. Case Study Report

The results from your governance analysis are documented in Case Study Report. The length of the Case Study Report is 15-20 pages (font 12 pt, spacing 1,5) + References and Annex(es).

The Case Study Report follows the general structure of a scientific article, although it can be more visual: the idea is that your visualisations help to describe your analysis results and they can also be directly used in your presentation.

The structure of the main Report is given in the text box below, while information on the References and Annex(es) are provided after the text box.

Introduction (1-2 pages)

Introducing your Case Study and what you are trying to achieve, including the general aim as well as the Governance Context, governance mode and Governance Objective of your Case Study.

Results (~10-12 pages)

This is the main section of your report, and it has two sub-sections:

i) Key results from your descriptive analysis

Structure this sub-section according to key governance elements i.e. institutions, actors, and interactions and the related steps. Use also visualisations describing the results from your analysis.

ii) Key results from your critical analysis

This section documents your results from the Step 5 above, including the Governance Strengths & Weaknesses picture and related short explanation.

Also remember to provide your clear answer and justification for the questions: Is the governance arrangement of your Case doing what it is supposed to do (i.e. meeting its Governance Objective)? Why or why not?

Conclusions (~1-2 page)

Conclude your Case Study based on the results presented (what were the key findings?) and place your results into a broader context.

References

List all the references (publications, websites, interviews....) you have used in your study at the end of your report. Similarly to a scientific article, make sure you cite your references correctly: remember that plagiarism is not allowed (for more, see Aalto's Code of Academic Integrity: <http://bit.ly/16EzldQ>). The citation style is for you to decide, but Harvard style is recommended (e.g. <http://guides.is.uwa.edu.au/harvard>).

The references must include also relevant peer-reviewed journal articles: many of them are already available as Reading Material for the course. To find scientific articles on your topic, use scientific search engines such as the Science Direct (<http://www.sciencedirect.com>) or Google Scholar (<http://scholar.google.fi/>). To access the articles, you can log in through the web pages of the Aalto Library.

Annex: Materials & methods

The Annex of your report describes the key materials (different types of literature, possible interviews etc.) as well as different research methods you have used in your analysis: it thus helps to understand how you actually carried out your analysis.

The Annex must also include your own reflection on how your given analysis framework and selected methods actually worked for your analysis. As part of your reflection, you are also encouraged to indicate what you would now do differently in your analysis.

Note that you may include into the Annex also additional visualisations and diagrammes that are relevant for your analysis, but that do not fit the actual results section.

3. Presenting your Case Study

You must present your Case Study to others during a Case Study presentation day on Week 7. The length of your presentation is maximum 12 minutes, and it should include both descriptive analysis part (what and how) as well as critical analysis part (why). All group members must participate in the presentation.

There are naturally different ways to prepare and give your presentation, and we encourage you to find your own style and approach! But, because of the time limitation, we will provide you an outline for the presentation. We also encourage you to use some guides/tips for preparing a good presentation (see e.g. [the YouTube video by Todd Reubold](https://youtu.be/Yis6mAnMjTc): <https://youtu.be/Yis6mAnMjTc>

Submit your presentation to your groups Teams channel before the session. Name your presentation as follows: # Group name - Presentation, where # is the number of your group.

4. Case Studies

The aim of the case studies is to examine different governance contexts, and in this way to deepen your understanding of different governance settings and related scales. At the same time, the analysis work to be done for the Case Study gives you a possibility to apply a set of governance analysis methods in practice as well as to discuss them with your peers.

We will next introduce all five Case Studies and their specific aims.

4.1 Sustainable Development Goal SDG6

Your Case Study focuses on global scale, and looks at the governance of Sustainable Development Goals i.e. SDGs (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdgs>), with specific focus on water-related SDG 6. For this reason, you will also look at the role that UN-Water and other key organisations have in the SDG implementation.

The SDGs are globally agreed objectives for international development, setting the agenda for sustainable development until year 2030. The SDGs process is led by the United Nations, but their implementation is the common responsibility for all of us. While there is also a water-specific SDG (SDG6), several other goals are closely linked to water as well. Within the UN system, UN-Water coordinates the efforts of UN entities and other international organizations working on water and sanitation issues: it is not, however, an organisation but rather a coordinating body, making its mandate more mixed than that of traditional UN organisations.

Your Case Study focuses in particular on SDG target 6.5: *By 2030, implement integrated water resources management at all levels, including through transboundary cooperation as appropriate*. This target is the aim of your governance case is trying to achieve.

Your task is to analyse this governance setting, and the suggested general objective for your analysis is (note that you can modify this objective if you want):

What kind of global governance arrangements exist for facilitating the achievement of IWRM-related Target SDG6.5, and how well such arrangement supports achieving this target?

This also means that the **key institution that set the general objective for the governance** of your Case is the Agenda 2030 that established the entire SDG-process and particularly the SDG6 and its target 6.5.

To get going with your analysis, you should start with official UN-documents related to SDG6, including the Agenda 2030 and SDG6-related key documents as well as guidelines such as this one: [Guidelines-to-Support-Country-Reporting-on-SDGs-1.pdf](#)

4.2 Mekong River Basin

Your Case Study focuses on regional scale with multiple countries, and looks at the governance related to transboundary Mekong River Basin. The Mekong is shared by six South-East Asian countries of China, Myanmar, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia and Vietnam. The river basin is seeing one of the most rapid hydropower development in the world, which is making transboundary cooperation in the region particularly important – and challenging.

In terms of actual water resources management within the river basin, the key organisation is the regional Mekong River Commission (MRC) that have four lower Mekong Basin countries as its members (<http://www.mrcmekong.org>) and whose work builds on the Mekong Agreement 1995. The Vision of the MRC for the Mekong River Basin is strongly linked to the three pillars of the sustainable development: “An economically prosperous, socially just and environmentally sound Mekong River Basin”.

Increasingly important in the region is also newer, China-led Lancang-Mekong Cooperation Mechanism and its Lancang-Mekong Water Resources Cooperation Center: it includes all six countries as its members, but is not as strongly institutionalised.

Your task is to analyse this governance setting, and the suggested general objective for your analysis is (note that you can modify this objective if you want):

How is the MRC’s governance organised and how well such arrangement supports achievement of its vision for the Mekong River Basin under current plans for hydropower development?

Here, it is also important to consider the roles of different riparian countries in the governance of the MRC and Mekong River Basin more broadly, with particular attention paid to the on-going hydropower development and its impact for the riparian countries and people.

The key institutions that set the general Governance Objective for your Case include the Mekong Agreement 1995 as well as the MRC’s current strategy documents, including its vision and mission (<https://www.mrcmekong.org/about/mrc/vision-and-mission>). Also have a look at the relevant Strategic Plans and Basin Development Plans as well as the MRC procedures such as PNPCA.

To get going with your analysis, you should thus start with the official MRC documents available in the MRC website: <https://www.mrcmekong.org/about/mrc/strategic-plans> Also read relevant scientific articles and other material related to the MRC and its governance.

4.3 EU water governance & EU-WFD

Your case study focuses on water governance at the level of European Union (EU) and specifically on the governance related to [the EU Water Framework Directive](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/info/intro_en.htm) (WFD):
https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/water-framework/info/intro_en.htm

WFD is a key instrument to guide water resources management and water protection in the EU member states, with an aim to achieve good ecological status of all waters in Europe. The WFD introduced a new legislative approach to managing and protecting water, based not on political boundaries but on natural geographical and hydrological formations i.e. river basins. Its successful implementation also requires coordination of different policies both at EU and national levels.

Your task is to analyse this governance setting, and the suggested general objective for your analysis is (note that you can modify this objective if you want):

What kind of governance arrangements exist to support the implementation of EU-WFD, and how well do these arrangements support in achieving the good status for all waters in the EU?

You are suggested to focus on the implementation of WFD as described in the directive, and you may consider this only at the level of the EU or then include also national level into your analysis.

The key institution that sets the general Governance Objective for your Case is therefore the Water Framework Directive itself as well as related policy documents and reports.

The directive and related documents found in the European Commission's website form also the main documents that you should start your analysis from. Also note that the functioning of the WFD was evaluated in 2019 ([Fitness check of the EU Water Legislation 2019](https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/fitness_check_of_the_eu_water_legislation/index_en.htm)):
https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/fitness_check_of_the_eu_water_legislation/index_en.htm

In addition, you are strongly encouraged also to read relevant scientific articles on the functioning (and not) of the EU-WFD and its governance.

4.4. River Kokemäenjoki: flood risk management

Your case study focuses on flood risk management and related governance in Finland, with focus on the Kokemäenjoki river basin. River Kokemäenjoki is one of the main flood risk areas in Finland, as prescribed by the EU Floods Directive and the Finnish Flood Risk Management Act. Flood risk management plans were prepared for Kokemäenjoki river for the years 2016-2021 and 2022-2027. This case study focuses primarily on these two planning cycles and plans.

Your task is to analyse this governance setting, and the suggested general objective for your analysis is (note that you can modify this objective if you want):

How is the governance of flood risk management process organized in River Kokemäenjoki, and how well it can actually reduce flood risks in the area?

You may also see if there have been some changes in the governance setting/arrangements between the first and second flood risk management cycles.

The key institution that set the general objective for the governance is the [Finnish Flood Risk Management Act](https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2010/20100620) (<https://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/ajantasa/2010/20100620>) together with Government Decrees on flood risk management ([link 1](#), [link 2](#)). In addition, the [EU floods directive](#) (2007/60/EC) sets a broader institutional context for the area: https://ec.europa.eu/environment/water/flood_risk/

The links above form also the key material that you should start your analysis from. Additional relevant material (mainly in Finnish only) include for example the following websites and related material:

<https://www.vesi.fi/kokemaen-vesistoalueen-tulvariskien-hallintasuunnitelma/>

https://www.ymparisto.fi/fi-FI/Vesi/Tulviin_varautuminen/Tulvariskien_hallinta

Note that some of the information has been transferred to:

<https://www.vesi.fi/vesitietokategoria/tulvat-ja-kuivuus/?vesitietotype=1&sort=3#vesitieto>

4.5 Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority HSY

Your Case Study focuses on local scale, and looks at the governance structure of the Helsinki Region Environmental Services Authority HSY with a focus on water supply arrangements (<https://www.hsy.fi/en/>).

HSY is a municipal body (*kuntayhtymä*) that produces waste management and water services, and provides information on the Helsinki Metropolitan Area and environment. It covers the four cities in the Helsinki Metropolitan Area, namely Espoo, Helsinki, Kauniainen and Vantaa. The HSY employs over 700 people and invests annually over 100 million euros in water and environmental infrastructure and services. The HSY's vision for 2025 is "Together we will create the most sustainable urban area in the world".

Your task is to analyse the governance setting of the HSY and its water supply services, including both drinking water and waste water. The suggested general objective for your analysis is (note that you can modify this objective if you want):

How is the governance related to water supply organised within the HSY and how well it facilitates meeting its vision for 2025?

When carrying out your analysis, you should also consider the relation between the HSY and its member cities (Espoo, Helsinki, Kauniainen and Vantaa) and their respective governance arrangements.

The key institution that sets the general objective for the governance of your Case is thus the HSY's strategy as well as related policy and implementation documents:

<https://www.hsy.fi/en/hsy/strategy-and-sustainability>

These are also the key materials that you should start your analysis from. In addition, please browse through the relevant documents related to the organisation of the water supply, including both drinking water and waste water (please note that majority of this material is available only in Finnish).