Table S1: Aggregations of aggregated stakeholder responses using approximate numbers and confidence intervals.

#	Abbreviated question	Approximate Number	+1	-1	Lower +1	Upper +1	Lower -1	Upper −1	Conclusion	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
4	q1: concerned with selection of WWT	0.5±0.8	73%	19%	52%	88%	7%	39%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	IN	IN
5	q2: no interest in WWT technologies	-0.9±0.4	4%	92%	0%	20%	75%	99%	Strongly No	IN	Unanimous No	Strongly No
6	q2: interest in approval of WWT	-0.5±0.8	15%	62%	4%	35%	41%	80%	No	IN	IN	IN
7	q2: interest in selection of WWT	0.2±0.9	50%	31%	30%	70%	14%	52%	CF/Yes	IN	IN	IN
8	q2: interest in research about WWT	-0.2±0.9	31%	54%	14%	52%	33%	73%	CF/No	IN	IN	Strongly Yes
9	q2: other interest	-0.96±0.20	0%	96%	0%	13%	80%	100%	Strongly No	Unanimous No	Strongly No	Strongly No
10	q3: BAT known	0.5±0.8	65%	19%	44%	83%	7%	39%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
11	q4: BAT rather important	0.88±0.33	88%	0%	70%	98%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes
12	q5: flexible BAT is suitable	1.	100%	0%	87%	100%	0%	13%	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes
13	q6: existing WWT are BAT	0.3±0.8	58%	23%	37%	77%	9%	44%	CF/Yes	IN	Strongly Yes	IN
14	q7a: environmental impacts matter for WWT	1.	100%	0%	87%	100%	0%	13%	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes
15	q7a: costs matter for WWT	0.8±0.5	85%	4%	65%	96%	0%	20%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes	IN
16	q7a: acceptance by users matters for WWT	0.8±0.5	81%	4%	61%	93%	0%	20%	Strongly Yes	IN	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes
17	q7a: ease of use matters for WWT	0.88±0.33	88%	0%	70%	98%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes
18	q7a: health matters for WWT	0.9±0.4	92%	4%	75%	99%	0%	20%	Strongly Yes	IN	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes
19	q7a: recycling matters for WWT	0.7±0.6	77%	8%	56%	91%	1%	25%	Yes	IN	IN	Unanimous Yes

Table continued (next page):

Table S1, continued

#	Question	Approximate Number	+1	-1	Lower +1	Upper +1	Lower -1	Upper −1	Conclusion	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
20	q7b: rank pollution	0.8±0.4	77%	0%	56%	91%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	IN
21	q7b: rank costs	0.5±0.6	50%	4%	30%	70%	0%	20%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
22	q7b: rank acceptance	0.4±0.6	46%	4%	27%	67%	0%	20%	Rather Yes	IN	IN	IN
23	q7b: rank ease of use	0.5±0.6	54%	8%	33%	73%	1%	25%	Yes	IN	IN	Strongly Yes
24	q7b: rank health	0.7±0.5	73%	4%	52%	88%	0%	20%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	Strongly Yes
25	q7b: rank recycling	0.0±0.6	15%	19%	4%	35%	7%	39%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
26	q8a: recycling for irrigation is important	0.6±0.6	69%	8%	48%	86%	1%	25%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
27	q8a: recycling for toilet flushing is important	0.7±0.5	69%	0%	48%	86%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	Strongly Yes
28	q8a: recycling of sludge is important	0.5±0.7	58%	12%	37%	77%	2%	30%	Yes	Unanimous Yes	IN	IN
29	q8a: use of biogas is important	0.5±0.6	62%	8%	41%	80%	1%	25%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
30	q8a: other is important	0.0±0.4	12%	8%	2%	30%	1%	25%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
31	q8b: rank irrigation	0.6±0.5	62%	0%	41%	80%	0%	13%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
32	q8b: rank toilet	0.6±0.6	65%	4%	44%	83%	0%	20%	Yes	IN	IN	Strongly Yes
33	q8b: rank sludge	0.4±0.5	42%	0%	23%	63%	0%	13%	Rather Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
34	q8b: rank biogas	0.4±0.7	50%	12%	30%	70%	2%	30%	CF/Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
35	q8b: rank other	0.0±0.4	8%	8%	1%	25%	1%	25%	Indeterminate	IN	IN	IN
36	q9: interest in standards	0.5±0.8	69%	15%	48%	86%	4%	35%	Yes	IN	IN	Unanimous Yes

Table S1, continued

#	Question	Approximate Number	+1	-1	Lower +1	Upper +1	Lower -1	Upper −1	Conclusion	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
37	q10: add pollutant to standards	0.0±0.8	31%	27%	14%	52%	12%	48%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
38	q10: keep standards as they are	-0.3±0.7	12%	46%	2%	30%	27%	67%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
39	q10: remove pollutants from standards	-0.2±0.7	15%	38%	4%	35%	20%	59%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
40	q11: relax thresholds of standards	0.0±0.7	19%	27%	7%	39%	12%	48%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
41	q11: keep thresholds	-0.1±0.7	19%	31%	7%	39%	14%	52%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	Strongly Yes
42	q11: sharpen thresholds	-0.3±0.7	12%	38%	2%	30%	20%	59%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	Strongly No
43	q12: enforcement of standards is rather strict	-0.3±0.7	15%	50%	4%	35%	30%	70%	CF/No	IN	IN	IN
44	q13: users should pay most capital costs	-0.2±0.8	23%	42%	9%	44%	23%	63%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
45	q14: users should pay most O&M costs	0.2±0.8	42%	27%	23%	63%	12%	48%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
46	q15: substantial revenues from recycling	0.1±0.8	38%	27%	20%	59%	12%	48%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
47	q16a: Union government should drive recycling	0.5±0.6	58%	8%	37%	77%	1%	25%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
48	q16a: state government should drive recycling	0.6±0.6	62%	4%	41%	80%	0%	20%	Yes	IN	Strongly Yes	IN
49	q16a: ULBs should drive recycling	0.4±0.7	54%	12%	33%	73%	2%	30%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
50	q16a: private sector should drive recycling	-0.2±0.8	19%	42%	7%	39%	23%	63%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
51	q16a: other drivers	0.0±0.4	4%	12%	0%	20%	2%	30%	Perhaps No	IN	IN	IN
52	q16b: rank Union government as driver	0.5±0.6	58%	4%	37%	77%	0%	20%	Yes	IN	IN	Strongly Yes
53	q16b: rank state government as driver	0.7±0.5	77%	4%	56%	91%	0%	20%	Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	IN

Table continued (next page):

Table S1, continued

#	Question	Approximate Number	+1	-1	Lower +1	Upper +1	Lower -1	Upper −1	Conclusion	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
54	q16b: rank ULBs as driver	0.5±0.5	50%	0%	30%	70%	0%	13%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
55	q16b: rank private sector as driver	0.2±0.8	38%	23%	20%	59%	9%	44%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
56	q16b: rank "other drivers"	0.2±0.8	38%	23%	20%	59%	9%	44%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
57	q18: violation of standard is barrier	0.5±0.6	58%	4%	37%	77%	0%	20%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
58	q18: futile over-fulfillment of standards is barrier	0.2±0.8	42%	19%	23%	63%	7%	39%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
59	q18:nitrogen irrelevant if water is used for irrigation	0.3±0.6	38%	8%	20%	59%	1%	25%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
60	q18: capital costs are barrier	0.5±0.6	58%	8%	37%	77%	1%	25%	Yes	IN	Strongly Yes	IN
61	q18: O&M costs are barrier	0.3±0.7	50%	15%	30%	70%	4%	35%	CF/Yes	IN	IN	IN
62	q18: lack of capacity hinders implementation	0.3±0.7	42%	12%	23%	63%	2%	30%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
63	q18: lack of qualified personnel is barrier	0.3±0.7	50%	15%	30%	70%	4%	35%	CF/Yes	IN	IN	IN
64	q18: lacking demand for unknown technology	0.3±0.7	46%	12%	27%	67%	2%	30%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
65	q18: procurement impedes implementation	0.1±0.7	31%	19%	14%	52%	7%	39%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
66	q18: lack of approval or certification is barrier	0.3±0.8	50%	19%	30%	70%	7%	39%	CF/Yes	IN	IN	IN
67	q18: water reuse not accepted by the public	0.4±0.7	50%	12%	30%	70%	2%	30%	CF/Yes	IN	IN	IN
68	q18: there is no incentive for water reuse	0.3±0.7	38%	12%	20%	59%	2%	30%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
69	q18: other barriers	0.2±0.5	19%	4%	7%	39%	0%	20%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
70	q19: make recycling mandatory	0.8±0.5	88%	4%	70%	98%	0%	20%	Strongly Yes	IN	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes

Table continued (next page):

Table S1, continued

#	Question	Approximate Number	+1	-1	Lower +1	Upper +1	Lower -1	Upper −1	Conclusion	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
71	q19: penalize ULBs for not recycling	0.88±0.33	88%	0%	70%	98%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes
72	q19: Union government should support recycling	0.8±0.4	85%	0%	65%	96%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes	IN
73	q19 state government should support recycling	0.8±0.4	85%	0%	65%	96%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes
74	q19: international donors should provide loans for recycling	0.6±0.6	69%	8%	48%	86%	1%	25%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
75	q19: international technical assistance for recycling	0.8±0.5	88%	4%	70%	98%	0%	20%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	IN	Strongly Yes
76	q19: user fees and taxes for recycling	0.3±0.7	46%	15%	27%	67%	4%	35%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
77	q19: more awareness rising for recycling	0.88±0.33	88%	0%	70%	98%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes
78	q19: more capacity building for recycling	0.92±0.27	92%	0%	75%	99%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Unanimous Yes	Unanimous Yes	Strongly Yes
79	q20: rank mandatory	0.8±0.4	77%	0%	56%	91%	0%	13%	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	Strongly Yes	IN
80	q20: rank penalty	0.5±0.6	54%	8%	33%	73%	1%	25%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	Strongly Yes
81	q20: rank Union subsidies	0.7±0.6	69%	4%	48%	86%	0%	20%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	Strongly Yes
82	q20: rank state subsidies	0.5±0.5	54%	0%	33%	73%	0%	13%	Yes	IN	IN	IN
83	q20: rank donors	0.4±0.6	42%	4%	23%	63%	0%	20%	Rather Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
84	q20: rank assistance	0.3±0.6	38%	4%	20%	59%	0%	20%	Rather Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
85	q20: rank fees & taxes	0.0±0.7	27%	23%	12%	48%	9%	44%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN
86	q20: rank awareness rising	0.4±0.7	54%	12%	33%	73%	2%	30%	Yes	Strongly Yes	IN	IN
87	q20: rank capacity building	0.3±0.7	46%	15%	27%	67%	4%	35%	Perhaps Yes	IN	IN	IN

Note: The numbering of the questions, #, starts with 4, as questions #1-3 relate to the respondents. "Question" abbreviates the question from the questionnaires; qX is question with number X in the questionnaire). "Approximate number" is an aggregation of the aggregated stakeholder responses to an imprecise number. +1, -1 are the percent of approval and disapproval, respectively. "Lower" and "Upper" are the lower and upper Clopper-Pearson confidence limits (assuming a two-sided P-value $p = 0.5$, corresponding to 95% confidence). Conclusion summarizes the outcomes on a scale "unanimous yes/no", "strongly yes/no", "yes/no", "rather yes/no", "perhaps yes/no" with decreasing reliability, as explained in the paper. Groups 1-3 are the aggregated responses within three groups of stakeholders, using the first two scales, only (and defining strongly yes/no using the definition of approval in terms of the function *Around*.)