

**Proceedings: Okavango Basin Stakeholders' Forum Workshop**  
**18-20 July 2012. Ngandu Hotel, Rundu**

## Table of Contents

List of acronyms .....	3
1. Background of the workshop .....	5
2. Welcoming remarks .....	5
3. Official opening .....	6
4. Introductions and overview of the programme .....	6
5. Recap of the National Action Plan (NAP) and Operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012 .....	6
6. Update on the Operational Plan and Planned activities .....	8
7. Update on other projects .....	20
8. Challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and Annual Operational Plan .....	23
9. Formulation of the Operational Plan for July 2012 – March 2013 .....	25
9.1. Reflection of IWRM planning .....	25
9.2. Formulation of the annual operational plan .....	25
9.3. Feedback from group work and plenary discussion.....	26
10. Review of the institutional framework of the OKBMC.....	27
10.1. Experiences by the Executive OkBMC .....	27
10.2. Functions of portfolio holders.....	27
10.3. Guidelines for election of portfolio holders.....	28
10.4. Election of OkBMC portfolio holders .....	30
11. Institutional framework for the NAP implementation team .....	30
12. Closure and Way forward .....	31
Annexes .....	34

## List of acronyms

BMA	Basin Management Approach
BMC	Basin Management Committee
BSO	Basin Support Officer
CBNRM	Community Based Natural Resource Management
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CORB	Cubango Okavango River Basin
DDS	Design and Development Services
DEES	Directorate of Engineering and Extension Services
DoF	Directorate of Forestry
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
DRM	Directorate of Resource Management
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry
DWE	Division of Water Environment
	Directorate of Water Supply and Sanitation
DWSSC	Coordination
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
	Environmental Protection and Sustainable
ESPMO	Management of the Okavango River Basin
FIRMS	Forum for Integrated Resource Management
IWQM	Integrated Water Quality Monitoring
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
KCS	Kalahari Conservation Society
KRC	Kavango Regional Council
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MFMR	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources
MLR	Ministry Lands and Resettlement
MOMS	Management Oriented Monitoring System
MRLGHRD	Ministry of Regional, Local Government, Housing and Rural Development
MWPC	Mayana Water Point Committee
NAP	National Action Plan
NNF	Namibia Nature Foundation
OKACOM	Okavango River Basin Water Commission
OKASEC	Okavango River Basin Commission Secretariat
OkBMC	Okavango Basin Management Committee
	Participatory and Integrated Land Use Management
PILUMP	Plan
RTC	Rundu Town Council
SAP	Strategic Action Plan
SAREP	Southern Africa Regional Environmental Programme

TA	Traditional Authority
TFO	The Future Okavango
VIP	Ventilated Pit Latrine
WQM	Water Quality Monitoring

## 1. Background of the workshop

Integrated water resources management (IWRM) is an approach aimed at the involvement and participation of all stakeholders in the development and management of water resources. IWRM is therefore a responsibility of all water service providers and related management and governance entities, as well as all water users in Namibia. In Namibia, IWRM is being implemented through basin management and the establishment of basin management committees (BMCs) in a number of demarcated basins, or water management areas. As common areas of drainage, they are considered to be the appropriate units for operational management of water and other renewable natural resources. The basin management approach (BMA) is aimed at providing the opportunity for all stakeholders in a basin such as water users, service providers, government, community based organisations (CBOs) and interested parties to work together to ensure that improved, efficient and effective water and natural resources management is achieved in basins.

The process of introducing the BMA in the Okavango River Basin started through stakeholder forum meetings. Thereafter, the Okavango River Basin Management Committee (OkBMC) and executive committee were formed and nominated in 2008 and have been serving since then. In order to manage water and other natural resources in the Okavango River Basin in a sustainable manner, a Strategic Action Plan (SAP) and National Action Plan (NAP) for the Okavango River Basin were formulated in 2010/2011. This was done through the Permanent Okavango River Basin Water Commission (OKACOM) under the project Environmental Protection and Sustainable Management of the Okavango River Basin (EPSMO). The NAP implementation process started in 2011/2012 when an annual operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012 was put together by the stakeholders in the basin. During this workshop, the operational plan for 2011/2012 had to be reviewed and a new plan had to be developed.

The **main objectives** of the Okavango River Basin Stakeholders Forum Workshop were to:

- Report on progress made in implementing activities in the operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012
- Plan activities and put together an annual operational plan for July 2012 – March 2013
- Update on new projects such as the Okavango Water Audit and The Future Okavango (TFO)
- Review the institutional arrangements of the OkBMC and elect new executive committee
- Review the NAP Technical Committee (lead implementation team) and nominate individuals to serve on such a committee.

## 2. Welcoming remarks

Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu, the Chairperson of the OkBMC welcomed the participants to the workshop, ranging from line ministries representatives to traditional authorities. In her welcoming remarks she encouraged stakeholders to work together in developing a new operational plan for the basin and share activities carried out over the past 12 months by various stakeholders. In addition, she urged the participants to share experience with one

another for the benefit of grassroot levels and towards achieving Vision 2030. Ms Lutangu Matengu advised the stakeholders to elect a new executive committee, especially considering that the existing one has been serving since 2008.

### **3. Official opening**

The workshop was officially opened by Mr. David Hipulwa from Kavango Regional Council (KRC) on behalf of the Honourable Governor Mr. Maurus Nekaro. In his opening speech he emphasised that there is no management of natural resources that is done in isolation and that it is important for stakeholders to plan and manage resources together for the benefit of the communities. He highlighted some of the challenges that are facing the Okavango River Basin and urged the participants to fully commit themselves and share experiences during the workshop.

**Refer to Annex 1** for the official opening speech by Mr. Hipulwa on behalf of the Honourable Governor.

### **4. Introductions and overview of the programme**

Upon welcoming remarks and official opening of the workshop, the facilitator from the Desert Research Foundation of Namibia (DRFN), Ms Clarence Mazambani welcomed the participants to the workshop. She requested the participants to introduce themselves by stating 1) their names, 2) the institution they represent, 3) an indication of whether it was their first time attending the stakeholder forum meetings for the Okavango River Basin and 4) their expectations from the workshop.

Furthermore, she gave an overview of the workshop programme.

**Refer to Annex 2** for the list of the participants and **Annex 3** for the programme of the workshop.

### **5. Recap of the National Action Plan (NAP) and Operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012**

Ms Laura Namene, a representative from the Division of Water Environment (DWE) gave a recap of the NAP and operational plan for the Okavango River Basin. In her recap she explained that each of the three countries sharing the Okavango River (Angola, Namibia and Botswana) developed a NAP based on the SAP. The NAP is country specific and is the foundation of the activities that has to be implemented in the basin. She reminded the stakeholders that based on the NAP they developed an operational plan in 2011 for the period March 2011 – July 2012. The NAP has to be reviewed every 5 years and the operational plan has to be reviewed every year.

The objective of the NAP is: to manage the basin in a sustainable manner for improved livelihoods, socio-economic development and environmental protection. The five themes in the NAP and operational plan:

- Theme 1: Basin development and management framework
- Theme 2: Livelihoods and socio-economic development

- Theme 3: Water resources management
- Theme 4: Land management
- Theme 5: Environment and biodiversity

Under each thematic area there are NAP outcomes. Ms Namene encouraged the stakeholders to acquaint themselves with the NAP and get an idea of where their activities fall under. It was also discussed and agreed that the NAP document be printed and distributed to participants for better reference.

The second part of her presentation focused on the NAP implementation mechanisms. She made reference to the National Coordination Unit and the NAP Technical Committee and how they are linked to OKACOM. The National Coordination Unit is Department of Water Affairs and Forestry (DWAF) and it is responsible for administration and coordination of the NAP implementation. The NAP Technical Committee is made up of basin stakeholders and is responsible for leading the actual implementation of the NAP and decision making. In addition, she highlighted the composition and mandate and functions of the NAP Technical Committee. She expressed her concern that even though an interim committee was nominated at the forum meeting in 2011, it is not active/functional resulting in lack of monitoring and evaluation of the NAP implementation.

**Refer to Annex 4** for the presentation on the recap of the NAP and operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

#### ***Questions and answers***

- *How is the NAP linked to what is happening in Angola and Botswana?*  
There is a National Coordination Unit (DWAF) and a National Steering Committee that reports to OKACOM and that is where the link comes in. In addition there is a CORB basin common SAP where all the three NAPs are based on. Currently the focus is at country level and harmonization is at a later stage, nonetheless reporting on progress is very important.
- *The recap of the NAP was supposed to focus on reporting progress regarding implementation of the NAP and the challenges thereof and not NAP in general.*  
It was clarified that the reason why the recap did not focus on progress made is because the NAP Technical Committee is not active. Such a committee is supposed to monitor and evaluate (M&E) the implementation progress and report back to stakeholders.
- *One of the objectives of the workshop is to plan activities for 2012 – 2013; therefore stakeholders would like to know the progress and plan based on that.*  
The presenters from various institutions will report back on the activities that they have implemented/achievements as well as the planned activities. In addition, they are expected to give an overview of the challenges that they are facing in implementing planned activities.

#### ***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- A shortcoming of the operational plan is that there is a lack of a monitoring and evaluation tool to track progress of the implementation. There should be a M&E, including how it is supposed to be done so that next year one can report on how far the stakeholders have gone in implementation of activities. Thereafter other institutions can report on individual plans.
- The inconsistency of participants to forum meetings affects the report back of achievements and planned activities. This is in a sense that representatives are supposed to report back to their institutions on the decisions taken and information shared at forum meetings but they do not do so. In future, institutions should delegate the right persons who are able to give feedback to their institutions.

## **6. Update on the Operational Plan and Planned activities**

One of the objectives of the workshop was to report on progress made in implementing activities in the operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012. Therefore, various stakeholder institutions gave presentations highlighting their achievements, successes, challenges and key interventions planned for 2012/2013.

### **6.1. Okavango Basin Management Committee**

Mr. Reinhold Kambuli, Basin Support Officer (BSO) for OkBMC gave a presentation on achievements and planned activities for the OkBMC. His presentation started off by defining IWRM including the Duplin principles and what a basin is. He emphasized the purpose of establishing a BMC for the Okavango River Basin. The presentation focused on the activities of the four working groups (WGs) of the OkBMC that were initiated by stakeholders in the basin:

- Water Quality Monitoring WG
- Biodiversity Monitoring WG
- Waste Management and Pollution Prevention WG
- Land Management and Livelihood Management WG

The four WGs are linked to the thematic areas in the NAP and operational plan for Okavango River Basin.

Some of the major achievements of the OkBMC highlighted in the presentation are: development of the wide water quality monitoring (WQM) programme for drinking, surface and ground water, development of the WQM strategy, identification and assessment of hot spots, development of the biodiversity monitoring framework, and facilitation of a clean-up campaign. Some of the challenges that the OkBMC is faced with in implementing its planned activities include: limited capacity to monitor water quality.

**Refer to Annex 5** for the presentation on the OkBMC achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013.

After the presentation the following comment was raised:

- There is limited integration of agriculture and irrigation scheme farmers into the OkBMC activities. In future, their activities should be incorporated into the operational plan for the basin, especially considering that they are the major water



users and biggest “drivers” for change in the basin. It was clarified that in the NAP there are a lot of activities that are agriculture related therefore agriculture should consider incorporating their activities into the new operational plan.

- In future there should be a uniform format for reporting e.g. indicating which activities were carried out which ones are outstanding according to the operational plan and related costs for all presenters.

## **6.2. Dash boards and MOMS for water governance**

Mr. Ramin Gillett, a student from University of Florida gave a presentation on the dashboards that they are piloting in the basin. Dashboards aim at assessing the effectiveness, transparency and trust in community based governance institutions such as conservancies and water points. Through the dashboards one can get an idea of how the communities/conservancies perceive their governance structures and how well they are working. It is a survey instrument that can be carried out in 2 – 3 years. They are piloting the dashboards in Mayana community, because it is a community with emerging institutions e.g. water point committee. The institutions that they are working with in piloting these dashboards include Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF), OkBMC and Southern Africa Regional Environmental Programme (SAREP).

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *Where will the dashboards be hosted and who will own it, collect and analyse data?*  
It will be NNF working with the OkBMC supported by SAREP.
- *There is a similar instrument with conservancies (financial and institutional) being piloted in Caprivi Region and the challenge is ownership and sustainability. Also experience has shown that the exercise takes time. Is it a similar experience with the dashboards? Who will be responsible for administering the data?*  
In Botswana they created a database where KCS put all info and excel analyses the data; therefore it did not require too much effort. They are yet to see how it will work, since they have just started.
- *Looking at the capacity of the community, database and computer are complicated. In future one would want Mayana community to do it, how will they do it looking at their capacity or will it be done by someone from outside?*  
OkBMC and NNF will assist the Mayana community in this regard.

Ms Lillian Pelane, student from University of Botswana gave a presentation on the Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) that are being introduced in the Mayana community. MOMS is a simple tool by conservancies and communities to control and monitor various traditional activities in important areas. The tool will be used by the communities themselves, they will gather information and analyse it. It is a paper based system, thus no need for computers. The local communities will work with the OkBMC to come up with better management and control of activities going on in important areas. The students will meet the Mayana Water Point Committee (MWPC) to train them on how to use the MOMS.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *How will ownership of the tool be ensured?*  
OkBMC, NNF and SAREP are all involved in the project.

- *Did the need for the tool come from the community and were there communities involved in actual development of the tool?*  
The students developed the tool and they will discuss it with OkBMC, NNF and SAREP. Thereafter OkBMC will be responsible for follow up.
- *A comment was raised that the Biodiversity WG for OkBMC also developed a monitoring tool and the students working on the dashboards and MOMS were advised to look at this monitoring tool as well.*

### **6.3. Division of Hydrology**

Ms Aune Amwaama, Division of Hydrology gave a presentation on the achievements and planned activities of the Hydrology Division in the Okavango River Basin. She reported on progress in implementing activities under the three projects in Okavango River Basin. The projects are: 1) the Kavango hydrological monitoring network and 2011/12 floods, 2) Kavango climate change analysis and 3) Kavango flood mapping. Thereafter she presented the key achievements under the NAP thematic area on water resources management (WRM): established automatic monitoring stations in Nkurenkuru, Rundu and Andara, reviewed present and required national meteorological and hydrological monitoring networks, reviewed water resources availability in the basin, and carried out climate variability and climate change assessments among others.

Ms Amwaama acknowledged that most of the activities that the Hydrology Division are responsible for under the operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012 were not implemented due to the Okavango River Basin Commission Secretariat (OKASEC) that is not in place.

**Refer to Annex 6** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by the Division of Hydrology.

### **6.4. Division of Water Environment**

Ms Laurica Keis, DWE gave a presentation on the achievements and planned activities for the Okavango River Basin by the DWE. In her presentation she focused on the NAP thematic areas on 1) WRM and, 2) environment and biodiversity. Some of the key achievements that she highlighted are: the formulation of the water quality strategy, training on water quality monitoring and selection of 15 monitoring sites along the Kavango River.

**Refer to Annex 7** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by the DWE.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *Why did DWE choose Town Councils to complete the WDM questionnaires?*  
They considered the demand and in future they would like to include the irrigation scheme farmers.
- *What are some of the results from the water quality monitoring?*  
It will take at least a year to analyse and present the results to stakeholders.

## **6.5. Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services**

Mr. Ankama, Directorate of Engineering and Extension Services (DEES), Division of Agriculture Engineering gave a presentation on their activities. His presentation focused on green scheme projects in Okavango River Basin and not necessarily the activities in the NAP/operational plan for the Okavango River Basin. This is a result of that Division having not been part of the planning process to give its contributions to the plan. According to Mr. Ankama, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) for irrigation scheme projects are carried out beforehand and submitted to Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) for approval. Currently, there are seven irrigation projects using water resources from Okavango River; therefore there should be a link between these and the OkBMC. The link that he foresees is sustainable agriculture which could fall under the thematic area on WRM. In his presentation he highlighted the negative impacts of irrigation scheme projects which included the use of fertilisers that could pollute water resources and emphasized that there is a need for monitoring pollution.

In conclusion, he requested the stakeholders to give ideas on what they expect DEES to implement in terms of the NAP and operational plan for Okavango River Basin. He further mentioned that some of the activities indicated in the plan are not the responsibility of DEES.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

### ***Questions and answers***

- *Does DEES carry out analysis of water requirements for irrigation projects and communicate with MAWF?*

DEES does not carry out any analysis and besides there is no governing body on water allocations. To clarify this it was said that green scheme projects normally require water abstraction permits whereby Division of Hydrology looks at the quantity of water that will be abstracted, thus to a certain extent analysis of water requirements is being done. In addition, DWE looks at the impacts e.g. pollution that the project is likely to have on water resources and hand a discharge permit with conditions.

- *It is said that there is a political will to increase the irrigation area; by how many ha will it increase?*

Approximately 6000 ha, however the limit that MAWF has been given is 3000 ha.

- *It is not clear whether EIAs were done on the green scheme projects, because nobody seems to have the information on any of the EIAs. Moreover, it seems there is a policy that is not being enforced/ implemented.*

The procedure is that a consultant is appointed to first do the design and based on the design an EIA is carried out. However, the results of the EIAs do not seem to get to MET, because there are political issues involved.

### ***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- DEES has a lot of activities in the NAP under the thematic area on livelihood and socio-economic development. DEES' activities do not appear in the operational plan for 2011/2012 because they were not present at the forum meeting in 2011.

- Considering that there are mechanisms that seem not to work, it is critical that Agriculture is represented on the executive committee for the Okavango River Basin permanently.
- The Environmental Management Act is very new, therefore, the irrigation schemes that were developed years back it was not really easy, because there were no policies and legislation to guide them. In future hopefully things will be done according to regulations. However some things are politically influenced and there is not much that the forum can say or do.

### **6.6. Ministry of Environment and Tourism**

Ms Josephine Ipinge, Division of Community Based Natural Resources Management (CBNRM), MET presented on the achievements, challenges, lessons learnt and planned interventions by MET in the Okavango River Basin. In her presentation she focused on MET's contribution to the NAP implementation under the thematic areas on 1) livelihoods and socio-economic development and, 2) environment and biodiversity. Currently there are 76 conservancies in Namibia; among these four are in Kavango region.

Some of the achievement that she reported on include: Conservancies Association Constitution has been drafted, conservancies are involved in platforms such as the KAZA, land boards and OkBMC and re-introductions of game in Khaudum North Complex is on-going. In her presentation she emphasized that there is a need to revive the CBNRM Regional Working Group.

**Refer to Annex 8** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by MET.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *How far is the gazetting of Daniel Sitetu conservancy?*  
It is in the process. There are eight steps that have to be followed before gazetting a conservancy. For Daniel Sitetu Conservancy they have drafted the constitution but boundary demarcation is not yet completed. Whereas, for Kapinga Kamwalye Conservancy they have not yet finished drafting the constitution, but the boundary demarcation is done. There is also still a need for a benefit distribution plan and game management plan.
- *Veld fires are really a challenge in the region, but MET does not seem to highlight it in their presentation.*  
Veld fires are not really the mandate of MET, but they would like to contribute to improved management of fires. DoF has a WG which is working on the issue of veld fires.
- Some of the issues raised as challenges can be incorporated into the new operational plan as activities.

### **6.7. Division of Geohydrology**

Mr. Salmo Ndjulume, Division of Geohydrology gave a presentation on the activities of the division. His presentation focused on the NAP thematic area on WRM. Some of the achievements mentioned in his presentation include: preliminary assessed the available data on groundwater in the Namibian part of the Okavango River Basin, identified groundwater

knowledge gaps, assessed existing information on water abstraction permits, defined criteria for selection of sites for new monitoring boreholes, and rehabilitated and drilled boreholes.

**Refer to Annex 9** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by the Division of Geohydrology.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

***Questions and answers***

- *The 31 boreholes that were drilled, are they monitoring or production/supply boreholes?*

In 2011/2012 a total of 46 boreholes were drilled for water supply. Of these 31 are specifically for rural water supply.

- *The activities in the operational plan refer to monitoring boreholes and not production boreholes. How many monitoring boreholes were drilled?*

Approximately two monitoring boreholes were drilled in Okavango River Basin in 2011/2012.

- *What is the status of the hydrocensus? TORs were supposed to be developed and then advertised by Geohydrology and SAREP. In the presentation it is said that the ministerial tendering process will be followed, what happened to SAREP since they are the ones who are supposed to fund the hydrocensus?*

No answer was provided, thus it has to be followed up. The presenter was not aware of this since the person who was dealing with such project has resigned and she needs to be consulted.

- *What is the purpose of monitoring boreholes?*

Monitoring boreholes are used to monitor the changes of water sources, both quantity and quality wise to prevent over-abstraction, as well as long-term decision making over resources use..

***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- The Division of Geohydrology should consider including activities on groundwater pollution in the operational plan for 2012 – 2013. This will include identification of sources of contaminants e.g. irrigation, industries.

- A Geohydrology Specialist conducted a preliminary assessment and identified 12 sites for monitoring boreholes. Till now SAREP has not received the review of the report from Geohydrology. It may be worthwhile to follow up with Geohydrology to complete the process and maybe consider including it in the new plan.

**6.8. Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources**

Mr.Christopher Munwela, Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources (MFMR) gave a presentation on the activities of MFMR in the Okavango River Basin. His presentation focused on the NAP thematic area on environment and biodiversity. Some of the achievements that he highlighted include: carried out biological surveys in zoned areas to monitor fish abundance, carried out a survey on fish stock of the Okavango River to assess the current exploitation levels in protected and unprotected areas, developed a biodiversity monitoring system, and developed a working management plan for wetland and its resources.

Moreover, MFMR conducted studies on: 1) occurrence and distribution of fish parasites, and 2) assessment of water quality of the Okavango flood plains with reference to selected trace metals. The reports will be made available to OKACOM, SAREP and OkBMC.

**Refer to Annex 10** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by the MFMR.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *Based on the studies that the MFMR carried out, what are the fish stocks in Okavango River and how accurate are the values? Are we on the alarming situation?*  
The MFMR has observed high fish abundance in protected areas, where no fishing is taking place compared to the unprotected areas.
- *Is fish not migrating from unprotected to protected areas resulting in high abundance in protected areas?*  
Fish is concentrated in areas where it is not being disturbed.
- *Is MFMR involved in interventions such as aquaculture that contributes to improving the livelihood of people?*  
MFMR has two aquaculture farms that are operational in the Kavango and are located in the hot spots. These are aiming at alleviating poverty and reducing pressure of the fishermen on the fish. MFMR would like to come up with aquaculture projects but the challenge is availability of space/land.
- *Did MFMR consult TAs to assist with regards to awareness raising on conservation and reducing overexploitation of fish using mosquito nets?*  
The TAs were involved and their concern is the use of mosquito nets. MFMR allows the use of traditional gears. However, MFMR does not allow the use of illegal fishing gears.
- *The game park is showing an increase in establishment of fish reserves, is MFMR considering piloting this with communities?*  
MFMR identified fish reserves and there are some areas that they came up with to protect the fish. Overall, the MFMR supports the idea but the TAs and politicians do not.
- *There is a provision within the MFMR that people can register their nets, doesn't this affect the fish stock, especially in cases where a lot of people are registered?*  
MFMR is busy amending the policy and they will soon consult with stakeholders, including TAs. In addition, MFMR has a bag limit with regards to fishing.
- *A concern was raised that even though the MFMR is under resourced it tries by all means/works hard to inspect and control illegal fishing in the Namibian part of the Okavango River. However the problem is that they cannot do anything about the illegal fishing by the Angolans, resulting in absolute exploitation.*  
The government in Angola is not yet established and they have not yet recruited fisheries inspectors. Nonetheless there is an upcoming SAREP facilitated meeting and delegation from Angola will be having a meeting with the representatives from Namibia to discuss the fisheries management.

## **6.9. Namibia Nature Foundation**

Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu, NNF gave a presentation on the achievements and planned interventions by NNF. Her presentation focused on the NAP thematic area on livelihoods and socio-economic development. The activities under this thematic area are closely linked to those for the land management and livelihoods working group of OkBMC. Some of the key achievements that she highlighted were that they have embarked upon the implementation of the Participatory and Integrated Land Use Management Plan (PILUMP) and so far 10 PILUMPs have been completed in Kavango Region. The purpose of developing PILUMPs is to understand the demography and to guide the implementation of developmental activities on the ground. The presentation also provided more information on what a PILUMP is all about, how a PILUMP is developed and the management body that is responsible for the implementation of the PILUMP.

In conclusion she highlighted some challenges: shortage of staff thus could not cover the whole area as well as transport issues.

**Refer to Annex 11** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by NNF.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

### ***Questions and answers***

- *Did the presentation focus on the activities of NNF/SAREP or both institutions are integrated?*

SAREP is funding some of the activities that NNF is implementing, and that is how the two institutions are linked.

*NNF works together with MET on some activities for conservancies, why is this not included in the presentation? Is SAREP not supporting conservancies?*

No answer was given

- *What organizational structures are at the community level to continue with the work after the SAREP Project has come to an end?*

The PILUMPs are clustered into conservancies, both emerging and gazetted ones.

- *What are the criteria that were used to choose the PILUMP sites and why not any other sites?*

The focus is on areas that already have on-going research programmes in terms of conservation biodiversity, because the idea is to strengthen the communities that they are already working with. Overall, all is done within conservancies, including emerging ones.

### ***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- The Future Okavango (TFO) project is establishing Forums for Integrated Resource Management (FIRMs) and there are similarities with the PILUMPs, therefore there is a need for coordination.
- A concern was raised that the Division of CBNRM is not committed or participating in planning and implementation of activities in Okavango River Basin and this is a challenge.

- There is a need to coordinate institutions such as Directorate of Forestry (DoF), MET and Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR). These institutions are hardly participating in activities and they do not even attend meetings.
- NNF should consider incorporating the neighbours to conservancies in their activities, because these can also be distractive to conservation.
- 

#### **6.10. Directorate of Water Supply and Sanitation Coordination**

Mr. Moses Mpareke, Directorate of Water Supply and Sanitation Coordination (DWSSC) gave a presentation on the achievements and planned activities for DWSSC. In his presentation he focused on the NAP thematic area on WRM. Some of the achievements that he highlighted were that DWSSC has provided training to 42 of its staff members on sanitation and how to facilitate community training, trained 42 WPCs, they have held a meeting with stakeholders towards establishing the Regional Water and Sanitation (WATSAN) Forum, carried out an assessment of current sanitation facilities/technologies in the basin and are yet to finalise the report, installed approximately eight new boreholes and have drilled 17.

**Refer to Annex 12** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by DWSSC, Kavango Region.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- Consider using WPCs for integrated water quality monitoring (IWQM), thus extending coordination to community level.
- A comment was also given that all presenters should present in the format used by Mr. Mpareke indicating activities that were planned, under each Thematic area, what has been implemented and what is carried over and at what cost and amount of funding spent.

#### **6.11. Directorate of Forestry**

Mr. Michael Otsub, DoF gave a presentation on the achievements and planned activities for DoF. His first remark was that the DoF activities were not coordinated with the NAP for Okavango River Basin because they previously did not participate in the planning therefore his presentation was not necessarily in line with the NAP themes and outcomes, but rather the routine work of DoF. Some of the activities that he presented were: DoF has started to train fire fighters, compiling proposals to request funds for value addition to forest products, they started with orchard development and have appointed local people to clear the areas and they are identifying new community forests.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

#### ***Questions and answers***

- *What is DoF planting/growing in their orchards, is it indigenous wild fruits trees or exotic?*  
It is all indigenous wild fruit trees such as marula and mangetti among others.
- *Can a community forest that is not gazetted get a block permit or not?*



No answer was given.

- *Does DoF have any monitoring tool in place and who is responsible for monitoring?*  
Yes DoF has a monitoring tool in place and people have been trained on how to do law enforcement and how to complete the forest inventory.

***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- Some of the participants were interested in knowing how many community forests have been gazetted. In response, it was said that community forests were donor driven and DoF staff were not involved, thus when donors pulled out there was no follow up on gazettement of community forests, thus the status is also not clear for DoF.

**6.12. Rundu Town Council**

Ms Moyo, Rundu Town Council (RTC) gave a presentation on the achievements and planned interventions by RTC. Her presentation focused on water, sanitation and waste management activities in Rundu Town. With regards to waste management she highlighted the following achievements among others: purchasing of a skip loader truck for waste collection, placement of refuse drums along the main roads and in the central business area, and development of the dumping site in Kasote e.g. construction of an office for the security guards. The key achievements with regards to water supply are: construction of 43km of water pipelines in recently formalized areas of Kehemu and Sauyemwa and replacement of all asbestos pipes to upvc pipes. Regarding sanitation, Ms Moyo highlighted the following achievements: construction of 700 ventilated improved pit latrines (VIP) toilets in recently formalized areas of Kehemu and Sauyemwa, construction of eight sewer pump stations with raising mains and construction of new oxidation ponds in Ndama. The RTC is also piloting waste management collection in Kehemu as a way of testing how successful can that be to improve waste collection in informal settlements.

Some of the challenges that RTC is faced with in implementing their activities are: lack of financial resources, lack of manpower in the Division responsible for Environmental Health, lack of Waste Management Plan, illegal connections and vandalism of water infrastructure.

**Refer to Annex 13** for the presentation on achievements, successes, challenges and interventions planned for 2012/2013 by Rundu Town Council.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

***Questions and answers***

- *What were the criteria used for selecting the dump site?*  
Not sure
- *In some cases VIP toilets are constructed next to the boreholes resulting in water contamination, what criteria did RTC take into consideration in selecting the sites for VIP toilets?*  
RTC used the Codes of Practice and the Sanitation Strategies as guidelines.
- *There is a Decision Support Tool (DST) that was developed by DWSSC in selection of sanitation technologies, was this used in selecting and constructing 700 VIP toilets?*  
Not sure, the construction of VIP toilets were initiated by Lux Development

- *How many contractors for waste collection did RTC sign contracts with?*  
About nine contractors
- *How often are skip containers emptied?*  
At the time of the stakeholders forum meeting the skip loader truck was not functional, thus the skip containers were not emptied regularly resulting in overflowing of waste.
- *What is the current state of the Kaisosi sewerage ponds? Is it deficient in electricity, a capacity issue or breakage of the machine resulting in the ponds not operating properly?*  
It is the breakage of the machine
- *What plans does RTC have in place regarding the runoff by the Kaisosi ponds, especially if they are still using them?*  
Not sure
- *Has RTC carried out a waste audit in order to guide them in developing their waste management plan?*  
Not sure
- *What did RTC base its choice of a sewerage system on; did they consider the issues of affordability by the beneficiaries?*  
Not sure. Participants clarified that there is a DST that can assist in this regard, what option to choose, which also includes affordability.

***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- RTC should consider implementing environmental mitigation, especially at the Kaisosi ponds, because these are a major threat to the environment. SAREP expressed their interest to assist in this regard.
- RTC should consider employing a security guard for the oxidation ponds because there are illegal activities taking place at the site, and in many cases when DWE does inspections they never find someone there.
- RTC should consider constructing public toilets in Rundu Town. In response, it was said that RTC is focusing on the mall system, meaning each and every mall must have a toilet. At the moment there is no space for public toilets in Rundu.
- RTC should liaise with Kavango RC because there is a student from Sweden who will work on putting together a waste management plan for Kavango Region. A comment was raised that someone experienced is preferred than a student who is coming to learn. The OkBMC's Waste management and Pollution prevention Working Group is planning a stakeholders consultation to agreed on outsourcing the exercise to a private person to develop waste management plans for the basin.

**6.13. SAREP and NamWater**

Ms Robyn Tompkins, SAREP and Mr. Muremi John, NamWater gave a joint presentation on activities that they are collaborating on. The key achievement that they highlighted was the signing of a collaboration statement between SAREP and NamWater. Thereafter their

presentation focused on planned activities under the collaboration statement and these are included in the operational plan for Okavango River Basin for 2012 – 2013. One of the key planned activities is the construction of a main pipeline for water supply in the Masivi community. SAREP will purchase the pipeline materials and also provide engineering expertise. It was emphasized that in order for this project to be successful, community assistance in terms of cost recovery is needed.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

#### ***Questions and answers***

- *What is the timeframe (start and end) of the project in Vungu Vungu, Mayana, Karutci, Nyangana and Masivi?*  
SAREP is fast tracking as much as they can and they are hoping in the next 2-3 months the work will be completed. Surveys have been done, some of the infrastructure are there already, and it is just a matter of extending and digging trenches with the community.
  
- *In most rural areas, water is critical since it adds value to improved livelihood e.g. through gardening. In this case it is highly likely that water for drinking will end up being used for gardening, is SAREP and NamWater ready to take the risks?*  
The water will be for drinking purposes and it is very expensive to use drinking water for garden. For example, big projects e.g. Etunda they make use of raw water from the canal for gardening. Therefore a similar arrangement can also be put in place in Kavango if there is a request and if a big project is planned. There is a need to prioritise the uses of water by the communities.
  
- *Once there is water supply in an area, expectations are created, because one cannot supply drinking water to people while their animals are dying of thirst. Then there is a need for another water source. Will the collaboration statement add value to problem solving in the water sector and it also signed by DWAF? IWRM should come into play.*  
Currently water for livestock is not an issue because the community is very close to the river. SAREP and NamWater identified areas where drinking water is a priority and they are taking an integrated approach to this.
  
- *Were the issues of affordability and billing taken into consideration when the collaboration statement was signed? Will NamWater subsidise these communities?*  
The poor people who cannot afford the water services already requested for a subsidy and NamWater is busy working on this. The outcome is not yet known, whether they will be subsidized and by how much.

#### ***Comments, remarks and suggestions***

- It is impressive that the collaboration by NamWater, SAREP and DWSSC is in writing and signed by the CEO. This will also clarify the responsibilities. Thus it was suggested that signing of MoUs could be a possible solution to lack of coordination among some stakeholders in the basin.

#### **6.14. SAREP**

Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu, SAREP gave a presentation on the achievements and planned interventions by SAREP. She started her presentation by mentioning that NNF and SAREP

signed a contract to support livelihood and socio-economic development activities in the basin. Therefore the activities that she presented under NNF were also made reference to under this presentation, because SAREP is funding the activities (see NNF presentation above).

Complementary to the presentation by Ms Dorothy Luntangu Matengu, Ms Charlie Paxton presented the SAREP activities on biodiversity. The key achievement that she highlighted was that a monitoring tool for biodiversity hot spots has been developed. Such a tool will be able to show which areas are good biodiversity hot spots. The challenge however, is that there is still no coordination between the Biodiversity WG and the OKACOM Biodiversity Task Force.

After both presentations the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *What is the link between the Biodiversity Task Force and Biodiversity WG? Are their work plans linked?*

The Task Force is a sub-committee of OKACOM, whereas the Biodiversity WG is more of a Namibia part of the Okavango River Basin under OkBMC.

- *What were the priority areas identified for interventions for next year?*

Biodiversity, conservation, crafts, conservation farming, water and sanitation

- *Are there any linkages with extension agriculture, are they involved in livelihood project activities undertaken/ who will take over when the project comes to an end to ensure sustainability?*

SAREP/NNF is working closely with the Extension Officers in Mashare. The Manager and Extension Officers are also working closely with the community.

- *Is there coordination between SAREP and other NGOs that are also implementing similar activities? How are the communities benefiting from this programme, especially considering that the interest is in tangible benefits?*

SAREP/NNF is working with TFO and other organisations in terms of sustainable agriculture. On the issue of sustainability, the idea is to empower the communities through the TAs, RC, Extension Officers for them to sustainably implement their activities in a long term and sustainably.

## **7. Update on other projects**

### **7.1. Okavango Basin Water Audit**

Mr. Jonathan Barnes, Design and Development Services (DDS) gave a presentation on the Okavango Basin Water Audit Project. In his presentation he mentioned that the project is funded by the Food Agricultural Organisation (FAO). The project is related to water resource accounts (a quantitative approach to measure the value of water) done at national level. FAO chose water audits because it is simple compared to water accounts.

His presentation included some of the results of the study: current and planned future water uses in relation to irrigation (ha) activity in the Cubango Okavango River Basin (CORB), and current and projected water withdrawals to meet water demand in the CORB-Namibia.

In terms of the NAP, the project activities fall under the thematic area on WRM. The idea is to improve and make water allocation and use more economically efficient.

They will be an overall report for the whole basin which will integrate all the national studies.

**Refer to Annex 14** for the presentation on the Okavango Water Audit Project.

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *Is the Okavango River Basin safe in terms of water availability?*  
Yes, because the green schemes may not necessarily come through due to viability issues.
- *What are the gaps in the study?*  
The mines were not interviewed and also they did not manage to get very good data on tourism. They used the assumptions in the IWRM Plan and also a lot of information was derived from there.
- Basin boundaries were another challenge because there are cases where such boundaries are cutting through the Karst water aquifers which may not be part of the basin, hence limiting the study area accuracy.
- *What is the next step to take the recommendations further?*  
The report on the Namibian part of the basin will be integrated into the one report for all three countries. Overall, the Water Audit Project consists of six components.

## **7.2. The Future Okavango**

Dr Patrik Klintonberg, DRFN gave a presentation on TFO Project. In his presentation he mentioned that TFO is not necessarily a new project because its implementation in the Okavango River Basin, Namibia commenced in March 2012. TFO is a research project funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF). The project's goal is to provide scientific knowledge contributing to improved natural resources governance and management. TFO aims to understand the impacts of natural resource management on ecosystems. The objectives of TFO are: 1) analyse selected ecosystem processes and functions; 2) measure and value the important ecosystem services; 3) compare influences of resource-use strategies; and 4) contribute to improved strategies for sustainable well-being of resource users through establishment of platforms where communities interact with each other. The project is being implemented in Angola, Namibia and Botswana and its duration is September 2010 – August 2015. The core site for the project in Namibia is Mashare. In terms of progress, Dr Klintonberg said that the project has initiated FIRMs in Mopapama, Mashare and Tjeje, including sub villages among others.

**Refer to Annex 15** for the presentation on TFO

After the presentation the following questions, comments and remarks were raised:

- *Is OkBMC part of the TFO project? During the two meetings in OKACOM it was suggested that this project should be presented to OkBMC*  
Yes, the BSO has been participating in some activities e.g. FIRMs
- *To what extent is the integration between what SAREP and TFO is doing?*

The project would like to avoid duplication as much as possible, therefore the vision is that TFO and SAREP works together as much as possible.

- *Who will own the database that will be developed under TFO?*  
The database is developed for OKACOM.

## 8. Challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and Annual Operational Plan

Each stakeholder was given two/three cards to write down what they regarded as major challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and operational plan for Okavango River Basin. The cards were then clustered based on similarities. Thereafter, the forum brainstormed on possible solutions to address the challenges that they had identified. Table 1 below presents the results from the exercise.

**Table 1: Challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and Annual Plan and possible solutions thereof**

Challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and operational plan of the Okavango River Basin	Suggested possible solutions to address the identified challenges
<p><b>Stakeholder coordination (23x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordination</li> <li>• Limited stakeholder cooperation among stakeholders</li> <li>• Lack of strong coordination between different stakeholders</li> <li>• Taking responsibility of the plan</li> <li>• Duplication of activities</li> <li>• Who can coordinate work effectively</li> <li>• Planning for effective management</li> <li>• Absence of some stakeholders in forum meetings</li> <li>• Overload of work</li> <li>• Funding to enhance coordination and cooperation</li> <li>• Coordination between NNF and TFO</li> <li>• Lack of cooperation between TAs, RC and line ministries</li> <li>• Lack of participation from agriculture</li> <li>• Lack of cooperation by DoF, MET, MLR and water related ministries</li> <li>• Insufficient performances measures and cooperation by most stakeholders</li> <li>• Mainstreaming key activities</li> <li>• Commitment by key service providers</li> <li>• Improve feedback to OkBMC and working groups on other activities to include them in the process e.g. Biodiversity Task Force and Biodiversity WG; DoF and Livelihoods WG</li> <li>• CBNRM WG is dormant – a need for revival</li> <li>• Lack of commitment by CBNRM Division</li> <li>• EIAs for irrigation scheme are not transparent</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sign MoUs for specific operational deliverables and budget</li> <li>• Revive CBNRM Working Group</li> <li>• Determine institutional mandates of all stakeholders</li> <li>• Participation in the OkBMC forum</li> </ul>
<p><b>Monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of the NAP (6x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no strong NAP implementation unit</li> <li>• Effective tools and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation and feedback</li> <li>• Monitoring of the plan</li> <li>• Poor records at local authorities for water use</li> <li>• Failing to use time windows of opportunities</li> <li>• Illegal fishing with drag nets destroy fish eggs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nomination of the NAP Technical Committee</li> <li>• Development of a monitoring and evaluation plan by the NAP technical team</li> </ul>
<p><b>Feedback to communities and traditional authorities (4x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participation of involved stakeholders (feedback and delegation)</li> <li>• Conflict of interest and hidden agenda</li> <li>• Lack of report back to the communities and TAs</li> <li>• The adaptation of recommendations for the communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quarterly feedback to local communities by service providers (including OkBMC and forum)</li> </ul>
<p><b>Funding for planned activities (7x)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAREP to continue assisting with</li> </ul>

<b>Challenges hampering the implementation of the NAP and operational plan of the Okavango River Basin</b>	<b>Suggested possible solutions to address the identified challenges</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of allocated funds for OkBMC full functionality</li> <li>• Limited funding for planned activities</li> <li>• Lack of budget for reporting back to communities</li> <li>• Budget/funding for some activities</li> <li>• Shortage of funds</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• funding</li> <li>• Government to continue funding</li> </ul>
<p><b>Inconsistency of participants at the forum (4x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconsistency of participants/ attendees</li> <li>• Time constraint</li> <li>• No cost recovery (per diem, transport and accommodation for private participants and communities)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MAWF should consider funds for per diems during budgeting</li> <li>• Think of exit and sustainability strategy for per diems when the project (SAREP) come to an end</li> <li>• Follow up on stakeholders in the OkBMC and send letters (Aune Amwaama)</li> <li>• Have forum meetings twice a year, resulting in shorter time spent in meetings</li> </ul>
<p><b>Sustainability of donor funded projects (3x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take responsibility for projects</li> <li>• Donor coordination with service providers</li> <li>• Lack of project exit strategies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ministries to follow up with donors</li> <li>• Integration of donors with responsible service providers/institutions</li> </ul>
<p><b>Delay in gazetting conservancies (2x)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process of gazetting conservancies is slow</li> <li>• Delay in gazetting conservancies is impacting the development in the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process on how to speed up the gazetting of conservancies is included in the annual operational plan for Okavango River Basin July 2012 – March 2013</li> <li>• Conservancies to plan in line with MET and NAP of the Okavango River Basin</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limited access to clean water</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mind setting (all stakeholders are not like minded)</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political power</li> </ul>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of access to land</li> </ul>	

*Per diems for private and community members* - The forum had a long discussion on per diems for private and community members. At the moment SAREP is responsible for reimbursing participants for their transport and accommodation costs, the concern is however the exit and sustainability strategy when SAREP comes to an end. For this specific meeting there was an oversight because no funds were requested from SAREP for per diems. The organizer indicated that he was not aware of such possible arrangements.

According to some participants the MFMRs, Ministry of Justice, MLR and Ministry of Regional, Local Government Housing and Rural Development (MRLGHRD) usually pays out per diems to communities and private participants when they have events similar to forum meetings. Therefore it should be possible for MAWF to pay out per diems to communities and private stakeholders. Participants suggested that MAWF should investigate the procedures that other ministries are following in paying out per diems to community members. In response, the MAWF representative at the meeting indicated that the concern of the OkBMC and forum is also similar to the one raised by other BMCs in the country. MAWF already investigated the possibility of paying out per diems to forum members and found out that it is not possible; the MAWF financial system does not allow that.



## 9. Formulation of the Operational Plan for July 2012 – March 2013

### 9.1. Reflection of IWRM planning

The formulation of an operational plan for Okavango River Basin July 2012 – March 2013 started off with a reflection on IWRM planning framework by Mr. Abraham Nehemia, the Under Secretary for MAWF. In his reflection, he emphasized that planning is a process and it a matter of identifying the real issues and challenges that are hampering the achievement of the objectives. The workshop has identified these issues, the next step is to identify, discuss and agree on how to deal with these issues in order to progress.

It is important for stakeholders to plan together, bring resources and implement activities together and not to work in isolation. He complemented the forum and mentioned that the OkBMC is being used as an example, because it has matured and gained experience in IWRM processes.

Mr. Nehemia emphasized the importance of monitoring the implementation of the plan. The biggest challenge in Namibia is that when it comes to planning most stakeholders are involved, but implementation is not done. Therefore it will be very crucial that there is monitoring of whether the activities in the plan will be implemented and get an idea on progress. He encouraged the forum to focus on tangible benefits instead of establishing more platforms.

### 9.2. Formulation of the annual operational plan

Participants were divided into five groups as per NAP thematic area. The institutions responsible for implementation of activities in each thematic area formed one group. In cases where a stakeholder institution appeared in more than one thematic area, the representative had to move from one group to the other to ensure that activities under each specific theme are included into the plan. However some institutions had more than one representative at the meeting which made it easier. The groups were as follows:

**Table 2: Groups for the formulation of the annual operational plan for Okavango River Basin**

Groups	NAP thematic areas	Stakeholder institutions
Group 1	Basin development and management framework	NAP implementation team, RC, OkBMC, MAWF, OKACOM, SAREP & GIZ
Group 2	Livelihood and Socio-economic development	Basin wide forum, DVS, MFMR, DoF, NNF, OkBMC, Irrigation Farmers, DEES, DPWM, SAREP, MAWF, DOAIF, CBOs, Land and Livelihoods WGs, NCCI & RC
Group 3	Water resources management	DEES, DWE, Division of Geohydrology, Mayana CWP/WPC, RC, Division of Water Planning, NamWater, University of Florida, University of Botswana, DRM, SAREP, OPM, OkBMC, Okavango Basin Water Audit Project, DWSSC, Division of Hydrology, OKASEC, Water quality Monitoring WG&Waste Management and Pollution WG
Group 4	Land management	MET, OkBMC, MLR, Shambyu TA, Mbunza TA, RC & Land and Livelihoods WGs, NCCI & RC
Group 5	Environment and biodiversity	DWE, MFMR, NACSO, OkBMC, DPWM (MET), DoF, MCA, SAREP, Biodiversity WG, RC, TFO, Waste Management and Pollution WG & Khaudum North complex & Water quality Monitoring WG

In preparation for the groupwork, the facilitator reminded the participants that they were not developing their plan in isolation, it had to be in-line with the NAP and therefore the following was agreed upon:

- Use the same format like for the old operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012
- Use the same thematic areas and outcomes as they appear in the NAP
- Fill in activities under the specific outcomes in the NAP
- Indicate the timeframe for implementing the activities, institutions responsible for implementation, milestones as well as the responsible donor or institution for funding each specific activity.

In order for all stakeholders to have the same understanding the following terms were defined by the facilitator before the groups embarked upon developing the plan.

- Activity - Is what we want to do
- Output - Is what we want to actually deliver
- Outcome - Is the impact of our activity/output
- Milestone - Is what we can measure to know the progress in the implementation of our activities

In addition the facilitator reminded the forum of the **NAP objective** and requested them to keep it in mind as they develop the annual operational plan.

*“To manage the Okavango River Basin in a sustainable manner for improved livelihoods, socio-economic development and environmental protection”*

### **9.3. Feedback from groupwork and plenary discussion**

Each group was given an opportunity to present to the forum the results of their groupwork. This allowed an opportunity for comments, questions and additions. Moreover it provided the forum with an opportunity to identify possible areas for collaboration and synergies. The following comments and suggestions were raised:

- A suggestion was made that a consolidated operational plan must be submitted to all collaborating partners/institutions that are indicated in the plan; best printed out than emails.
- It was clarified that SAREP has core funding that is allocated for core activities; however they also have grants where organisations can apply following the right procedure.
- An observation was made that DEES’s activities were not included in the plan, therefore a suggestion was made that a follow up has to be made for DEES to submit their activities for inclusion into the plan.
- A suggestion was made that there is a need for a section that describes the implementation mechanisms of the plan.
- A suggestion was made that there is a need to develop urban water demand management (WDM) plans by NamWater and local authorities.
- Coordination of activities was again re-emphasised. A suggestion was made that if stakeholders organize themselves they can implement some of the activities together e.g. training. For example all the trainings could be put together and conducted in one week/ a specified timeframe.

After the feedback session from the groups, one stakeholder from each institution was nominated and tasked with the responsibility of consulting with colleagues back in their institutions/offices and submit a revised plan to Ms Laurica Keis by the 27<sup>th</sup> of July 2012. Table 3 below shows the nominated individuals.

**Table 3: Nominated individuals responsible for submitting revised plans from their institutions**

<b>Institutions</b>	<b>Responsible person/ Responsible</b>
OKBM	Reinhold Kambuli and Executive committee
TFO	Maxcon Simfukwe
MLR/GIZ	Patricia Mwilima
MET	Josephine Ipinge
Division of Geohydrology	Salmo Ndjulume
DWSSC	Moses Mpareke
SAREP	Geof Kuwarae
MFMR	Christopher Munwela
Division of Hydrology	Aune Amwaama
Division of Water Environment	Laurica Keis
DEES	Mr Moses Munenge
NamWater	Muremi John
Okavango Water Audit	Jonathan Barnes
Kavango Regional Council	Mr Nauyoma
NNF	Dorothy Lutangu Matengu
DoF	Michael Otsub
Division of Planning	Christofer Munikasu
NCCI	Lukas Muhepa
Rundu TC	Ms Sithembinkosi Moyo
Nkurenkuru TC	Mr. Paulus Shihinga

## **10. Review of the institutional framework of the OKBMC**

### **10.1. Experiences by the Executive OkBMC**

One of the objectives of the workshop was to review the institutional framework of the OkBMC and elect new executive committee members. This session started off with sharing of experiences by a representative in the old OkBMC Executive Committee, Ms Charlie Paxton. In her brief talk she emphasized the following:

- The executive committee portfolios are voluntary and there is no payment involved
- If one is in the executive committee s/he has to make time for basin activities
- Commitment is very important, it should be someone who is prepared to do it
- Very important that the committee participants in basin activities, it is a participatory committee
- She recommended that it is better to have local people in the committee, meaning people that are in Rundu or nearby because during her time she had difficulties getting to meetings, sometimes she was coming late to meetings because of distance.

She concluded by thanking the forum members for supporting the executive during their time of office/service.

### **10.2. Functions of portfolio holders**

Ms Aune Amwaama, Division of Hydrology gave a presentation on the BMC structure and the roles and functions of the BMC portfolio-holders. In her presentation she made reference to the basin forum and BMC and emphasised that the executive committee is accountable to

the latter. She emphasised that there is a two way communication between all the three institutions/levels. She then focused on four portfolios, i.e. Chairperson, Vice-chairperson, Treasurer and Secretary, which are said to be compulsory for a BMC. The functions of the each of the portfolio-holders were described as follows:

**Chairperson:**

The Chairperson shall be in charge of the routine functioning of the OkBMC on local, regional and national levels including;

- attending workshops,
- chairing meetings,
- press statements,
- liaison withMAWF, OKACOM and other stakeholders, etc.

**Vice-chairperson:**

- The Vice-chairperson shall act as Chairperson in his/her absence,
- Should the position of Chairperson become vacant as outlined above, then the Vice-chairperson shall automatically act as Chairperson until a new Chairperson is elected.

**Treasurer:**

In consultation with the BSO, the Treasurer shall be responsible for

- The financial management of the OkBMC and report back quarterly to the OkBMC on the financial status thereof. All accounting records of the OkBMC shall at all times be open for inspection by members when the need arise.
- Together with two other executive members, the treasurer shall open a banking account. All monies received shall be deposited into the OkBMC banking account.
- The Treasurer with the approval of the OkBMC shall be responsible for the investment of funds.

**Secretary:**

Assists the BSO with general office administration especially in his/her absence with

- minute taking, meeting organizations and logistics, etc.

**Additional portfolio-holder(s)**-Additional BMC members may be appointed as per need to spearhead various activities on behalf of the BMC.

**10.3. Guidelines for election of portfolio holders**

Before the nomination and election process, the executive committee for OkBMC and the forum agreed on the following rules/criteria/guidelines:

- The nomination of the portfolio-holders should be based on their capabilities
- A nomination has to be seconded in order for it to be considered
- One cannot nominate himself/herself
- A balance of gender in the portfolio-holders is desirable - considering that one of the principles of IWRM is that women should be encouraged to participate in IWRM, gender should be taken into consideration in the BMC.
- Main members, only, should be nominated and not alternates.
- Only key stakeholders can be nominated (OkBMC). Table 4 below presents the OkBMC stakeholder institutions and nominated main members and alternates.
- Only forum members are allowed to nominate and vote

- One could run for more than one portfolio, if not elected to previously nominated positions.
- At least three nominees per portfolio
- Existing executive committee members can also run for nominations and elections
- The nominee has to accept the nomination in order to be considered for election; in the case of nominees who are absent, but are main members, they would have to be contacted first for them to accept the nomination.

To support the nominations, a list of OkBMC stakeholder institutions and nominated main members and alternates (Table 4) and that of existing OkBMC Executive Committee Members (Table 5) were presented and displayed throughout the process.

**Table 4: OkBMC stakeholder institutions and nominated main members and alternates**

No	OkBMC stakeholder institutions	Names of main members	Names of alternates
1	Rundu Town Council	Mr. John Sinime	Ms Sithembinkosi Moyo
2	Nkurenkuru Town Council	Mr. Paulus Shihinga	Mr. Ndara Malakia
3	Kavango Regional Council	Mr. Mathaus Nauyoma	
4	Directorate of Forestry	Mr. Moses Moses	Mr. Andreas K. Haita
5	Directorate of Water supply and sanitation coordination	Mr. Moses Mpareke	
6	Directorate of Extension and Engineering Services	Mr. Moses Munenge	Mr. Clemens Hatutatlé
7	Community Based Crafts	Ms Charlie Paxton	
8	Basin Wide Forum	Mr. Alfons Siyere	
9	Ministry of Education	Mr. Alfons Dikuaa	
10	Ministry of Health and Social Services	Ms Elizabeth Muremi	
11	NamWater	Mr. Keith Suukuta	
12	Khaudum North Complex	Mr. Lirumba Lourence	
13	Rundu Tourism Forum,	Mr. Wynand Peypers	
14	Namibia Chamber of commerce and Industry (NCCI)	Mr. Reginald Ndara	Mr. Lucas Muhepa
15	Ministry of Lands and Resettlement	Mr. Alfred Sikopo	
16	Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Mr. Karel Ndumba	
17	Kavango Regional Farmers Union	Mr. Disho Thikusho	
18	Shambyu TA	Mr. Edward Sikerete	
19	Gciriku TA	Mr. Festus Shikerete	
20	Namibia Nature Foundation	Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu	
21	Ministry of Fisheries and Marine Resources	Dr. Ekkerhard Klingerhoeffer	Mr. Christopher Munwela

**Table 1: Existing Executive OkMBC**

Portfolios	Names of OkBMC executive committee members	Institutions
Chairperson	Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu	NNF/SAREP
Vice Chairperson	Mr. Reginald Ndara	NCCI
Secretary	Ms Charlie Paxton	Community-Based Crafts
Treasurer	Vacant	
Additional members	Mr Moses Mpakere	DWSSC
	Mr Alfons Siyere	Basin Wide Forum
	Ms Ndapanda Kanime	DoF
	Mr Mathaus Nauyoma	KRC

#### 10.4. Election of OkBMC portfolio holders

A total of 22 forum members took part in the nomination and voting process. The election process resulted in the following:

Portfolios	Name of OkBMC Executive Members	Institution	Votes
Chairperson	Mr Michael Osub	DoF	Only nominee after others declined
Vice-chairperson	Mr Lukas Muhepa	NCCI - Rundu	15
Secretary	Ms Charlie Paxton	Community Based Crafts	22 (the only nominee)
Treasurer	Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu	NNF/SAREP	22 (the only nominee)
Additional members	Mr Christopher Munwela	MFMR	22 (the only nominee)
	Mr Alfons Siyere	Basin Wide Forum	22 (the only nominee)
	Mr Edward Sikerete	Shambyu TA	22 (the only nominee)

**Chairperson:** the other nominees for chairperson were: Mr Christopher Munwela (MFMR), Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu (SAREP/NNF), Ms Charlie Paxton (Community Based Crafts), Mr Alfons Siyere (Basin Wide Forum) and Mr Lirumba Lourence (Khaudum North Complex) but they all declined the nominations.

**Vice chairperson:** the other nominee for Vice-chairperson was Mr Mark Paxton (5 votes).

#### 11. Institutional framework for the NAP implementation team

The implementation mechanisms of the NAP propose that there should be a NAP Technical Committee in place to lead the technical implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the plan. In preparation for the nominations of the NAP Technical Committee, Ms Laura Namene gave a presentation highlighting the composition, mandate and functions of such a committee as indicated below.

**Composition:** The NAP Technical Committee will be comprised of technical experts from the different implementing units (ministries, NGOs, consultants, donor supported projects). For certain components the formation of sub-committees might be recommended.

**Mandate/role:** Lead the actual implementation of the plan and decision making on the technical level.

**Functions and Responsibilities:** The functions and responsibilities of the NAP Technical Committee are:

- Develop operational plans (log frames) and budget plans for the different components of the NAP (operationalization of the NAP)
- Identify implementers and develop reporting structure
- Develop overall NAP and component based monitoring system
- Do quarterly M&E and give technical input and orientation
- Communicate and cooperate with technical teams of neighboring countries and other initiatives (SAREP, TFO etc.).

The Technical Committee will meet at least quarterly, but could meet more regularly if the need arises

After the presentation, the forum nominated the persons indicated in the Table 6 below to serve on the NAP Technical Committee.

**Table 6: Nominations for the NAP Technical Committee**

<b>Names of NAP Technical Committee members</b>	<b>Institutions</b>
Ms Laura Namene	DWE
Mr. Reinhold Kambuli	OkBMC BSO
Ms Clarence Mazambani	DRFN (Facilitator)
Ms Josephine Ipinge	MET
Mr. Noa Shapumba	MFMR
Ms Aune Amwaama	Division of Hydrology
Mr. Martin Muller**	MLR/GIZ
Mr. Aaron Muti	NamWater
Mr. Johannes Akim	SAREP/NNF
Ms Dorothy Lutangu Matengu	SAREP

\*\* After consultation with his employer, he was informed that he cannot be part of the Technical committee. If necessary, a replacement must be sought.

## 12. Closure and Way forward

The facilitator of the workshop, Ms Clarence Mazambani thanked the participants for their active participation, enthusiasm and commitment throughout the workshop. The following actions were identified as the way forward:

**Table 1: Way forward**

<b>Way forward activities</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
Compile the proceedings from the workshop	<b>Clarence Mazambani</b>
Compile the draft annual operational plan for July 2012 – March 2013 and circulate to the stakeholders for further review	<b>Clarence Mazambani to compile &amp; Reinhold Kambuli to circulate</b>
Incorporate comments from stakeholders into the draft annual operational plan for July 2012 – March 2013	<b>Clarence Mazambani</b>
Finalise the annual operational plan for July 2012 – March 2013 and present it to the Under Secretary of MAWF	<b>NAP Technical Committee</b>
Follow up with the OkBMC stakeholder institutions to reconfirm their membership (main members and alternates)	<b>Aune Amwaama</b>
Other follow up actions	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Share the six reports from the Water Audit Project with the OkBMC and forum</li> </ul>	<b>Reinhold Kambuli</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Email a word document of the NAP to OkBMC and forum</li> </ul>	<b>Reinhold Kambuli</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Print copies of the NAP and operational plan for the OkBMC and forum</li> </ul>	<b>Reinhold Kambuli</b>

Thereafter, Ms Laura Namene thanked the participants on behalf of MAWF and congratulated the newly elected OkBMC Executive members. Furthermore she thanked Ms Clarence Mazambani for facilitating the workshop.

In the absence of the newly appointed Chairperson for the OkBMC, the Vice-chairperson (Mr Muhepa) gave the closing remarks. He thanked the participants for their commitment and active participation throughout the workshop.

The meeting closed with a prayer led by Ms Josephine Iipinga. Participants were reminded to gather for a group dinner starting 18h00 at the same venue.





**Annexes**

**Annex 1: Official opening speech**

**KEY NOTE ADDRESS**

**By**

**HONOURABLE MAURUS NEKARO, GOVERNOR OF THE  
KAVANGO REGION**

**Ngandu Safari lodge, Rundu**

**AT THE OKAVANGO ANNUAL STAKEHOLDERS FORUM**

**18 JULY 2012**

---

Director of Forum proceedings,

The Under Secretary and Commissioner Mr. Abraham Nehemia,

Representatives of the Southern Africa Regional Environmental Program  
(SAREP),

Representatives of our Government Ministries,

Non Governmental Organizations' (NGOs) representatives,

Academic professionals, Environmental specialists,

Town Council representatives, Ladies and Gentlemen.

It's my warm pleasure to welcome you all to this important gathering and to the Kavango Region.

On behalf of the Kavango Regional Council and the residents of the region, I am delighted and want to thank you for bringing Okavango Basin stakeholders on a common platform to discuss Basin resources management. It shows that we are not alone in our endeavor in trying to address the challenges we face while aiming to develop our region.

As you may all know, Namibia is the driest country in the Sub-Saharan Africa while all its perennial water sources are shared with neighboring states, making

them transboundary that need liaison with sharing countries. We also know that freshwater and land are the most basic resources for development and cannot be managed in isolation. The Namibian Government values agriculture and tourism developments as keys to economic independence and food security for the country of which all these require water.

Our perennial water resources are key to national development but are only available along the country's northern and southern borders limiting freshwater access for the Central Areas where major economic activities are taking place, a challenge. These shared resources create a platform to work together with our neighboring states for their combined management thus ensuring a sustainable level of development and resources use.

A significant part of the population in the Kavango Region depends on land and the abundant natural resources provided by Okavango River for their daily livelihoods. It is therefore critical that the Planners, Developers and investors like, must seriously consider the people and their traditional links to the river while pursuing the development initiatives within an environmental friendly manner.

To address this approach, the Namibian Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry has established Okavango Basin Management Committee where local stakeholders can liaise with each other in the basin resources management. This platform has resulted in the formulation of the Namibia National Action Plan for the sustainable management of Okavango River Basin of which implementation progress would be reviewed at this forum.

As a number of developments are planned for the Basin, it is important to liaise and share information with each other including the communities that use the resources while considering the voiceless environment. Our communities use the river's natural resources for food, building materials and drinking water as well as for washing and swimming. We do not want the water quality of this river to deteriorate due to human and animal activities. It is therefore important that this stakeholders' forum is one of the key platforms to bring everyone on the table and involve them in planning the management activities.

On behalf of the Kavango Regional Council, I wish to confirm our commitment to all efforts that are aimed at sustainable development of this region and we

**I thank you**

## Annex 2: List of the participants

Full Names	Institution	Tel Number	Fax Number	Email address	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
Laurica Keis	MAWF	061 2087172	061 2087160	LKeis@mawf.gov.na	√	√	√
Jonathan Barnes	DDS Water Audit Project	0812857638	061 227618	<a href="mailto:JIBARNES@IAFRICA.COM.NA">JIBARNES@IAFRICA.COM.NA</a>	√	√	√
Charlie Paxton	OkBMC	0812419473			√	√	√
PatrikKlintenberg	DRFN	061 377500	061 230172	<a href="mailto:Patrik.klintenberg@drfn.org.na">Patrik.klintenberg@drfn.org.na</a>	√	√	
Martin Muller	MLR-GIZ	0814354334	061 255401	Martin.mueller1@giz.de	√	√	√
Patricia Mwilima	MLR	0812717116	088642476	<a href="mailto:chumamwilima@gmail.com">chumamwilima@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
NairengeKertuu	OkBMC	0818342857			√	√	√
SintangoSixtus	OkBMC	0813173666		<a href="mailto:sixtussintango@gmail.com">sixtussintango@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
SiyereAlfons	OkBMC/BWF	0812272482		P.O Box 1554, Rundu	√	√	√
Hamutenya D.H	Governor Office	0816466361	066 255036	<a href="mailto:dhamutenya@yahoo.com">dhamutenya@yahoo.com</a>	√		
Mutero E. Sikere	Shambyu TA	0813431973			√	√	
DishoThikusho	KRC	0811294639	066 255359	<a href="mailto:dishothikusho@iway.na">dishothikusho@iway.na</a>	√		
LirumbaLourence	Khaudum North Complex	0817494469			√	√	√
John Muremi	NamWater	066 714300	066 714389	<a href="mailto:MuremiJ@namwater.com.na">MuremiJ@namwater.com.na</a>	√	√	√
JahannesAkim	SAREP	0812262025		<a href="mailto:Js.akim8@gmail.com">Js.akim8@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
SakeusKupepa	SAREP	0812873374		<a href="mailto:sackypembu@gmail.com">sackypembu@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
Johannes Ndjamba	SAREP	0813369115		<a href="mailto:Johannes.kambinda@gmail.com">Johannes.kambinda@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
Fidelis Mpofu	NNF/MCA-IND	0814269055		<a href="mailto:Fidelis.mpofu@gmail.com">Fidelis.mpofu@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
Ramin Gillett	University of Florida	0818588116		<a href="mailto:Ramin.gillett@gmail.com">Ramin.gillett@gmail.com</a>	√		
Lillian Pelane	University of Botswana			<a href="mailto:pelanegii@gmail.com">pelanegii@gmail.com</a>	√		
Aune Amwaama	MAWF – Hydrology	061 2087259	061 2087256	<a href="mailto:AmwaamaA@mawf.gov.na">AmwaamaA@mawf.gov.na</a>	√	√	√
Laura Namene	MAWF – Water Environment	061 2087141	061 2087160	<a href="mailto:namenel@mawf.gov.na">namenel@mawf.gov.na</a>	√	√	√
Dorothy LutanguMatengu	SAREP – Namibia/ OkBMC	0811280615	066 256145	<a href="mailto:dorowams@gmail.com">dorowams@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
Mbamba Joseph Hausiku	MCWP/ MWPC Mayana	0813796293		<a href="mailto:mbamba.joseph@gmail.com">mbamba.joseph@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
MukoyaDagobert	Mbunza TA	0855605506		<a href="mailto:dmukoya@yahoo.com">dmukoya@yahoo.com</a>	√	√	√
Josephine Ipinge	MET	0812875266		<a href="mailto:andthose@yahoo.com">andthose@yahoo.com</a>	√	√	√
MaxonSimfukwe	CEDP/ TFO			<a href="mailto:cedpmax@yahoo.com">cedpmax@yahoo.com</a>	√	√	√

Full Names	Institution	Tel Number	Fax Number	Email address	Day 1	Day 2	Day 3
TaddeusNakangombe	MAWF – KBMC	0812338046	064 200821	<a href="mailto:kamuvulundje@gmail.com">kamuvulundje@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
Reinhold Kambuli	OkBMC	066 256446	066 255931	<a href="mailto:okbmc@iway.na">okbmc@iway.na</a>	√	√	√
Lukas Muhepa	NCCI	0811280549			√	√	√
KlemensHatutale	MAWF – DEES	066 255666	066 255846	<a href="mailto:hatutaleK@mawf.gov.na">hatutaleK@mawf.gov.na</a>	√	√	√
LivingiLivingi	Rural Water Supply	066 266100	066 255041	<a href="mailto:livingij@yahoo.com">livingij@yahoo.com</a>	√		
Christopher Munwela	MFMR	0811223350	066 256844	<a href="mailto:cmunwela@yahoo.com">cmunwela@yahoo.com</a>	√	√	√
GosbertHamutenya	MFMR	08112842008	066 256844	<a href="mailto:ghamutenya@gmail.com">ghamutenya@gmail.com</a>	√		
NoaShampumba	MFMR	066 256813	066 256844	<a href="mailto:noa.shapumba@gmail.com">noa.shapumba@gmail.com</a>	√	√	√
LuizaChilunda	BWF	066 258263		<a href="mailto:Luiza.kupembona@yahoo.com">Luiza.kupembona@yahoo.com</a>	√	√	
Robyn Tompkins	SAREP - WSS	+26771371646		<a href="mailto:tompkinsr@jgi.co.za">tompkinsr@jgi.co.za</a>	√	√	
FideusMpofu	NNF	0814269055		<a href="mailto:Fidelis.mpofu@gmail.com">Fidelis.mpofu@gmail.com</a>		√	√
Ankama AN	MAWF	061 2087491	061 2087482	<a href="mailto:ankamanambwandja@yahoo.com">ankamanambwandja@yahoo.com</a>			
SalmoNdjuulume	MAWF	061 2087108		<a href="mailto:djuulumes@yahoo.co.uk">djuulumes@yahoo.co.uk</a>	√	√	√
Clarence Mazambani	DRFN	061 377500	061 230172	<a href="mailto:clarence.mazambani@drfn.org.na">clarence.mazambani@drfn.org.na</a>	√	√	√
Leopold Niipare	DWSSC	0811244176		<a href="mailto:niipare@iway.an">niipare@iway.an</a>		√	
Abraham Nehemia	MAWF	061 2087696	061 2087227	<a href="mailto:nehemiaa@mawf.gov.na">nehemiaa@mawf.gov.na</a>		√	
GeofKuwarae	SAREP	+267 71616121	+267 6860978	<a href="mailto:gkhwarae@sarep.co.bw">gkhwarae@sarep.co.bw</a>		√	√
Michael Otsub	DoF	0817852628	066 255353	<a href="mailto:otsubm@yahoo.com">otsubm@yahoo.com</a>		√	√
Aaron Muti	NamWater	066 714300	066 74389	<a href="mailto:mutia@namwater.com">mutia@namwater.com</a>			√

- Annex 3 Programme of the workshop**
- Annex 4 Recap of the NAP and operational plan for July 2011 – March 2012**
- Annex 5 OkBMC presentation**
- Annex 6 Division of Hydrology presentation**
- Annex 7 DWE presentation**
- Annex 8 MET presentation**
- Annex 9 Division of Geohydrology presentation**
- Annex 10 MFMR presentation**
- Annex 11 NNF/SAREP presentation**
- Annex 12 DWSSC, Kavango Region presentation**
- Annex 13 Rundu Town Council presentation**
- Annex 14 Okavango Water Audit Project presentation**
- Annex 15 TFO presentation**
- Annex 16 Status of old Annual Operational Plan for the Okavango River Basin\_ Based on the National Action Plan (NAP) for July 2011 – March 2012**
  
- Annex 17 New Annual Operational Plan for the Okavango River Basin\_ Based on the National Action Plan (NAP) for July 2012 – March 20123**