



Minutes of the Annual Basin Management Coordination and Information Sharing Workshop

OUT OF NATURE COUNTRY LODGE
11 -12 DECEMBER 2013



Contents

Abbreviations	4
Executive Summary	5
Day 1: Wednesday, 11 December 2013	
Opening and Workshop Objectives	7
Reflections on the 2012 Annual Workshop	7
Upper Swakop and Zambezi Basins	8
Omaruru Basin	9
Orange-Fish Basin	10
Kuisseb Basin	11
Okavango Basin	12
Tsumeb Sub-Basin	13
Niipele Sub-Basin	13
Iishana Sub-Basin	14
Olushandja Sub-Basin	15
Government Financing System and its Operations	15
Reflection on NWRM and IWRM-CEB Projects	17
Day 2: Thursday, 12 December 2013	
Review of Day 1	18
National IWRM Plan – Implementation Status and Strategy	18
World Water Day Commemorations 2014	20
IWRM Website	21
Directorate Resource Management: Functions and Mandate	21
Closing Remarks on the GIZ-sponsored Projects	24
Workshop Closure	26
Workshop Evaluation	27

Annexes

- Annex A : Annual Basin Management Coordination Workshop Programme
- Annex B: Participant List
- Annex C: Reflections on 2012 Annual Workshop
- Annex D: Upper Swakop and Zambezi Basins
- Annex E : Omaruru Basin
- Annex F: Kuiseb Basin
- Annex G: Orange-Fish Basin
- Annex H: Okavango Basin
- Annex I : Tsumeb Sub-Basin
- Annex J : Niipele Sub-Basin
- Annex K: Ilishana Sub-Basin
- Annex L: Olushandja Sub-Basin
- Annex M: GRN Financing System
- Annex N: Reflection on NWRM and IWRM-CEB Projects
- Annex O: Review of Day 1
- Annex P: National IWRM Plan - Status and Strategy
- Annex Q: DRM - Functions and Roles

Abbreviations

BMC	Basin Management Committee
CEB	Cuvelia-Etosha Basin
DRFN	Desert Research Foundation of Namibia
DRM	Directorate Resource Management
EC	Economising Committee
EU	European Union
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GRN	Government of Namibia
GWP	Global Water Partnership
IWRM	Integrated Water Resource Management
LA	Local Authority(s)
MAWF	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MRLGHRD	Ministry of Regional, Local Government, Housing and Rural Development
NWP	Namibia Water Partnership
NWRM	Namibia Water Resources Management
O/M/As	Offices, Ministries and Agencies
RAD	Rent-a-Drum
RC	Regional Council(s)

Executive Summary

Agreed Upon Actions

	For Action
<ul style="list-style-type: none">MAWF: DRM and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism should meet to discuss a joint management and enforcement of solid waste and waste water management.	Ms Aune Amwaama
<ul style="list-style-type: none">A copy of the annual tender exemption would be availed to BMCs.	Ms Muheua
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The Economising Committee would discuss the matter for potential exemption on reimbursements for transport costs.	Mr Koch
<ul style="list-style-type: none">DRM undertook to write to the banks requesting for the waving of fees and to give public recognition to the bank who responded positively.	Mr Koch
<ul style="list-style-type: none">BMCs should provide inputs on the IWRM website: www.iwrm-namibia.info.na User: admin Password: blank	Petronella Buys buysp@mawf.gov.na 061-208 7026

Requested Action

A request was made for MAWF to liaise with the Ministry of Regional and Local Authority, Housing and Rural Development to facilitate recognition of and cooperation with the BMCs. In this regard it was also requested that a briefing session and/or invitation to introduce the BMCs be undertaken by the senior managers of the Ministry with the senior managers within the LAs. The Minister, Permanent Secretary or Under Secretary, as custodians of the process, should intervene to facilitate progress.

Information Availed

	Contact Person
<ul style="list-style-type: none">The booklet on the Roles and Responsibilities of Institutions supporting Basin Management	Ms Aune Amwaama
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Training on institutional arrangements within the legal framework	DRFN

- | | |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Training manuals on IWRM | Ms Aune Amwaama |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Budget support for capacity building to the amount of €6 million by the EU to GRN, through NPC and MoF under the National Sanitation Strategy and €1,4 million where no in-country expertise exist – earmarked for the sector – could potentially be applied for funding of awareness campaigns | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Experiences and learnings of the Local Initiatives Programme in Africa on liaisons with LAs | Mr Rapule Pule
Ms Aune Amwaama |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● The National IWRM Plan (shortened version)● Thematic Area Reports of the National IWRM Plan● The CEB IWRM Plan | IWRM website |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Information of the Global Water Partnership● Membership to the Namibia Water Partnership | www.GWP.org
DRFN |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● World Water Day Commemorations, 26 and 27 March
Theme: “Integrating Water, Food and Energy for Improved Livelihoods” | Outapi |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">● A draft of the amended Water Resources Management Act | Mr Harold Koch |

Day 1: Wednesday, 11 December 2013

Opening and Workshop Objectives

Ms Mariele Davel, Workshop Facilitator

To guide presentations and focus discussions the purpose and objectives of the workshop were re-stated as:

- Sharing information amongst the basins with a specific purpose to learn from each other and improve coordination; and
- To focus on how the IWRM and BMC initiatives would be taken forward, also with a view to the closing of the GIZ contribution to the projects.

In this context a brief overview of the programme was provided. The programme for the workshop and a list of participants are attached as Annexes A and B.

Reflections on the 2012 Annual Workshop

Ms Maria Amakali, MAWF

Ms Amakali reflected on the objectives and provided feedback on the following action points that were agreed on in the previous workshop:

- The booklet on the roles and responsibilities of institutions supporting basin management were completed and printed and was available to all.
- The training provided by DRFN to BSOs and stakeholders in the CEB on institutional arrangements within the legal framework took place and could be provided to other basins should a need exist.
- The Water Resources Management Bill has been passed by Parliament and would be gazetted soon.
- The Directorate Resource Management (DRM) has started with drafting of regulations to facilitate implementation of the Act once gazetted.
- The development of the website was in progress and Ms Petronella Buys took over website management in the context of the closure of the GIZ projects. The website was paid in advance for the next following year under the GIZ budget which would ensure continuity and stability for establishment and initial functioning. All basins were requested to provide feedback on the content (accuracy and substance) and the layout of the site.
- The point on the strengthening of communication between DRM, BSOs and stakeholders was deferred to the presentation by Mr Koch the following day. The process was, however, ongoing and the absorption of all BSOs in the DRM structure and all BMC activities in the DRM budget were considered key milestones. The only basin without a BSO was Kuiseb and it was the intent to recruit someone as soon as possible. The restructuring of the Ministry with the proposed

Division for Basin Management would provide more human capacity and decentralization of the Directorate to the basins.

- The DRM was in the process of streamlining its reimbursement strategies in cognizance of challenges experienced. Detailed discussion was deferred to Ms Muheua's session scheduled for later the day. For a long term financial strategy it would, however, be important to know what was planned at basin level so as to absorb as many activities in the DRM budget. BMCs were encouraged to prioritise activities and source own funding to supplement GRN funding.

A copy of the presentation is attached as Annex C.

Upper Swakop and Zambezi Basins

Ms Aune Amwaama, MAWF

A copy of Ms Amwaama's presentation is attached as Annex D. In summary she reported that:

- no BMC/Forum for the Upper Swakop Basin was finalized yet and that a workshop towards achieving this outcome was planned for February 2014; and
- Eight countries form part of the Zambezi Basin where a requirement was set that each country form a stakeholder coordination platform first. Such a workshop was held in Katima Mulilo on 1 and 2 August 2013, where it was realized that a more inclusive forum had to be consulted for the initiative to be successful. A workshop to that effect was therefore scheduled for February or March 2014.

These interventions would then lead into Basin Management Forums for the two basins, but probably not yet to the establishment of BMCs.

Discussion

Answer: in response to clarification sought Ms Amwaama reiterated that no basin-wide forum for the Zambezi Basin existed at the time as a National Stakeholder Coordination Committee had to be formed per country first. Out of this platform a BMC for the basin would be formed which would be responsible at an implementation level.

Question: Though many stakeholders were involved, the catchment area for the Zambezi Basin was small. The strategic importance of the BMC for the basin was therefore recognized, but would it justify the establishment of a BMC?

Answer: The catchment area justified the establishment of a BMC as attributors, e.g. the Kwando, Linyanti and Chobe, were included in the demarcated basin. The basin was also of national-strategic importance as it included conservancy areas.

Omaruru Basin

Ms Hanne Alpers, Omaruru BMC

Ms Alpers gave background to awareness raising efforts that Omaruru Basin undertook to reach out on a national level and to the community through combining projects, initiatives and stakeholders. Examples of such initiatives were their participation in:

- The Land Matters in Art initiative undertaken by the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement in which an art installation was erected in the Omaruru River with the participation of a broad base of stakeholders;
- Celebrations of the World Water Day in combination with an open market;
- Areva Mine-sponsored visit of journalists to the basin;
- Four cleaning campaigns involving the schools and community, and
- Winning the Ministry of Environment and Tourism competition for the cleanest town in Namibia.

A video was shown depicting the art installation initiative and the challenges faced in the basin.

These initiatives led to broad media coverage, e.g. documentation in the GIZ-sponsored Art Catalogue, placement in the Erongo version of the Republikein newspaper and inclusion in a coffee table book on Namibia. The message from the basin was that work in the public space, where a broad base of stakeholders and crosscutting projects, themes and initiatives could be reached, mobilized people and resources and made everyone involved in spreading the message. The basin also experienced that the response from stakeholders towards sponsoring was very positive if a sound proposal was provided and clear visible benefits demonstrated. In addition, the basin contributed in kind to initiatives undertaken through e.g. availing their BSO, vehicle, internet, etc. to e.g. clean-up campaigns.

A copy of the presentation is attached as Annex E. In addition to the challenges listed in the presentation it was explained that it took a year of action, much effort on awareness raising and a facts-based presentation to Omaruru Municipality to gain their recognition, and that progress was difficult in the absence of such recognition and cooperation.

Discussion

Comment: Regarding waste water management a twinning agreement with a town in Sweden has facilitated progress in other basins which could be explored by the Omaruru Basin.

Question: In a question to the European Delegation it was asked whether funds could be available for a country-wide awareness campaign involving all the basins.

Answer: Mr Sjaak de Boer indicated that budget support to GRN of €6 million was availed for capacity building under the National Sanitation Strategy, but that the Ministry of Finance and National Planning Commission would have to be approached in this regard. There was

also a small fund of €1,4 million available to the sector where expertise for capacity building could not be sourced in-country.

The Basin was applauded and congratulated on a job well done.

Orange-Fish Basin

Mr Clarence Tjiho, Orange-Fish BMC

A copy of Mr Tjiho's presentation is attached as Annex F. In addition Mr Tjiho explained the many challenges experienced in cooperating with Keetmanshoop Municipality and that, due to the nature of the internal problems experienced, the BMC was considering the option of moving to Mariental.

Discussion

Question: Regarding the *Prosopis* cleaning efforts undertaken in the basin it was asked why The Godwana Collection was not interested to continue with support towards such initiatives.

Answer: Godwana Collection has indicated that their core business was tourism and that they have already invested through the clean-up operations undertaken. The Department of Forestry was, however, issuing permits which would lead to ongoing initiatives and the Department of Agriculture was involved in spraying activities to curb the spread and growth of the plants.

Question: The Karas Youth League has requested money as a start-up *Prosopis* harvesting. It was asked whether support could be provided in this regard.

Answer: Local authorities were requested to develop a tender in this regard as a pilot initiative. Should the pilot be successful the approach would be fully approved.

Question: Cooperation with local authorities was noted in almost every presentation as a challenge. A request was made whether the MAWF could liaise with the Ministry of Regional and Local Authority, Housing and Rural Development to facilitate recognition and cooperation with the BMCs.

Comment: MAWF should focus on awareness campaigns, for which funds were available, and demonstrated impact in the basins to improve cooperation. A sensitization programme focusing on especially linking land use planning to quality water supply and management should be beneficial.

Comment: Ilishana Basin reported that 3 top managers from town councils were executive members of the BMC as a result of continued communication and consultation efforts by the BMC.

Comment: From experiences with the local initiatives programme in Africa it was learnt that local authorities do not feel part of programmes and were accessed only as service providers in projects. Involving LAs and allowing them in day-to-day operations and ownership/control over resources reap results. Working through umbrella organisations, e.g. ALAN, also

demonstrated benefits in other countries. Rapule Pule would avail material in this regard to Aune Amwaama through whom the basins could benefit from the experiences and learnings of this forum.

Comment: In Omasati the Regional Council became involved due to the crises caused by the drought, as in Ilishana through the floods. Contacts developed during these disaster situations remained and have proven beneficial in sustained cooperation. It was further emphasised that contact points, e.g. with Traditional Authorities, should be established and such persons included as stakeholders in meetings. It was also found that radio talks were more effective than printed material and that a larger audience was reached.

Request: It was requested that a briefing session and/or invitation to introduce the BMCs be undertaken by the senior managers of the Ministry with the senior managers within the LAs. The Minister, Permanent Secretary or Under Secretary, as custodians of the process, should intervene to facilitate progress.

Comment: BMCs should use scientific technical facts when communicating with municipalities as these institutions were not in possession of such data - to create credibility and dependence. Pressure through the media and citizens could also be mobilized, e.g. by public disclosure of the LA's involvement in meetings/initiatives (e.g. number of times invited versus times attended). Awareness campaigns, however, were very important mechanisms towards mobilization.

Comment: A municipality has a legal mandate as enacted through by-laws. The BMCs should drive towards the inclusion of priority issues in by-laws to address issues of responsibility and enactment/implementation.

Kuiseb Basin

Ms Susan Roux, Kuiseb BMC

Ms Roux reported that the BMC was experiencing severe challenges in continuing their work with no BMO, inaccessibility of the office, financial constraints, BMC members being fulltime employed elsewhere, etc. Although the BMC never met, it was able to hold one successful stakeholder forum during the year. In view of the low level of activity the plan for 2014 has not changed significantly from 2013's annual plan and it was also indicated that an activity like the Kuiseb Profile had been on the BMC annual plan for the past 8 years.

In her presentation she also related the following quote:

"Government has been managing water resources in this country from a central level with minimal or no involvement of users on the ground. This is no longer going to be the case...the best management practice for water resources is by means of carrying it out at a basin level" made by Helmut Angula on April 28 2004 and raised the question: where are we now.....?

Despite having a very professional, active and supportive municipality and involvement of NamWater the basin was confronted with a severe water supply crises as demand in Walvis Bay would triple over the next 15 years due to a new port being constructed. Amongst others, the Walvis Bay Municipality

was to build 70 000 houses over the next 5 years. In the context of global warming and seawater encroachment, especially into existing boreholes, tremendous water demand management challenges would have to be addressed. Amongst others, a desalination plant and drilling of more boreholes were planned, but water management in the basin would remain a major challenge.

A copy of her presentation is attached as Annex G.

Discussion

Question: Would Walvis Bay Municipality be prepared to fund some BMC activities?

Answer: The municipality is very supportive and has offered to levy 1c per municipal account towards funding of BMC activities.

Question: On the question of community involvement, e.g. the farmers, what were the real topics identified in the Kuiseb Basin?

Answer: The Walvis Bay development was the main priority and the role and benefit of the BMC to the other stakeholders would have to be rethought and restructured in the context of available capacity.

Comment: It was suggested that the BMC accessed people who would have a business interest in the Basin to mobilise involvement.

Answer: During the open day held the NGOs, students and researchers responded. Other stakeholders did not participate. The Basin also would have to get a functioning committee and BSO again before it could approach any stakeholders for support. During the first 8 years the Basin was run from a private office, but that could no longer be sustained.

Okavango Basin

Mr Reinhold Kambuli, Okavango BMC

During Mr Kambuli's presentation he highlighted the following, that:

- Kavango Regional Council had a twinning agreement with the Sweden City of Eman, which could be duplicated in e.g. Omaruru Basin. Eman, however, was considering withdrawing from the agreement due to slow progress made on the Namibian side.
- The annual stakeholders' forum did not take place due to communication challenges.
- During the Rundu clean-up campaign a new approach was followed by combining the campaign with a public dialogue with service providers on sanitation. Invitations to participate in the event went out under the signature of the Mayor/CEO of the Municipality to establish credibility.
- Rundu has a major dumping problem which could not be addressed via a clean-up campaign due to its magnitude. This was affecting tourism and the further development of the town, e.g. layout of hiking trails. The town council has, however, not shown any interest in the income generation opportunities offered through tourism. Awareness campaigns, therefore, were a

priority. In this regard, influential people should be involved to promote a credible platform for awareness raising. The town council has, however, implemented fines for people transporting waste through access points to the town and not returning with such, which would constitute illegal dumping. These fines were then added to municipal bills. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism could also issue fines in this regard.

A copy of Mr Kambuli's presentation is attached as Annex H.

Tsumeb Sub-Basin

Mr Julius Mavulu, Tsumeb BMC

Mr Mavulu highlighted the following challenges experienced in the Basin, i.e.:

- Lack of participation of stakeholders primarily as a result of a lack of understanding of incentives and the rate of reimbursement of travel expenditure for especially Traditional Authorities and Farmers' Communities. Some persons have even lost hope of being reimbursed.
- The Council forms part of a sub-committee of the BMC, but has not attended the last two meetings.

A copy of his presentation is attached as Annex I.

Niipele Sub-Basin

Mr Leonard Jona, Niipele BMC

Mr Jona said that the Basin was fortunate as Regional and Local Councilors did participate in BMC meetings, as compared to many other basins where challenges were experienced.

A copy of his presentation is attached as Annex J.

Discussion

Comment: Would the pumping of water in Niipele through an open stream into a catchment area not result in substantive losses due to evaporation? Would it not be wiser for NamWater to construct a pipeline and that offtake points be installed?

Comment: The recycle bins displayed in the presentation were bought at Waltons Stationers for N\$3 000 per set of 3 bins. Normal bins could, however, also be used with relevant colour coding.

Comment: Mr Jona undertook to research and consult with the Town Council for the inclusion of regulations on public toilets into by-laws, which should help to address compliance regarding the use of public toilets. Some facilities were, however, located outside the town council's boundaries.

Iishana Sub-Basin

Mr Stevenson Tuukondjele, Iishana BMC

During his presentation Mr Tuukondjele said that simple and affordable desalination options were investigated. Amongst others, CuveWaters was approached during the research, but that other options were also being explored as the alternatives piloted by CuveWaters posed implementation challenges due to the capacity needed for maintenance and resultant sustainability and also affordability of the technology. The BMC has taken note of other options implemented at village level which was cost-effective. These options would be further explored. The BMC was also looking into harvesting rain water flowing from Angola.

A copy of his presentation is attached as Annex K.

Discussion

Comment: CuveWaters tested four plants of which one was found viable for Namibian conditions and which was not dependent of electricity supply. The use of this technology was recommended.

Answer: The efforts of CuveWaters were appreciated, but the BMC felt to include exploring alternatives beyond the options offered by CuveWaters.

Question: Would the canal at Etaka be integrated into the initiatives at Ohangwena II?

Answer: The Basin was looking at water off-flow and the utilization thereof.

Comment: NamWater planned to feed such water into the pipeline. This would also be of benefit to the Basin.

Question: Was the costing for offtake and the maintenance of the pipeline taken into consideration or were the cost calculations and comparisons based on the initial rollout cost only, as maintenance of a pipeline was more expensive than that of a canal and with power failures people would be without water?

Answer: Costing on offtake and maintenance were included in the calculations. There were experts involved in the development process and takeover ownership by NamWater would also be easier in the case of a pipeline.

Comment: Awareness raising would be important to inform stakeholders in this instance that the piped water was not potable.

Comment: Vandalism of canals was not seen in Angola as was the case in Namibia. Namibia is paying a social price because the advice of Angola was not taken at the time exchange with partner experts took place.

Olushandja Sub-Basin

Mr Silvanus Uunona, Olushandja BMC

A copy of Mr Uunona's presentation is attached as Annex L.

Discussion

Answer: On a question raised during the presentation on “How far is the CuveCon process?” the answer was given that Namibia has met with Angola to develop an agreement which was at the time with the Office of the Attorney-General from whom an answer was awaited. The Angolan Secretary of Water would be in Namibia from that Wednesday to Friday and it was anticipated that the negotiations would be finalized and the agreement signed during the visit.

Question: In all presentations there was an emphasis on solid waste management. What happens within the basins once the waste has been collected?

Answer: An agreement with the Local Authority existed and the BMC was collaborating with Rent-a-Drum North to recycle waste. Rent-a-Drum, however, collected waste infrequently depending on the amount of waste and an interim arrangement has therefore become essential. Land was needed to operate such an interim operation. Options were, however, explored with the Local Authority.

Comment: Solid waste and waste water management posed challenges to BMCs. MAWF:DRM and the Ministry of Environment and Tourism should meet to discuss a joint management and enforcement regarding these critical areas.

Comment: The Regional Councils allocated and implemented a sanitation budget. In Tsumeb Basin such allocations were processed through the WATSAN Forum before implementation was approved.

Answer: In response to a question it was answered that the MAWF carried the costs of canals and earth dams.

Comment: IWRM training manuals were available to the BMCs through Ms Aune Amwaama.

Government Financing System and Operation

Ms Immaculata Muheua, MAWF

A copy of Ms Muheua’s presentation is attached as Annex M.

Discussion

Question: Do the regulations and procedures provide room for emergencies? These were especially relevant in cases like approval for purchasing of air tickets.

Answer: Yes, if 3 quotations were obtained signatures from 5 Economising Committee Members could be obtained for an ad hoc approval. The availability of Economising Committee Members could, however, influence the speed at which the approval was obtained.

Question: Did any exceptions to the N\$10 000 ceiling on tender requirements exist, e.g. for running of workshops?

Answer: There was an annual tender exemption of which a copy would be availed to BMCs.

Question: Would it be possible to contract the services of the second lowest tenderer from which a quotation was obtained should the service provider from the lowest quotation be unable to deliver the services within the required timeframes?

Answer: Yes, it could be done, but a letter from the first service provider needed to be obtained stating that the services could not be rendered in the required timeframe and the BMC would have to write a motivation letter on why the second service provider was used.

Question: Due to delayed payments of telephone bills, telephone lines were often cut off. What could be done?

Answer: Neither the BMCs nor MAWF were at fault. Telecom has a system where payments from GRN were handled centrally, resulting in delayed communication to the regions. GRN should discuss these challenges with Telecom Namibia.

Comment: The BMC was advised to transfer the telephone account to be paid under the project and not by GRN to circumvent the problem.

Question: What events were funded by GRN?

Answer: Mostly awareness campaigns. Events need to be included in annual plans, though, to be funded.

Question: Did a budget from a BMC cover only operational costs or also capital/project costs?

Answer: Projects were covered if included in the budget.

Question: Could the reimbursement process be shortened?

Answer: The option of paying BMCs into their BMC account in advance of meetings was discussed. These payments had to be substantiated with receipts and proof of attendance through the BMOs. In cases where stakeholders do not have personal bank accounts it posed a problem, however, and payments were often delayed. GRN also had problems with payments into NamPost accounts. In addition, payments could only be made into an account corresponding the actual name of the recipient. BMCs were requested to submit only one invoice per person.

Comment: Payment could be made to a bank without a person having an account at the bank. Release of money would be on proof of identification.

Comment: BMCs could probably learn from the WATSAN forums which were well-attended even in the absence of reimbursements. The WATSAN was, however, a different kind of platform and stakeholders in the BM Forums were already accustomed to payments. GRN procedures on payments were also very strict.

Question: BMCs were to keep bank accounts active to deal with these kinds of payments. This, however, resulted in substantive bank fees for which BMCs did not have funds to cover charges.

Comment: Omaruru Basin was selling beer to earn income to cover such expenditures.

Question: Could GRN give BMCs an allowance to cover these charges?

Comment: One BMC invoiced GRN for meeting attendance and added VAT to cover for such charges.

Comment: Such practices were against the GRN State Finance Act and therefore illegal. Could the option be explored to set the rendering of bank services to BMCs out on tender so that costs could be covered under the tender?

Comment: In the meeting held at Okahandja it was discussed that MAWF would liaise with Ministry of Finance to discuss options. Feedback on the agreed action that was to be taken should be provided by MAWF.

Comment: The BMCs were established under an Act of Parliament and should therefore have a mandate to operate.

Comment: Do not try and change GRN systems and procedures. Understand the system and find ways to operate within these boundaries/regulations.

Reflection on NWRM and IWRM-CEB Projects

Mr Martin Neumann, GIZ

The presentation by Mr Martin Neumann was not an official report, but provided a platform for reflection on the two projects. The projects started in 2006, were inaugurated in 2008 and would come to a close on 31 December 2013 with no option of extension due to a joint decision by GRN (NPC) and the German Government to shift focus away from the water sector onto other priorities in Namibia.

A copy of Mr Neumann's presentation is attached as Annex N.

Discussion

Comment: There was a gap that was left between the institutional set-up and operational functioning of the BMCs and focusing BMC work on thematic priority areas. The BMCs would be left to deal with the gap in the absence of the project support.

Day 2: Friday, 19 April 2013

Review of Day 1

Ms Mariele Davel, Workshop Facilitator

In summarizing the presentations and discussions of day 1 Ms Davel highlighted the vast spectrum of experiences reported by the BMCs – from active to struggling with sustainable functioning. A summary of the crosscutting challenges, main discussion points and key actions to be taken were reflected on PowerPoint. A copy of the PowerPoint summary is attached as Annex O.

National IWRM Plan – Status and Strategy

Ms Maria Amakali, MAWF

Ms Amakali gave recognition to the work done and the growth achieved by the BMCs as reflected in the previous day's presentations.

In her presentation on the National IWRM Plan she emphasized the following, that:

- The National Plan was developed through a joint venture with partners;
- BMCs should have copies of the publications available in their offices and that thematic reports were available on the MAWF website;
- The IWRM Plan approach could be used towards the future review/development of the National Plan; and
- Some activities from the National Plan were already taken up in NDP4.

On the institutional arrangement for implementation she said that:

- The Project Manager was the Under Secretary: Water and Forestry;
- The Project Coordinator was Ms Nashipili;
- The key stakeholders for the Monitoring and Evaluation Team still had to be identified.

The Namibia Water Partnership (NWP) was dormant in Namibia at the time, but attempts were underway to reactivate the forum by the end of 2013.

A copy of Ms Amakali's presentation is attached as Annex P.

Discussion

Question: Who was the NWP and how could contact be established?

Answer: The NWP was established in 2000 in Namibia, chaired by MAWF:DRM, Ms Amakali and the secretariat function was performed by DRFN. The Partnership consisted of partners from the private, public and NGO sectors and UNESCO. BMCs could become members of the

partnership and should approach DRFN in this regard. The Partnership obtained funds from the Global Water Partnership, although insufficient to cover all responsibilities per country. In Namibia the NWP was to a large extent duplicating the functions under IWRM. The role of the Partnership in Namibia therefore had to be defined.

Question: Who constituted the Global Water Partnership?

Answer: The GWP was divided into global regions where Private individuals and organisations formed the partnerships. The GWP secretariat was based in Sweden and the chairpersons of the regional partnerships met annually to develop a global strategy and themes to be implemented regionally and by the NWP's at country level. Information on the GWP could be accessed on www.GWP.org.

Question: Was the implementation of the National IWRM Plan project-based or ongoing?

Answer: Although the word project was used in describing e.g. the institutional arrangements, the implementation was ongoing with the current plan spanning a 10-year period, to be reviewed after 5 years. The correct description would, therefore, most probably have been IWRM Manager instead of Project Manager.

Comment: The idea with the IWRM approach was to have plans developed at basin level which would then be integrated to form the National Plan. The pace of BM Plan development was, however, slow and the National Plan was therefore developed first. With the IWRM Plan for CEB being finalised themes could be taken from the National Plan and incorporated in the drafting of the annual operational plans. The IWRM CEB Plan would be printed in the near future and would be available to other basins for reference purposes. Basin plans completed in the interim could then feed into the National Plan once it is reviewed after 5 years.

Question: How will the IWRM CEB Plan be adopted by MAWF?

Answer: The work of the Coordination Committee should continue and be taken up in the functions of the Ministry. The cooperating partners would then fall away. A major challenge, however, was implementation of the plan in the context of insufficient funding.

Question: What advice could be given to Iishana Basin regarding their plan?

Answer: Iishana has a 5-year plan. The plan could be prioritised in the context of the National Plan. The national Monitoring and Evaluation Team would evaluate implementation and report back areas for improvement to the relevant BMCs.

Comment: Resources available for implementation should be considered also in the context of how the different plans align.

Response: The issues identified per basin should have been consulted during the drafting of the National Plan and alignment between plans should therefore not pose many challenges. The Monitoring and Evaluation Platform would also contribute towards alignment. Basins should take the National Plan into consideration during the next planning cycle.

Question: The Kuiseb Basin does not have an IWRM Plan? How should development be initiated?

Answer: The IWRM Plan for CEB could be used as a template upon which a 5-year strategic plan for the basin could be developed. Funding for implementation should then be sourced. Every basin should have a long term plan upon which annual plans should be based. Upon completion the plan should be submitted to MAWF where after it would be slotted into the National Plan. If all basins have a strategic plan before the 5-year review of the National Plan, the review could be built on the basin plans. A detailed strategy should still be worked on.

Comment: The National Plan should be distributed in popular user-friendly format.

Response: The National Plan was available in shortened version of ±40 pages on the IWRM website.

Question: The BMCs would need support/guidance in drafting plans. How would this be provided?

Answer: The basins were advised to focus on 2 to 3 themes for the National Plan and to identify key activities to be implemented per basin within the context of resource availability.

Comment: Prior to the development of the National Plan the Basin Plans were developed based on key issues identified per basin. With the rollout of the National Plan basins should develop Annual Basin Plans based on the themes identified in the National Plan. The only basin who at the time did not have a Basin Plan was Kuiseb.

World Water Day Commemorations 2014

Ms Maria Amakali, MAWF

Ms Amakali explained that different private and public organizations met annually to decide and organise the World Water Day Commemorations for the specific year. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism normally spearheaded the Wetlands Day celebrations and MAWF the World Water Day Commemorations. Both Ministries were, however, members to the organizing forum. In Namibia the two themes were combined into one theme which for 2014 would be “Integrating Water, Food and Energy for Improved Livelihoods” to be celebrated on 26 and 27 March in Outapi.. Everybody was invited to participate in the celebrations, but it was recognized that all would not be able to travel to Outapi. Basins were therefore encouraged to arrange initiatives within the national theme.

Ms Amakali’s presentation is included in Annex Q.

Discussion

Question: How were the destinations for the celebrations selected?

Answer: The local organising committee made the decision in the context of the theme and rotated celebrations per annum throughout the country. The previous year’s celebrations, for instance, was in the Orange-Fish Basin as the theme was “International Cooperation”.

The IWRM Website

Ms Petronella Buys, MAWF

Ms Petronella Buys was given an opportunity to do a short presentation to introduce the IWRM website to participants. She gave recognition to the significant work done by GIZ interns in setting up the website to date. With the GIZ-project coming to a close she would be taking over as website administrator on behalf of MAWF. She also expressed sincere thanks to all who had already provided inputs towards establishing the site. Only input received could be posted on the site and the Ministry was therefore dependent on the BMCs for the content and quality of the website. The website was not operational in the public domain until such time as it was properly set up. It could be accessed in the interim though:

www.iwrm-namibia.info.na

User: admin

Password: blank

Ms Buys's contact e-mail address was: buysp@mawf.gov.na and was also provided at the bottom of the IWRM web-page. She could also be reached via telephone at 061-208 7026, but preferred e-mail contact as it provided an easy record for follow-on of the communication. Inputs were requested as a matter of urgency, especially since the closure of the project and the availability of Mr Martin Neumann as soundboard would only be available until the next Friday. Some information was cross-referenced for easy access, but some people found it to be duplicating. Inputs/feedback in this regard was also encouraged. The website would be available on Facebook and Twitter once publicly launched. The website would be published publicly once MAWF gave approval for its full implementation.

Discussion

Requests: A participant requested that the search engine of the site be tested and it worked efficiently. This was identified as one of the main challenges in the use of websites.

Another request was made that the background to the website be made a bit lighter as it appeared black during the demonstration. Ms Buys requested that the input be sent through via e-mail to ensure that it be followed on.

Directorate Resource Management: Functions and Mandate

Mr Harald Koch, MAWF

Mr Koch explained that he was not properly briefed and had therefore put together a presentation that he thought would be beneficial to participants. The roles and functions of the DRM at the time in reality, however, constituted "any other task as assigned by the supervisor" which primarily consisted of attending meetings and workshops without proper prior notification/briefing. The roles and functions of the Directorate, especially standards, also depended much on the guidance provided by the facilitator

at the time of development. In this regard he read from the Role and Functions Booklet which contained standards that were very vaguely stated.

The plans falling under the Directorate's mandate were listed in the presentation. DRM was member to the Steering Committees of all these plans. A majority of the Directorate's time therefore went into planning, reporting on monthly, quarterly, bi-annual and annual basis on plans. He quoted a saying stating that "you can kill development by planning it to death" and asked the question whether that was the reason so little got done by the Directorate.

On the Major Initiatives of the Directorate he gave the following inputs:

- The Water Resources Bill had been finalised and would be enacted. It was, however, already under review;
- The final signatures were obtained the previous Tuesday and the restructuring of DWAF could therefore hopefully be implemented;
- Only one BMC still had to be constituted;
- The IWRM Plan could be shortened by deleting all unnecessary information and focusing on the plan only;
- The flood hazard and vulnerability mapping in northern Namibia should be completed within the next 6 months after which monitoring could be started.

On the functions of the Directorate he provided the following information, that:

- The function siting and drilling of boreholes of the Division Geohydrology, excluding monitoring boreholes, would be transferred to the Division: Hydrology;
- There would be no Division: Planning in the new structure and that the function would be integrated into the Ministerial Planning Division.

At the time 106 positions out of 234 in the DRM were filled and the current staffing situation could therefore be a major contributing factor to many staff members not fulfilling their core functions. Better utilisation of staff could be the result once vacancies were filled. Challenges experienced with capacity was, however, not only related to filling of vacancies, but referred also to experience. The importance to avail and utilise expertise to develop capacity, not learnt in workshops, was critical to the functioning of the Directorate. Due to these challenges the Directorate had to prioritise functions and activities and deliver results with the resources available.

With the passing of the Water Resources Bill by Parliament he quoted the "hope (that) all will stop making excuses to implement". He also indicated that the Directorate had started work on the development of regulations towards implementation of the Act once gazetted, but that the work has not been finalised yet. Data Management was another challenge that needed continuous updating.

A copy of Mr Koch's presentation is attached as Annex Q.

Discussion

Question: What were the main areas to be addressed in the review of the “NamWater Act”?

Answer: One main issue that was addressed was the paying of taxes for services by service users. Another area was redefining the role of NamWater as that of bulk water supplier to include other water-related fields such as managing and technical assistance to LAs on billing for services rendered. The other main areas focused on aligning the Act to the Water Act. A draft of the amended Act was available for perusal.

Question: When will the Water Resource Management Act be implemented as BMCs were faced with challenges with the Act not being implemented since 2004 and stakeholders indicating that they were operating outside the existing Act?

Answer: The Bill has been passed by Parliament and was awaiting the signature of the President, where after it could be gazetted. This was anticipated to be effected between January and March 2014. Should the regulations be ready by then, these could be gazetted as well and implementation could take effect.

Question: With ±40% posts filled, was there any plans to fill the vacancies?

Answer: Some of the positions were not filled in view of the pending approval of the revised structure so as not to create redundancies. Capacity development would be guided by a Personal Development Plan that staff has completed and signed off as part of their Performance Agreements. Suitable interventions would then have to be sourced to develop the identified competence. Sourcing funding for workshops and capacity building has not proven to be difficult.

Question: What awareness campaigns were planned to facilitate the implementation of the Water Act?

Answer: The Steering Committee would be responsible for the implementation of the Act, which included awareness raising. Funds for this purpose were also budgeted for under the development budget. The actual plans were, however, not drafted yet, but would be aligned to similar campaigns held in the past consisting of, amongst others, information sessions in the regions during which the old Act would be discussed in comparison to the new one.

Question: What would the role of the BSOs be during these campaigns?

Answer: The BSOs would, by all means, be allowed to be involved, to learn from the campaign and to take efforts forward.

Question: Water is an important resource. In the context of the resource shortages, should MAWF not receive more focus nationally?

Answer: The sentiments were shared as operations and development depended on water and electricity. This was even reiterated during deliberations where the German Government indicated that support to the Water Sector would be stopped based on negotiations with

GRN. Namibia could be congratulated on not having a major crisis in any one of the two sectors. In the absence of a crisis, a mind-set change was required in Namibia. A strategic plan, in collaboration with NamWater, was to be developed to address the challenge. Funding has proven not to be the biggest challenge.

Comment: NDP4 demonstrated balance, focused on production and was business-oriented. The question should be raised whether it could be achieved in the absence of critical resources like water and electricity. MAWF should drive the underscoring of water in national themes like employment creation.

As a closure to Mr Koch's presentation he was asked to respond to matters pending from the previous day's deliberations. Feedback was provided on the following issues:

- On Land Use Planning versus Water Demand Management he underscored that the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement should liaise with MAWF and the BMCs as land allocation should follow water availability. One example was the need for consultations on the drafting of the Kavango Land Use Plan.
- On constructing a canal versus a pipeline he commented that constructing a canal in today's world constituted a crime as demonstrated, amongst others, by the many deaths. Canals did not provide a long term solution. Should resources be a constraint it would be wiser to build a pipeline in phases over time than to build a canal. The resources for maintenance thereof should, however, be taken into consideration when costing the project.
- On reimbursements for transport costs he suggested that the Economising Committee should discuss the matter for potential exemption.
- On the matter of bank accounts and related bank fees the matter could be addressed through the annual budget once the Division was created. DRM also undertook to write to the banks requesting for the waving of fees and to give public recognition to the bank who responded positively. One participant added that NedBank had a green policy and has proven in the past to be most approachable in their basin.

Closing Remarks on the GIZ-sponsored NWRM and IWRM CEB Projects

Mr Sjaak de Boer from the EU Delegation

Namibia could be tremendously proud of what has been achieved despite the challenges experienced. In closing he highlighted the following three issues as his message to the BMCs:

- The question should consistently be raised on what the core issues were around which the population needs to be mobilized within the basin. This pursuit and issues advocated on should not become static.

- BMCs should continuously ask themselves what value they were adding to the development of the population in the basin. If this critical question could not be answered the BMC would die over time.
- The BMC should be the advocate of water in the basin and should be the first point to be consulted with within the basin on any matters related to water use, e.g. in the matter of land use planning.

If these three areas would be the focus of BMCs IWRM would be established in Namibia.

BMC Representatives

Ms Hanne Alpers

In 2008 Ms Alpers attended the first attempt at dialogue on IWRM and found it to be a complete waste of time as it was not clear what the experts expected Namibian attendants to do. She never thought that the system would work based on volunteer involvement. Over the years, however, the growth was noted, also particularly in the people who were involved, e.g. BMC member fluency in English and ability to take decisions. Every presentation given the previous day was professional. Such achievements demonstrated the vision of those who started the initiative and she wanted to thank all involved for the empowerment and say in what GRN is doing and the support it was offering to a Ministry whose capacity was over-stretched. Such leadership was applauded.

Ms Tuwilika Haludilu on behalf of Ms Wita Kroll

Ms Kroll sent a sms in which she thanked all BMC members for the time they could work together and sent them a special message on the way forward.

Mr Martin Neumann for the GIZ Project

The Projects were an adventure to GIZ especially given the stakeholder environment in which it was implemented. This was a situation not normally faced where diverse stakeholders and many donors had to be integrated into the new Basin Management direction. Administering the projects posed another adventure due to the different partners' requirements in terms of reporting, financing and auditing systems. In the midst of these a way was found to channel funds and deliver results, for instance the data and documents produced in collaboration with DRFN. Throughout the project there was a tendency to bring in many topics and it was a challenge to focus on the national resource, water, within this context. Establishing that focus through general awareness raising and water resource management was still a process which had to be worked on in future, beyond the institutional establishing of BMCs. The establishment of the BMCs and the restructuring of the DRM served as backbone to the initiative, but the question to be asked would be whether the creation of these institutions had added value to Namibians' future? Recruiting more human capacity would add to the foundation laid. On a personal level Mr Neumann was closing off in Namibia, but would be involved in similar work within the sector at SADC level and would thereby stay in contact with Namibia and individuals. In closure he thanked the partners for their support, i.e. BGR, DRFN and MAWF.

Workshop Closure

Mr Abraham Nehemia, MAWF

Mr Nehemia apologized for not being able to be present during the first day of the workshop. He recognized that what has been achieved from the start of the project until that day was remarkable, especially since Namibia had to figure out how to proceed as progress was made. The most important accomplishment was that the direction that was set from the onset had been maintained throughout. Where BMCs did not know what to do and MWAFF had to drive the initiative in the absence of experience the clear vision and policy to manage water resources in Namibia guided the process. A Ministry should be making policies and should not be involved in daily management, although remaining in touch with what happened on the ground. A Ministry's task was to put the needs on the ground in language understandable to Parliament so that policies could be formulated that would drive implementation. The content and essence of such policies should be from grassroot level - in this context referring to the BMCs in Namibia.

The workshop of 2013, however, had a different connotation in that the initiative had support from GIZ, but hence forth Namibia had to take full ownership themselves. If BMCs were not serious about the presentations delivered the previous day, they were not serious about water resources in the country. Taking the initiative forward could only happen with the seriousness of the BMCs. The gains would not be for individuals, but for the country and future generations. Mr Nehemia was proud of what has been achieved, but it only constituted the beginning. All development started somewhere, but there was a need for continued progress which would result in growth. One can only get better by way of experience learnt from basics and from those who have been there before. Experienced persons were leaving the sector one by one and, belatedly, there was a scramble to get hold of their expertise. Such expertise need to be learnt from whilst available.

It was important that Namibia got where it was and was standing on its feet. The basics had been put in place and have come from people involved on the ground. Documents were not the important factor. What was important was the situation on the ground – to do what will work on the ground and thinking out of the box.

The journey from here on would be more difficult, but the people from the “Land of the Brave” would see it through if they pull together. One danger would be if all did not work together, but pulled in different directions. Information should flow and challenges identified. Money was not the issue. If planned properly, expenditure could be justified and enough money sourced in Namibia to implement.

Mr Nehemia gave a special word of thanks to Messrs Neumann and De Boer for their consistency and persistency brought to the project aiding the successes achieved. Mr De Boer was thanked for his diligent attendance of Steering Committee meetings and for constantly bringing in new ideas and identifying of challenges. Through this way capacity was built to deal and care taken that matters were dealt with properly. His support would still be sought as the initiative was taken forward.

Mr Nehemia noted that Mr Neumann had given his life to the projects. He was constantly liaising with Mr Nehemia on administrative and logistical matters and fully involved in IWRM. Proof thereof was seen on a daily basis. The functioning of the Oshakati Office was attributed to the work of Ms Tuwilika Halidula, especially in the absence of availability of capacity from other sources. The office has rendered support to all basins country-wide.

Mr Nehemia also recognized that another key person would not be present at the next workshop and that Mr Koch would be retiring from the Ministry in early 2014. Without him Basin Management in Namibia would not have been achieved. The Director was commended for the way in which he managed an initiative that was assigned to him outside his assigned job functions. In this context, especially, it was important to have the Act signed as soon as possible and to have a dedicated division that would deal with BMCs.

Mr Nehemia wished all staff the best for the festive season and a period of rest, but reminded delegates to be aware of water issues throughout the season and to encourage sound use thereof wherever they go.

Handing over of Symbol of Appreciation

Ms Maria Amakali, on behalf of all present, thanked Messrs Neumann and De Boer for their consistent and persistent contributions to what has been achieved in IWRM in Namibia over the years. A gift was handed over to each one with the request that they not forget Namibia!

Workshop Evaluation

At the closure of the workshop participants were asked to provide feedback on posted flipcharts and the following inputs were obtained:

Challenges Experienced

- Communication not always clear
- To keep BMCs focused and well-supported and briefed on MWA policy and progress
- Change challenges to opportunities, nothing is unachievable, one step contributes to a one million steps
- Coordination among the different sectors
- Two-way communication
- Capacity/human resources
- Water Act
- Lack of commitment

Recommendations on the Way Forward

- Keep it up, good job
- BMCs should go out of their way to mobilise and integrate municipalities in their basins into their day-to-day activities and structures
- Need ministerial support to make local authorities aware of BMCs work and role within ministry's structure
- Need ministerial awareness campaign on new Act very fast
- Sustainability and funding/finances and human resources
- Teamwork and better communication
- BMCs to become independent and operate on their own
- Keep it going

The Usefulness of the Workshop in terms of Information Sharing and Coordination

Out of a potential rating of 1 = poor to 5= excellent, the following ratings were received:

- 9 x excellent
- 4 x very good
- No further ratings were received

Recommendations for Future Workshops

- Brief handouts and summary for reporting back to office
- Briefing on inter-ministerial cooperation/inter-connectedness
- Need to be trained on available law/regulations
- Aware need to be enhanced at institutions management level
- One milestone at a time
- Teamwork seminar/communication seminars