



Regional Water Sector Programme
A SADC initiative funded by Danida



water & forestry
Department:
Water Affairs and Forestry
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROCEEDINGS

IWRM Experiencing Sharing Workshop

**With focus on
IWRM Indicators and Up-scaling**

**Bakubung Bush Lodge
North West Province, South Africa
24-26 October 2007**

Prepared by Jean Boroto, Workshop Facilitator

Executive Summary

Delegates from six countries (Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia) met for three days at the Bakubung Bush Lodge in the North West province, South Africa, from 24 to 26 October 2007.

They are all involved in community projects characterised by:

- Their small size and the focus on communities
- Their focus on improvement of livelihoods through better management of water resources
- Using water as a catalyst for development
- The financial assistance from Danida through the SADC Regional Water Programme (Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland and Zambia) or through bilateral agreements (South Africa and Zambia).

These projects are called IWRM demonstration projects and aim to engage the community in implementation. The workshop, the third of the kind as part of the SADC Regional Water Programme, therefore aimed at providing a platform through which:

1. Relevant experience will be shared among participants;
2. IWRM indicators that will facilitate the monitoring of each of the projects will be better formulated
3. An analysis of the up-scaling opportunities and challenges will be carried out.

In order to achieve these objectives, the SADC Regional Water Programme in collaboration with the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry of South Africa designed this workshop with a combination of critical elements of success: (1) the design of an interactive workshop with a mix of plenary and group work sessions in order to maximise the gains and (2) the diversity of experiences shared by those, from the six countries, involved in these IWRM projects and the contribution/input from external speakers to provide inspiration.

The outcomes of the workshop exceed the expectations with several unanticipated spin-offs. The outcomes include:

1. The sharing of experiences on implementing participatory community based projects, has equipped the participants with sufficient insight to better implement their projects in their respective countries; in this regard, the workshop was a learning experience.

2. A draft framework for IWRM indicators and an improved definition of such indicators relevant to each project, with focus on process and outcome indicators,
3. A draft framework for the process for up-scaling, including the identification of conditions and strategies with the involvement of local authorities
4. A greater ownership of the projects by the local authorities – as custodians of the welfare of the communities - present in the workshop and a confirmation of the contribution of the projects to the local development agenda, despite their relative small size
5. A confirmation that the financial sustainability of the projects was achievable, lending credibility to the prospects of up-scaling,
6. The streamlining of the roles and responsibilities of the different parties involved in each project, especially the implementers and the monitoring agents and their level of intervention. This will be through a monitoring framework customized to each project
7. The acknowledgement of the need for proper gender mainstreaming in each project, with a clearer understanding of the challenges for the effective involvement of women and an attempt to address this through indicators in the framework.
8. The realization that despite the different contexts, the experiences in all countries were similar, with ownership of the projects by the beneficiary communities being paramount to their success.
9. Despite the level of development and adoption of water policy and laws, the success of actions on the ground did not depend solely on such policies or laws. It is dictated by the need to achieve a sustainable impact in improving the livelihoods of communities through better access to water and other resources.
10. The commitment to succeed, no matter the challenges and the realization of a sense of a common destiny from the six participating countries.

These proceedings provide a summarized account of the workshop and illustrate that the SADC region believes that IWRM, at a community level (preferably household level) , as the cases presented during the workshop, is a tool for achieving the objective of poverty eradication, through improved water management. The full account of the workshop and all the presentations are available at www.sadcwater.com

Table of Content

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	II
TABLE OF CONTENT.....	IV
ACRONYMS.....	VI
PART I: INTRODUCTION	1
1. BACKGROUND TO THE WORKSHOP.....	2
2. STRUCTURE OF THE PROCEEDINGS.....	3
PART II: THE PROCEEDINGS	5
1. DAY ONE, SESSION ONE: OPENING SESSION.....	6
1.1. INTRODUCTION OF THE PARTICIPANTS	6
1.2. WELCOME.....	6
1.2.1. SADC Water Division.....	6
1.2.2. Host country: South Africa.....	6
1.3. OBJECTIVES OF THE WORK	7
2. DAY ONE, SESSION TWO: SHARING OF EXPERIENCES	8
2.1. MALAWI: COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN THE DZIMPHUTSI PROJECT	8
2.2. IMPLEMENTING IWRM IN ZAMBIA.....	9
2.3. KABWE KASALALA IRRIGATION SCHEME	9
2.4. THE PROCESS OF SELECTING OF 21 IWRM PROJECTS IN THE OLIFANTS-DOORN WMA IN SOUTH AFRICA	9
2.5. PRESENTATION ON IWRM IN SOUTH AFRICA	10
2.6. SOME OUTCOMES FROM THE SESSION ON EXPERIENCE SHARING.....	10
3. DAY ONE, SESSION THREE: EXTERNAL SPEAKERS	11
3.1. ILO – GENDER, POVERTY ERADICATION, DECENT WORK	11
3.2. FAO: FOOD SECURITY.....	12
3.3. IWRM INDICATORS.....	13
3.4. OUTCOME OF SESSION ON EXTERNAL SPEAKERS	13
4. DAY ONE: SUMMARY	14
5. DAY TWO, SESSION ONE: IWRM INDICATORS	15
5.1. IWRM MONITORING FRAMEWORK /SADC	15
5.2. ZAMBIA: LOCAL IWRM INDICATORS: SOUTH AFRICA.....	16
5.3. LOCAL IWRM INDICATORS: SOUTH AFRICA.....	16
6. DAY TWO, SESSION TWO: IWRM INDICATORS: GROUP WORK	18
6.1. GUIDE TO GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON IWRM INDICATORS	18
6.2. GROUP REPORT BACK ON INDICATORS	18
6.2.1. Group 1	18
6.2.2. Group 2	19
6.2.3. Group 3.....	20
6.2.3. Group 4.....	21
6.2.5. Group 5.....	21

6.3 SUMMARY ON GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON INDICATORS	22
7. DAY TWO, SESSION THREE: UP-SCALING	23
8. DAY TWO, SESSION FOUR: UP SCALING: GROUP WORK.....	24
8.1. GUIDE TO GROUP DISCUSSIONS: UP- SCALING.....	24
8.2. GROUP REPORTS BACK ON UP-SCALING	24
8.2.1. <i>Group 1</i>	24
8.2.2. <i>Group 2</i>	24
8.2.3. <i>Group 3</i>	25
8.2.4. <i>Group 4</i>	26
8.2.3. <i>Group 5</i>	27
8.3. SUMMARY OF GROUP DISCUSSIONS ON UP-SCALING	28
9. DAY TWO: SUMMARY	29
10. DAY THREE, SESSION ONE: PROJECT SPECIFIC GROUP WORK.....	30
10.1. INTRODUCTION TO PROJECT SPECIFIC WORKING GROUPS	30
10.2. PARALLEL DISCUSSIONS	30
11. DAY THREE, SESSION TWO: REPORT BACK	31
11. 1. PROJECT SPECIFIC REPORT BACK	31
11.1.1. <i>On Indicators</i>	31
11.1.2. <i>On Up- scaling</i>	32
11.2. LOCAL AUTHORITIES' PERSPECTIVE.....	33
11.3. SUMMARY: BENEFITS TO EACH PROJECT	34
12. DAY THREE, SESSION THREE: CLOSING SESSION.....	34
12.1. THE WAY FORWARD	34
12.2. SADC.....	35
PART III: SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES	36
1. KEY OUTCOMES.....	37
2. SUMMARY ANALYSIS: EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP.....	38
APPENDICES	39
A1. WORKSHOP PROGRAMME	40
A2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS.....	44

ACRONYMS

CMA	Catchment Management Agency, South Africa
Danida	Danish International Development Agency
DWAF	Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation (of the United Nations)
GWP	Global Water Partnership
IDP	Integrated Development Plan
ILO	International Labour Organisation
IWMI	International Water Management Institute
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
LFA	Logical Framework Analysis
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MEWD	Ministry of Energy and Water Development, Zambia
PAWD	Partnership for Africa Water Development (for the development of National IWRM and Water Efficiency Plans, includes Malawi and Zambia)
PSF	Program Support Facility
SADC	Southern African Development Community
WMA	Water Management Area (South Africa)
WSPS	Water Sector Programme Support (by Danida in Zambia)
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

PART I: INTRODUCTION

1. Background to the workshop

A workshop organized by the SADC Regional Water Sector Programme in collaboration with the DWAF IWRM Phase II Project which was held from 24 to 26 October 2007, at Bakubung Bush Lodge, in the North West Province in South Africa.

The SADC Regional Water Sector Program has a Component on Programme Support Facility (PSF) of which the identification of projects demonstrating the positive effects on people's livelihood from applying IWRM principles. It focuses on five countries: Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland and Zambia. They are at different stages of implementing their projects, with Namibia being the most recent country to join.

The South African DWAF IWRM Phase II Project focuses on small projects in the Western Cape Province, in the Olifants - Doorn Water Management Area (WMA). It builds on the experience of Phase I where communities were prepared and opportunities for Phase II projects were identified.

Both aim to achieve IWRM at the lowest scale possible, focusing on measurable benefits for households. The time had come, considering the progress made to date, to bring together the role players (implementers, M&E agents and the local authorities who are expected to be the representative of the beneficiaries) with the aim to:

1. Facilitate the *sharing of experiences* between the different projects
2. Develop or identify *IWRM Indicators* that would assist in measuring the benefits of the projects
3. Initiate opportunities for *up-scaling the lessons* being learnt for a wider implementation of IWRM beyond these pilot cases

The presence of local authorities was to confirm and foster their ownership of the projects taking place in their jurisdictions, not only for their guidance in the implementation process, but

also in preparation for future up scaling. It was hoped that in this way, the benefits of the projects would be more sustainable.

It was the third experience sharing workshop of the kind, following the first held in November 2006 (at the onset of the IWRM demonstration projects of the Regional Water Sector Program) and the second which consisted of a field trip in Zambia (May 2007). This time, however, the workshop brought together delegates from Namibia, Malawi, Mozambique, South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia.

42 participants attended the workshop, comprising delegates from the six countries, representing delegates from the implementing agent, national and local authorities and monitoring agents; a representative from the SADC Water Division, a team from Danida-Zambia working on a similar project, external speakers including the facilitator and the team of the SADC Regional Water Sector Program.

Because of the mix of delegates from the six countries and the external speakers, a participative approach to reinforce the need for sharing across countries and various perspectives (given the institutional and professional diversity of the participants and presenters) was adopted. There was therefore a balance of presentations, group work and reporting back to enable each delegate to contribute. One of the unexpressed objectives was also a strengthening of a network of IWRM practitioners that would continue to share experiences beyond the workshop.

2. Structure of the Proceedings

These proceedings are structured as follows:

After this Introduction Part,

Part II presents the proceedings according to the program of the workshop during the three days (from Wednesday 24 October to Friday 26 October 2007). It is a mix of plenary presentations and group works and report backs.

Part III summarises the main outcomes of the workshop, including the key recommendations of the evaluation questionnaire filled in by the participants.

Appendices are provided at the end of the proceedings, including the workshop programme and the summary of the responses to the questionnaire. The participants list, with their contact details, is attached separately as an Excel document.

All the presentations made at the workshop as well as the participants list are available at the www.sadcwater.com.

PART II: THE PROCEEDINGS

1. DAY ONE, SESSION ONE: OPENING SESSION

1.1. Introduction of the participants

The facilitator, Mr Jean Boroto, invited the participants to introduce themselves, stating their names, institution and role in the project. All participants introduced themselves accordingly.

1.2. Welcome

1.2.1. SADC Water Division

Mr Christmas Maheri from the SADC Water Division welcomed all participants on behalf of the SADC Secretariat. In his address, he thanked the Kingdom of Denmark for its support to the Water Sector in the SADC region. He also thanked the host country, South Africa, for the hospitality. He acknowledged the other five countries represented in the room as well as the representatives from FAO, ILO who were expected to intervene in the workshop.

Finally, he thanked the team of the SADC Regional Water Programme for all the efforts that went into organizing the workshop and for the premises which were conducive to productive work. He concluded by expressing the hope that delegates would make the most out of the workshop.

1.2.2. Host country: South Africa

Mr Derek Weston of the Department of Water Affairs and Forestry, South Africa welcomed all delegates in South Africa. He stated that the workshop was exciting and important in that it would address the issue of water and poverty. He expressed satisfaction over the progress made to date with Danida's support to South Africa during Phase I and the current Phase II. He stated that he was looking forward to the positive outcomes of this workshop, in order to facilitate especially the up-scaling of the lessons learnt.

He wished to the participant a fruitful workshop and an enjoyable stay in South Africa.

1.3. Objectives of the work

Mr Ole Houmøller, Regional Advisor of the SADC - Regional Water Programme, made a power point presentation where he gave the objectives of the workshop. These were:

- *Experience sharing between the demonstration projects* with the purpose of ensuring that specific lessons in relation to the project implementation are shared, particularly around involving the communities.
- *IWRM indicators* with purpose of defining and agreeing on specific IWRM indicators for each project and designing / adapting the monitoring program to be able to monitor these indicators.
- *Up-Scaling the lessons* with the purpose of identifying actions that can facilitate the use of the project processes and lessons in future water resources management.

He reminded the participants of the two previous experience sharing workshops and stressed the same objective of experience sharing was to be enriched by the mix of the 5 SADC projects, the South African projects and the Danida funded project in Zambia (through a bilateral agreement between Danida and Zambia).

He stressed that the two other objectives of this third workshop was on Up-scaling and Indicators. He invited the participants to share *what* they were doing in their projects as well as *how* they were doing it. The intention was to get a clearer picture so that at the end of this workshop, each project could move decisively into delivering its outputs and outcomes with clear indicators and prospects for up-scaling.

Finally, Mr Houmøller gave an overview of the program for the three days, highlighting that:

- Day One would be enriched by external motivational speakers in the afternoon, after presentations on the sharing of experiences. Day one would be in plenary session.
- Day Two would be dedicated to presentations and group discussions on Indicators (in the morning) and Up-scaling (in the afternoon) and that both presentations will be followed by group discussions. The composition of the groups was compiled in advance to allow for a good mix of countries and external participants for enriching the discussions. This was the objective of Day two.
- Day Three would be a project specific day and the 'D' day of the workshop in that delegates would be grouped together per country/project, to agree on their specific

indicators and opportunities for up scaling. It was expected that the project specific discussions would benefit from the insight gained during Day Two.

The facilitator concluded this session by reiterating the above points and inviting the participants to maximize the use of the workshop for the benefit of their projects. He insisted on the participatory nature of the workshop and stressed that Day Three, though the last, was the most critical day in consolidating the gains of the workshop for each project.

2. DAY ONE, SESSION TWO: SHARING OF EXPERIENCES

This session had five presentations on respectively:

1. One of the five IWRM demonstration projects of the SADC Regional Water Programme, being carried out in Malawi, namely IWRM and improved rural livelihoods project for Dzimphutsi, Chikwawa District;
2. Implementing IWRM in Zambia by Ministry of Energy and Water Development (MEWD);
3. A Danida funded project in Zambia, through a bilateral agreement with the government of Zambia.
4. The process of selecting of 21 IWRM Projects in the Olifants-Doorn WMA in South Africa
5. The implementation of IWRM in South Africa

2.1. Malawi: Community Participation in the Dzimphutsi Project

Mr Frank Mwenechanya of Coda & Partners, the implementing agent of the IWRM Demonstration project in Malawi made a Powerpoint presentation on how communities were involved in the design and implementation of this project which targeted 97 households. The presentation attracted several questions from the other participants, including on:

- The cost of the community participation
- The role of existing policies and strategies in the water sector
- The benefit to the poor in the community, including women and disabled persons.

2.2. Implementing IWRM in Zambia

Mr Hastings Chibuye from the MEWD made a presentation on Zambia's progress in implementing in Zambia. This was at national level, it summarised the high level IWRM framework within which the Zambian water sector is being managed and reformed and on-going initiatives such as the Danida funded programme and the Partnership for Africa Water Development (PAWD) for a National IWRM and Water Efficiency Plan.

The presentation attracted questions on:

- Licensing for water at the lowest level
- International obligations in the current legislation
- The policy and legislation regulating the water sector in Zambia

2.3. Kabwe Kasalala Irrigation Scheme

Ms Litumelo Mate of Danida- Lusaka presented the Kabwe Kasalala Irrigation Scheme project, as part of the Danida Water Sector Programme Support (WSPS) in Zambia which covers 12 districts. The project has three objectives, namely:

- To reduce poverty,
- To increase food security, and
- To improve agricultural productivity

Districts are the implementing agents of such projects and in this specific case, 3 communities out of the 6 which were initially approached, are benefiting from the project with 30% of the scheme being owned by women. Of particular interest is that 20 000.00 US\$ were initially injected in the project and these funds were paid back within a year.

2.4. The process of selecting of 21 IWRM Projects in the Olifants-Doorn WMA in South Africa

Mr Faldee Abrahams made a Powerpoint presentation on the process of selection of 21 IWRM projects for funding by the Danida funded IWRM Phase II Programme in the Olifants-Doorn WMA in South Africa. These were grouped according to the following four themes:

- Water for Health and Food Security

- Water and Environment
- Water and Small-Scale Infrastructure
- Water for Resource Limited Farmers and Reform

Projects funded were chosen according to a strict selection criteria; the maximum funding was of the order of R160 000 per project (or just more than 20 000US\$); each project had to benefit households not individuals alone; they were all community based projects.

5 copies of compendium of 29 IWRM Project projects presented for funding at the 26 September showcasing conference were given to the five SADC projects. It is out of these 29 projects that 21 were finally selected.

One major consideration is that these projects built on the experience gained during the IWRM Phase I project which supported projects for as little as R5000.00 (around 700US\$).

2.5. Presentation on IWRM in South Africa

Mr Derek Weston made a Powerpoint presentation on Danida's support to IWRM in South Africa, highlighting the components of the different phases, the need for a sector wide approach, the institutional challenges with the establishment of the Catchment Management Agencies (CMA) and their roles in IWRM. He cited some specific challenges in implementing IWRM in South Africa, such as the need to synchronise budgets, the need to balance between strategic and on the ground projects and the need for monitoring. He presented some pillars of good governance which were keys to the success of IWRM. These include fairness, accountability, responsibility, transparency, discipline, independence and social responsibility.

2.6. Some outcomes from the session on experience sharing

This session highlighted that:

- Policies and laws are important in creating an enabling environment, but that when they are not finalised, they cannot hold back implementation of action on the ground;
- IWRM is relevant at all scales, from local to national, as demonstrated by the two presentations from Zambia but it finds its true significance and relevance at local level where communities are directly at the core of its implementation;
- Ownership by communities is important, such as in Malawi and Zambia, and that this requires their involvement from the onset of the project. In the case of Zambia, some parts of the community chose not to participate. Gender issues remain critical and require attention, especially on the ownership of resources.
- Minimal resources are sometimes required and financial sustainability is achievable; this is a good incentive for up-scaling for both the beneficiaries and the providers of start - up resources. This is the case in South Africa (in eThekweni as stated during discussions) and in Zambia (Kabwe Kasalala) where projects have demonstrated that the initial investment can be recovered and reinvested elsewhere for replication.
- Emerging indicators cover not only the ownership by communities and better gender fairness in the allocation of resources, but also tangible benefits such as income generation and improved food security.

3. DAY ONE, SESSION THREE: EXTERNAL SPEAKERS

Three presentations were scheduled for this session:

- (1) Gender, Poverty Eradication
- (2) Food Security indicators
- (3) IWRM indicators

3.1. ILO – Gender, Poverty Eradication, Decent Work

Ms Benedetta Magri of the International Training Centre of the International Labour Organisation (ILO) facilitated an interactive plenary discussion on gender issues and poverty. Then she invited the participants to divide themselves in groups and to answer the following questions:

1. *What would success mean in my project if gender equality as an objective has to take place in my project?*

2. *How would I measure it?*

Participants were invited to make a maximum of two suggestions each to this final question. After the group discussion, the report back yielded the following points (unedited):

1. Participation by gender
2. Percentage of representation in local institutions
3. Secret monitoring mechanism (Note: the participant meant a discreet monitoring or surveillance mechanism, without the knowledge of the implementors)
4. Improved standard of living and income
5. Access to resources benefits
6. Participation – team work
7. Women are empowered through
 - a. participation
 - b. access to resource
 - c. women only platform
8. Women Indicators: representation is already good
 - a. Project level: male involvement
9. Decision making over access to resources
10. Representation in communities
11. Ownership to resources
12. Social empowerment: women acknowledged, taken seriously
13. Ownership- participation
14. Equity in domestic chores of women participating
15. Changes in gender roles
16. Satisfaction
17. Gender and projects success

It was agreed that of the above, the most emerging gender indicators would be:

- Ownership by women of resources (land and others) that are used in the project
- Effective participation by women in decision making.

3.2. FAO: Food Security

Mr Roger Short made a summary presentation in MS Word on behalf of Jean Michel Arnaut from the FAO who would not make it. The presentation consisted of examples of food security

indicators. Some were for the development objective of achieving/improving food security with several immediate objectives such as: improved food production, efficiency in the food marketing system, increase in income, increase in employment opportunities, increase in food stocks, etc.

Impact indicators presented related to household income and employment; access to food; food production and family nutrition and health.

Participants were invited to consider the relevance of these indicators in their respective projects.

3.3. IWRM indicators

Mr Jean Boroto made a Powerpoint presentation on some pointers towards IWRM indicators. After introducing some water resources management challenges in Southern Africa, he explained the Global Water Partnership (GWP) definition of IWRM, the IWRM Principles, the three IWRM Pillars of Economic Efficiency, Social Equity and Environmental Sustainability and the IWRM Framework (Enabling Environment, Institutional Roles and Management instruments) . He discussed the need for indicators illustrated by a hypothetical case of access to water. He finally presented a list of possible indicators as related to the three IWRM pillars and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as well as other sustainability indicators, using examples of the Manyame sub catchment council in Zimbabwe and the Densu River catchment in Ghana. The relevance of these indicators from household, community, local, provincial, national and regional scales was also highlighted as an illustration of the opportunities for up scaling.

3.4. Outcome of Session on External Speakers

This session was a logical built up from the experience sharing session, providing specific indicators on gender and food security and confirming the value of an IWRM approach and the wide scope of indicators which have to be *objectively measurable*.

These presentations touched on key issues that were of interest to most projects and would feed into the following day dedicated to the IWRM indicators and up- scaling.

The interest of the participants remained high until past 18:00 when the last presentation ended.

4. DAY ONE: SUMMARY

Because it had been a long day, the evening session (scheduled for 20:30, after dinner) was cancelled considering that most delegates were exhausted. During this session, countries had been invited to make informal presentations of their projects.

The outcome of Day one was positive in that:

- The sharing of experience was effective considering the discussions that took place from the first presentation and during each session
- The variety of themes discussed through the different presentations
- The emerging understanding of the value of indicators and up-scaling and
- The consensus that the projects were of great value, confirming that the need for the PSF component and the South African IWRM Phase II.
- The high level of interest maintained until the end.

It emerged through discussions of Day One that:

1. The scale at which IWRM was being implemented was critical as households were targeted and involved: this is the lowest level at which IWRM can be undertaken.
2. There were similarities in all countries, mostly the need to address poverty and to empower communities; to involve women in a significant fashion (especially in the ownership and decision making).
3. It is important to ensure sustainability throughout the project, this requires ownership from inception (during the formulation of the project) to implementation, relevance of the project to the needs of the community, efficient use of resources (people, in-kind and financial resources) available.
4. Common challenges include effective ownership by all (sometimes part of the community or gender are not sufficiently represented), community mobilization especially obtaining the household (non-authority) input and involvement and the integration with other initiatives by the relevant authorities (to avoid duplication and to add real value).

5. DAY TWO, SESSION ONE: IWRM INDICATORS

5.1. IWRM Monitoring Framework /SADC

Dr Barbara van Koppen of the International Water Management Institute (IWMI) made a Powerpoint presentation on the Monitoring Framework of the five demonstration projects. This is aimed to be a participatory project management tool of impact and process indicators for

- joint learning-by-doing
- critically analyzing and documenting impact and lessons learnt
- for up-scaling field-tested IWRM innovations through SADC

She presented the two objectives:

- (1) *The IWRM livelihood impact indicators* and the impact matrix assessment for ex- ante and ex-post impact assessment,
- (2) *'How to do' participatory process indicators* (by project phase) with the following steps:
 - pre-project scoping
 - introducing IWRM concept
 - crafting a non-elite interface between project and community
 - identifying, prioritizing and co-designing sub-projects (technology choice, site-selection!)
 - transparent budget, own contributions, and accountancy;
 - Implementing work plan efficiently
 - exit strategy

This was illustrated by examples from the different projects.

This presentation led to a discussion on indicators, with, notably Mr Charles Reeve from the European Commission (EU) proposing the following five kinds of indicators:

- Input indicators
- Process indicators
- Output indicators
- Outcome indicators

- Impact indicators (which were more of a long term nature).

The exact classification of an indicator would also depend on the nature of a project and the level at which, in the hierarchy of the project (goals, objectives, outputs, activities) the specific indicator was used.

5. 2. Zambia: Local IWRM indicators: South Africa

Mr Shadreck Nsongela of the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) in Zambia made a Powerpoint presentation on the Namwala IWRM and Food Security project, Namwala being of the two pilot areas of the Zambia IWRM project. The WWF is the implementing agent for the project.

The project is aimed at demonstrating the food security, livelihoods and poverty reduction benefits of implementing IWRM principles and practices. The presentation was aimed at complementing and illustrating the earlier presentation by Dr van Koppen.

In defining possible project indicators, the following pointers were provided:

- Diverse use of water: Have project interventions led to more diverse use of water/water resources?
- Increased Productivity: Have project interventions led to increased water productivity?
- Improved Availability/Accessibility to water: Have project interventions led to increased availability of water/accessibility to water?
- Increased food security: Have project interventions resulted in increased food productivity and security?

The question of the opportunities for up-scaling was also raised in concluding the presentation.

5. 3. Local IWRM indicators: South Africa

Mr Roger Short made a Powerpoint Presentation on IWRM in South Africa with a focus on empowering marginalised communities to actively engage in local water management. This presentation was on a sustainable process recommending an empowerment conceptual model suggesting that:

- Linking capacity development to the concept of demonstrating that implementing IWRM can improve livelihoods and community well-being
- And then, communities will understand water management issues and be able to interact with new institutions.

This is the model being implemented in the South Africa case with communities in the Olifants-Doorn WMA and it was working. Several indicators were alluded to, including multilayered indicators building on international commitments such as the MDGs and the different conventions agreed upon by countries, mostly driven by the United Nations and national frameworks guided by National Development Plans, Department Strategic Plans and micro level/local plans. Other indicators were multi dimensional with a theoretical framework based on

- Institutional Climate
- Social and political structures
- Individual assets and capabilities
- Collective assets and capabilities

In practical terms, this could be measured by:

- The communities' incremental understanding of IWRM issues
- Their confidence and being part of society
- How do institutions and other bodies contribute to these?
- An intra-community learning for bettering livelihoods and well-being.

The discussions that followed raised the concern that IWRM was too big with the suggestion that it was wiser to stick to a little project, as demonstrated by the presentations made so far; that it was important to focus on delivery and that it was challenging to work with many people and institutions, considering, in addition, the political issues. The need for cooperative governance was however acknowledged, to foster institutional collaboration and the streamlining of efforts and resources for a common purpose. The Masibambane case in South Africa was cited as an example of such cooperative governance.

From the discussion that followed, it was agreed that indicators had to reflect the attributes of *quantity*, *quality* and had to be *time-bound*.

6. DAY TWO, SESSION TWO: IWRM INDICATORS: GROUP WORK

The composition of each group was already provided in the conference material (with each delegate being assigned a number of 1 to 5); minor adjustments had to be made to accommodate everyone. These groups consisted of a mix between different countries, professions and institutions.

6.1. Guide to group discussions on IWRM indicators

Considering the need to further brainstorm, in preparation for the next day when each project would have to focus on its own indicators, this session aimed to improve the identification and understanding of appropriate indicators from a generic perspective, within the development field.

The following questions were therefore given to each group:

- 1. Establish a comprehensive list of indicators as might be relevant to your project.*
- 2. Classify these indicators as either process indicators or outcome indicators*

6.2. Group report back on indicators

Each group took the freedom to deal with these questions at their convenience. The following are the summary of the group discussions:

6.2.1. Group 1

Group one chose to work on a hypothetical project defined as follows:

1. Goal: Poverty Alleviation

2. Processes:

- Sink two boreholes
- Dig irrigation canals

3. Inputs:

- Financial resources
- Expertise

4. Output:

- Water available to irrigate 10ha of land

From this, the group agreed on the following indicators:

5. Outcome Indicators:

- No of households benefiting from the resource /No. of jobs created
- Volume and variety of grown/crops produced
- Erosion/salinization/sedimentation problems

6. Impact Indicators:

- Increase in Income generated
- Improved food security
- Reduced Incidence of diseases

6.2.2. Group 2

Group 2 listed some indicators without classifying them, the proposed the following:

- Increased purchasing power of the people
- Reduced mortality and morbidity rate through water in the region
- Increased food production
- Reduced conflicts over water
- Well structured groups
- Well functioning cooperatives structures
- Number of women accessing resources

- Responses to institutions to water governance
- Increase in water efficiency (domestic/farming)
- Improve stakeholder participation
- Reduce distance to water points
- Increase job creation
- Water resource use
- Reduce density of water invasion plants
- Established institutions to deal with IWRM concepts
- Improved coverage of water supply and sanitation

6.2.3. Group 3

Like Group 2, Group 3 listed its own indicators as follows:

- Increase by 20% of civil society organisation involved in community facilitation by the end of 2008
- Volume of water used per person for domestic use
- Proportion of communities people accessing portable water by gender
- More women and man using more water for more uses
- Participatory planning at community level
- Local participatory forums established and meeting regularly
- Increase in number of food secured households
- Recovering of shallow wells/boreholes
- Effective water demand management techniques Catchment
- More people engaging in Agro-business
- Involvement of local leadership
- Participatory consultations at all levels
- Integrated development plans in place
- Increased percentage of honesty among group members

Consolidation

- 20% increase in number of CSO involved in facilitating community drivers development by 2008

- 150 liters of water used per person per day for more than one use by 2010

6.2.3. Group 4

Group 4 discussed the following indicators and classified as them follows:

Indicator	Type
Improved food security	Impact
Improved ownership by women	Outcome
Volume of production	Output/outcome
Volume of sales	Output/outcome
Improved access to water	Outcome
Improved income/profit	Outcome
Improved health	Impact
Improved Sanitation practices	Outcome
Improved agriculture production	Outcome
Improved active participation of women in water management	Process
Increased irrigation area	Output
Establishment of water management institutions	Process
Improved water quality	Outcome/impact
Job creation	Outcome/impact

6.2.5. Group 5

Group 5 agreed to the following indicators, most of them classified:

Outcome indicators

- Quantity and quality of water
- Number of people by gender
- Number of water resource uses
- Effective community based organisations
- Household income levels

- Production and food security levels
- Time and distance to water points

Process indicators

- Number of community organisation managing the water resource
- Stakeholder participation and involvement
- Project conceptualisation and development
- Capacity of communities to interact with local government
- Employment creation
- Business and entrepreneurship development
- Number of water points and other related water infrastructure
- Number of women/men trained in water resource management, use and maintenance

Impact indicators

- Improved standards of living
- Emergence of women and men in leadership positions
- Level of awareness across stakeholders
- Incidence of water borne diseases

Unclassified indicators

- Integration of capacity building of cross cutting issues
- Level of understanding of ecosystems
- Spin off of activities which are contributions to livelihood
- Increased local level financial accountability
- Water quality

6.3 Summary on group discussions on indicators

The indicators presented by each group do not reflect the level of discussion that went into agreeing on each. These discussions were based on a sharing of experience and understanding,

meaning that each participant had the opportunity to contribute to the debate. In the process, there was a greater understanding by all of the need for indicators in preparation for the following day's session on each project.

It became clear that the focus of a project determines the indicators as well as the type of the indicator for that specific project. This also means that the same indicator may be classified differently from one project to another.

Considering that most projects have a focus on improving livelihoods through effective water management and using water as a catalyst, some indicators that are likely to feature in most projects are related to:

- Job creation and income generation
- Level of ownership and involvement in decision making
- Ownership of resources by women and their representation in decision making
- Improved food security
- Involvement of local authorities and integration with local development plans
- Improved access to water (such as through distance traveled to a water point)
- Improved water quality
- Improved health

7. DAY TWO, SESSION THREE: UP-SCALING

Mr Ole Houmøller made a Powerpoint presentation on up- scaling. He stated that the up-scaling was meant to ensure that the good practises and lessons from the projects become the norm when local and national government engage in water resources planning and water supply. He emphasized the role of local government, the need to fit with their planning system and the role of communities as well as that of national governments.

He ended by introducing the group discussions on up-scaling.

8. DAY TWO, SESSION FOUR: UP SCALING: GROUP WORK

8.1. Guide to group discussions: up- scaling

The same group composition was kept as for the session on indicators. This session was equally meant to prepare for the next day when each project team would work on its own up scaling.

The following questions were given for group discussions:

- (1) How do we ensure that projects can be up-scaled?*
- (2) What are important preconditions for up-scaling?*
- (3) What can WE do to facilitate and support up-scaling?*

(WE meaning: the project, communities, local government and national government)

8.2. Group reports back on Up-scaling

8.2.1. Group 1

Group 1 responded to questions (2) and (3) as follows:

Pre conditions for Up-scaling

- Buy-in by Political/Traditional Leaders
- Awareness/consultation at the outset
- Project should fit in the Integrated Development Plan (IDP)
- Monitoring-Lessons learned to inform process (project success potential)
- Institutional (Local Authority) Capacity - human and financial

How can we facilitate and support up-scaling (we-project, communities, Local government)

- Political will from Central Government
- Resource mobilization and support at both National and Local Authority levels
- Exposure and marketing

8.2.2. Group 2

Group 2 responded to questions (2) and (3) as follows:

Preconditions	Up-scaling
Community awareness and ownership	Awareness creation
Successfully sustainable project	Use of champions from successful projects
Use existing leadership and administration structures	Exchange visits
Communication own contributions	Replicability
Institutionalise program into government policy	Existence of opportunity
	Addresses felt needs
	Enabling environment
	Capacity building

8.2.3. Group 3

Group 3 responded to the three questions as follows:

Ensuring up-scaling projects:

1. Project monitoring and evaluation
 - Draw lessons relating to
 - a. Government policies
 - b. MDGs
 - c. Civil Society
 - Quantify impacts cost benefits
2. Communication strategy:
 - share lessons learnt and best practices
 - marketing expertise (how you package information)
 - exchange visits/earning journeys

Pre-conditions for up-scaling

- Have a re-packaged IWRM concept that appropriate e.g. What for achieving MDGs
- Set up guidelines norms, standards

Facilitating up-scaling

- Stakeholders involvement
 - exchanges
 - workshops
 - learning journeys
- Use of rights based approach
- Understanding
- Responsibilities
- Link community plans to local, provincial, national plans

8.2.4. Group 4

Group 4 responded to the three questions as follows:

Ensuring up - scaling of projects

- Involve government/decision makers in the planning and implementation
- Document the projects
- Presentation of project results to local government forum/traditional leaders/decision makers
- Presentation of project proposals to financial committees for budget allocations
- Dissemination of project information and achievements
- Champions to coach new projects (business opportunity)
- Awareness raising on the projects
- Project are part of municipality/local government plans
- Empowerment into local government process (knowing their entitlement)

Preconditions

- engage key institutions and stakeholders
- confirm contribution of the project to the needs of the targeted project area
- collaboration between project community and government
- institutional readiness

- finances
- project must have been successful
- Monitoring and evaluation

Facilitating and supporting up-scaling:

- Project level
 - Inclusion, participation and communication
- Communities
 - Internalise, coaching and mentoring
- Local government
 - Support and report, platform for experience sharing
- National government
 - Policies and platform for experience sharing

8.2.3. Group 5

Group 5 responded to the 3 questions as follows:

Ensuring up-scaling of projects

- Address Felt needs
- Identification and Inclusion of all stakeholders in the Project cycle.
- Interest should be shown
- Project approaches should be aligned with national policies and strategies.
- Develop feasibility studies for local government
- Meet other sector and stakeholder needs

Preconditions

- Success (portrayed)
- Communication and lobbying across board
- Finances
- Planning for up scaling
- Documentation of the project process and lessons
- Dissemination Structures

- People's interest, willingness and mutual trust
- Capacity building of stakeholders
- Champion to drive up scaling process

Facilitating and supporting up-scaling

- Utilizing existing structures
- Awareness creation through different media
 - Stakeholders
 - Potential beneficiaries
 - Policy makers
 - Newsletter for policy makers
- Linkage with International Organisations
 - Talk shows

8.3. Summary of group discussions on up-scaling

The following generic points emerged as essential for achieving the effective up-scaling of development projects (such as those which were the focus of this workshop):

- The need for champions (to act as ambassadors of good projects, for their replication)
- The necessity to highlight a success story which would inspire other projects
- The need to document experience impacts and lessons learned for future reference
- Undertaking a targeted information dissemination drive, especially towards decision makers and other potential beneficiaries
- Capacity building for community and local authority in order to support and facilitate up- scaling
- Demonstrating the financial sustainability of existing projects is a good incentive for up-scaling.
- It is important that up-scaling is undertaken as part of the broad development plans of the relevant jurisdiction (local authority, province) and in consistency

with the policies in place and as far as possible have local authority involved in the project from the start

9. DAY TWO: SUMMARY

As summarised in Sections 6.3 (Summary on Indicators) and 8.3 (Summary on Up-scaling) above; the insight gained on both indicators and opportunities for up-scaling were inputs that would feed into project specific discussions for the next day.

The presentations and discussions on IWRM indicators and up-scaling have, therefore, contributed to better capacitate all participants in understanding their relevance for their projects. They have further suggested some pointers towards indicators and up-scaling (as summarised in 6.3 and 8.3).

With specific regard to indicators, the need for a broader presentation on the Logical Framework Analysis (LFA) for project formulation and Monitoring and Evaluation was discussed, but this was not deemed appropriate for this workshop.

Two great achievements of this day were:

1. The effectiveness of the group discussions through the diversity of experiences, the views shared, resulting in each participant gaining a better insight on both indicators and up-scaling.
2. The ability to fit in the two themes with the presentations, group discussions and groups report back into the programme without compromising the quality of each session. One key constraint was to finish on time in order to proceed with the game drive at 16:30.

A game viewing drive in the Pilanesburg National Park took place followed by a bush braai at the Bakubung Boma in the evening.

10. DAY THREE, SESSION ONE: PROJECT SPECIFIC GROUP WORK

10.1. Introduction to project specific working groups

The previous days have been a gradual built-up to this specific day where each project would dedicate time to revisit their project and firm up their indicators and consider the opportunities for up-scaling. This was therefore the D-day of the workshop in terms of effectively applying the insight from the previous day to each project on both the indicators and up-scaling.

The facilitator introduced the programme of the day, insisting on the necessity to maximize the gains of the previous days to better formulate the indicators that would be applicable to the respective projects and to identify opportunities for up-scaling.

The need for local authorities to take ownership of the outcomes of the discussions was stressed, in view of the up- scaling opportunities that this provided to them to achieve their mandate of service delivery; building on the lessons of these projects. Their feedback will therefore be valuable as scheduled on the programme.

The six countries went into group discussions, to deal each with their respective projects:

- 1. Defining/refining their indicators*
- 2. Agreeing on how to go about up-scaling*

10.2. Parallel discussions

The need to clarify the monitoring framework for some countries called for dedicated discussions aimed at defining roles and responsibilities between the implementing and the monitoring and evaluation agents as well as the level of monitoring and the practical arrangements logistical for carrying out these tasks.

These discussions took place while the countries were working on their projects.

11. DAY THREE, SESSION TWO: REPORT BACK

The detailed projects report back is available at www.sadcwater.com. They are comprehensive in most instances and cannot be reproduced here in their entirety. The following is therefore a summary of the key issues on indicators and up-scaling which highlights key features of these reports.

11. 1. Project specific report back

The six countries presented their reports in a plenary session in the following order: Mozambique, Malawi, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland and Zambia on the projects. All countries demonstrated an understanding of the purpose and necessity of formulating indicators that were appropriate for the monitoring of IWRM in their projects and discussed their proposed strategies for achieving up-scaling of good practices and lessons from the projects.

11.1.1. On Indicators

Each country is at a different level of the implementation of their project, with Namibia mostly still at process definition level.

The indicators defined were therefore specific to each project. For the four projects from Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland and Zambia, the indicators were predominantly mostly outcome indicators with a mix of process indicators. The following example is an illustration from Mozambique which had set the done with a concise yet clear and comprehensive report back on *'Improved Livelihoods of Ndonga Village communities through locally based land and water resources management, using IWRM principles.'*

The following are the outcomes of the project from Mozambique with the proposed indicators:

Outcomes	Indicators
1. Improved food security	At least 75% of Ndonga HouseHolds have secured food all year round from the first year of the end of project cycle Number of food & cash crops variety increased by 75%

2. Improved security against negative socio-economic effects of flooding	At least 20% Food production stored yearly for the flooding prone period. At least 20% of agriculture produce used as source of income from the first year of the end of project cycle
3. Improved Governance of water related resources	At least the annual key district planning meetings involve the village representatives
4. Improved active participation of women in land & water resources management	All social groups are represented in the water management. Units and benefit from the project At least 40% of water management members are female

Mozambique also presented other indicators on the outputs and processes.

In the case of Namibia, considering that they are still at the initiation of their project, they dwelt more on process indicators such as:

- Production of Inception Report
- Broader Stakeholders Consensus Established
- Stakeholders Capacity strengthened and Built
- Pilot Projects Implemented
- Omaruru Basin Management Committee Established

South Africa presented a LFA of their community pilot projects with a detailed list of indicators.

11.1.2. On Up- scaling

All countries recognized the need and identified conditions for up-scaling. The role of involving decision makers (at appropriate levels), the needs for documenting experiences, for

disseminating of project information and for champions were mentioned as strategies for up-scaling.

As an illustration, Mozambique proposed the following strategies::

- Develop a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework for the project
- Engage in the Steering Committee (SC) influent political and technical institutions related with land & water resources
- Use existing community consultation councils to introduce the project in the planning process
- Document and disseminate project information, lessons learnt and best practices to key stakeholders, (communities local and national government) through brochures, guidelines, press, radio, TV & workshops

Of particular importance was the mention of a Toolbox that would guide communities in the process of up-scaling. An existing Toolbox that could be customized to the needs of the projects was mentioned.

11.2. Local authorities' perspective

At the end of this session, the representatives of local authorities, the ultimate custodians of each project, were requested to express their views, provide their advice and share their expectations.

The following views were expressed:

- An overall acknowledgement of the value of the workshop, especially the opportunity for experience sharing which had been beneficial through the lessons learnt from other countries;
- The high expectations raised by the project and the impatience for delivery on the ground,
- The confirmation that the projects were important as they were having a direct impact on improving livelihoods at household level and were 'pilot' cases, offering an opportunity for replication or up – scaling.
- The commitment to the success of the project for the benefit of their communities

- The acknowledgement of the need for up-scaling and the required resources that needed to be mobilized.
- Gratitude towards Danida for supporting the projects and to SADC for providing an enabling environment.

11.3. Summary: benefits to each project

It is clear that after the report back session, each project had gained from the workshop by revisiting and refining their indicators in the light of the discussions held during the workshop. Equally they have identified up-scaling opportunities. The reports from each project showed that each had customised the information shared during the workshop to their specific context.

It is therefore expected that at the next workshop, each project will demonstrate progress in relation to each. However, while the indicators are within the scope of each project, the issue of up-scaling will require a work plan, the implication of several other roleplayers, under the custodianship of local authorities with their communities.

On the indicators, each project is expected to demonstrate how they will be used to guide the attainment of the objectives. The monitoring team will also use them as a basis for monitoring and supporting each project..

12. DAY THREE, SESSION THREE: CLOSING SESSION

During this session, delegates were asked to fill in a two page evaluation form (as discussed Part III below, summary of outcomes: evaluation of the workshop by the participants).

The closing session had two speakers, one from the SADC Regional Water Programme on the way forward and the other from the SADC Water Division for closing remarks.

12.1. The way forward

Mr Ole Houmøller made a Powerpoint presentation during which he:

- Revisited the purpose of the workshop (experience sharing, up-scaling and indicators) and confirmed that they were achieved, considering the outcomes of the different sessions.

- Outlined the way forward in the form of:
 - Follow up country workshops to concretise the outcome of the deliberations of this regional workshop at project level
 - A follow up regional workshop where the different projects would be expected to demonstrate the gains of this workshop through the progress to be achieved by then.
 - Further networking, with the papers presented at this workshop being also posted on the web at www.sadcwater.com
- Thanked the Regional Water Programme staff involved in the preparation of the workshop, especially Ms Linda Kamoto and Ms Tania Kruger.
- Wished a safe journey back home to the participants

12.2. SADC

Mr Christmas Maheri of the SADC Water Division had the following closing words:

- He thanked all the delegates for their active participation in the workshop.
- He expressed the wish that this programme is extended to the other SADC countries considering that they all had the same challenges and needs
- He thanked the team of the SADC Water Regional Programme for the hard work and preparation that had lead to a successful workshop. He recognised that the venue had also been conducive to good deliberations.
- He wished all the delegates a safe journey back to their countries and homes.

PART III: SUMMARY OF OUTCOMES

1. KEY OUTCOMES

Considering its set objectives, the following are the key outcomes of the workshop as emanating from the different sessions:

1. The sharing of experiences on implementing participatory community based projects has equipped the participants with sufficient insight to better implement their projects in their respective countries; in this regard, the workshop was a learning experience.
2. A draft framework for IWRM indicators and an improved definition of such indicators relevant to each project, with focus on process and outcome indicators,
3. A draft framework for the process for up-scaling, including the identification of conditions and strategies with the involvement of local authorities
4. A greater ownership of the projects by the local authorities – as custodians of the welfare of the communities - present in the workshop and a confirmation of the contribution of the projects to the local development agenda, despite their relative small size
5. A confirmation that the financial sustainability of the projects was achievable, lending credibility to the prospects of up-scaling,
6. The streamlining of the roles and responsibilities of the different parties involved in each project, especially the implementers and the monitoring agents and their level of intervention. This will be through a monitoring framework customized to each project
7. The acknowledgement of the need for proper gender mainstreaming in each project, with a clearer understanding of the challenges for the effective involvement of women and an attempt to address this through indicators in the framework.
8. The realization that despite the different contexts, the experiences in all countries were similar, with ownership of the projects by the beneficiary communities being paramount to their success.
9. Despite the level of development and adoption of water policy and laws, the success of actions on the ground did not depend solely on such policies or laws. It is dictated by the need to achieve a sustainable impact in improving the livelihoods of communities through better access to water and other resources.

10. The commitment to succeed, no matter the challenges and the realization of a sense of a common destiny from the six participating countries.

2. SUMMARY ANALYSIS: EVALUATION OF THE WORKSHOP

The full evaluation of the workshop by the participants is included in Appendix A2. The following points emerge from this evaluation:

1. Most delegates agree that the workshop was participative, that they were sufficiently involved and that they gained some practical knowledge
2. The majority of delegates agree that the objectives of up- scaling and IWRM indicators were clear and that the workshop programme, including the presentations and group discussions, supported the attainment of these objectives
3. There is unanimity on the suitability of the venue, which was conducive to a good workshop
4. Most delegates found the logistical arrangements adequate, except for the need for translation for non- English speaking participants and the need to consider refunding travel costs in proportion to the distance traveled by delegates
5. The delegates found that the workshop had several strengths, including the structure of the programme which contributed to the sharing of experiences, the presentations, the facilitation, the material sent before the workshop, the working group sessions and, the participation of local authority representatives.
6. The most recurring weakness in the opinion of some participants is that there was no sufficient time to discuss all the issues; other issues include some presentations without case studies, the language barrier for non English speakers and the lack of clarity in the concepts used.
7. Suggestions for a follow up workshop are mixed and include a venue (Namibia), a proposal to hold it at a project site, the need to provide translation, the need for training in LFA and sending the documents well in advance.

APPENDICES

A1. WORKSHOP PROGRAMME

Time	Activity	Responsible
DAY ONE: WEDNESDAY 24 OCTOBER 2007		
7:00	<i>Drive from Pretoria to Bakubung Lodge Tea/Coffee upon arrival</i>	<i>All</i>
10:00 –	Session 1: Opening Session	
11:15	Welcome - SADC	Christmas Maheri
	Welcome – South Africa	Derek Weston
	Introductions & Objectives of the workshop	Ole Houmoller
11:15-	Session 2: Sharing of Experiences	
13:30	Malawi, Dzimphutsi	Frank Mwenechanya
	Danida Zambia	Litumelo Mate, Hastings Chibuye
	South Africa – Case 1	Faldee Abrahams
13:30 - 14:30	<i>Lunch</i>	
14:30-	South Africa – Case 2	Derek Weston
16:00		
	Session 3: External speakers	
	ILO – Gender, Poverty Eradication, Decent Work	Benedetta Magri
16:00	<i>Tea break</i>	

Time	Activity	Responsible
16:15- 17:45	FAO – Food Security	Roger Short On behalf of Jean Michel Arnaut
	IWRM Indicators	Jean Boroto
<i>19:00</i>	<i>Dinner</i>	
20:30	Evening Program - project presentations (informal)	Cancelled
DAY TWO: THURSDAY 25 OCTOBER 2007		
	Session 1: IWRM Indicators	
8:00 – 8:45	IWRM Monitoring Framework /SADC IWRM Indicators in Zambia	IWMI - Barbara v Koppen Shadreck Y. Nsongela
8:45 – 9:30	Local IWRM Indicators /SA	Roger Short
	Session 2: IWRM Indicators – Group Work	
9:30 – 9:40	Introduction to working groups	Jean Boroto
9:40 – 11:30	Group work on IWRM Indicators	All
<i>10:00</i>	<i>Tea</i>	
11:30 – 12:30 -	Report back group work	All
12:30- 12:40	Summary on Indicators	Jean Boroto
<i>12:40 –</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	

Time	Activity	Responsible
<i>13:30</i>		
	Session 3: Up-scaling	
13:30 – 14:00	Up-scaling Requirements	Ole Houmoller
	Session 4: Up-scaling – Group Work	
14:00 –	Introduction to Group work	Ole Houmoller
15:30	Group work	All
<i>15:00</i>	<i>Tea</i>	
15:30 –	Report back group work	All
16:30	Summary on Up-scaling	Ole Houmoller
<i>16:30</i>	<i>Game drive and Bush Braai</i>	
20:00	Evening Program – TBA	

DAY THREE: FRIDAY 26 OCTOBER 2007		
	Session 1: Project Specific Working Groups	
8:00	Introduction to Group work	Jean Boroto
8:15 – 12:30	Drafting project indicators / up-scaling activities	All
<i>12:30 - 13:30</i>	<i>Lunch</i>	

	Session 2: Report back	
13:30 – 15:30	Presentation of project indicators and up-scaling plans	All
	Local authority feedback	
15:00	<i>Tea</i>	
	Session 3: Closing Session	
15:30 – 16:00	Summary – were the objectives achieved?	Ole Houmoller
	Way forward	Ole Houmoller
	Closing remarks	Christmas Maheri
16:00	Delegates depart	

A2: WORKSHOP EVALUATION BY PARTICIPANTS

Summary Evaluation of the workshop: IWRM and Experience Sharing Workshop (IWRM Indicators and Up Scaling) Bakubung Bush Lodge, 24-26 October 2007

Note: x marks a response by a participant in the relevant boxes

This survey is divided into three sections:

- (1) On Experiencing sharing
- (2) On IWRM Indicators and Up scaling
- (3) Overall planning and running of the workshop

I. On experience sharing

Rate the level of experience Thank you for taking the time and effort to respond to this questionnaire. Please give your most candid and thorough response to the questions below. Rest assured that the information you share here is confidential.

The sharing between participants, as far as this first objective of the workshop is concerned:

- Almost none
- Could have been more participative and informative: xxxx
- Was adequately participative and enriching: xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxx

Rate the level of your involvement in the activities of this workshop

- Very uninvolved: x
- Somewhat involved: x
- Enthusiastically involved: xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xx

How much practical insight and knowledge have you gained from other s (presenters and participants) during this workshop?

- None:
- Some practical knowledge: xxxxx
- A great deal: xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxx

II. On IWRM Indicators and Up scaling

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
These two objectives where clear	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xxx	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx Xxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxx	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The workshop programme supported these objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xXxxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx x x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The presentations and information provided to support these objectives were adequate	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xx	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xx	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>
The group discussions	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
helped better understand these objectives.	xxxxx xx				

III. On overall planning and running of the workshop

a. The venue and facilities provided for the workshop

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The facilities (conference venue, meals, rooms) were adequate	[] xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx x	[]xxx	[]	[]	[]
Safety was not a concern	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx	xx		xx	x
The atmosphere was conducive to work (peaceful and quiet environment)	xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxx	xx			

What did you like most about this venue?

1. The tranquil surroundings/environment allowing good work xx
2. The good atmosphere and arrangements
3. The professional and social interactions
4. The isolation from busy towns was good
5. Private and it calls to be more concentrating, out of town
6. The conference and accommodation rooms
7. Excellent accommodation
8. Trip/game viewing
9. Beautiful and without disturbances
10. Conducive to a great workshop
11. It was quiet, staff very friendly and rooms are beautiful
12. Refreshing ideas
13. Quiet, relaxing, away from office but near enough
14. Has a pleasant ambiance
15. The environment was conducive to good thinking
16. Nice, comfortable place, conducive for work
17. The facilities, sitting arrangements and mind refreshing water and sweets
18. Case for nature, animals, birds and great accommodation, food and people
19. Good and clean well lit and water and drinks available
20. Just about everything
21. Peaceful and refreshing
22. Wildlife viewing, quiet place, good for serious business
23. Very little distraction from other conference groups
24. The hospitality of the staff was greatly appreciated
25. Everything
Ideal for participation and interaction on such serious issues as IWRM
26. It is quiet
27. Excellent rooms
28. Accommodation, rooms, food, landscape, location, everything

What did you not like about this venue?

1. It is very cold
2. Workshop close to the restaurant, a times the noise levels from patrons were interruptive
3. Arrangements of meeting rooms -was a bit too formal table arrangements
4. A bit too far from the airport
5. Electricity cuts
6. The conference room was big enough, however the seats were too close
7. Conference equipment was not up to standard
8. Lack of access to day to day requirements as related to shops
9. Aircon/ heating

b. On the logistical arrangements and communication

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The traveling and logistical arrangements were excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx xxxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxxx	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> x	<input type="checkbox"/>
Communication before and during the workshop was excellent	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx xxxxx xxxxxx xxxxx xx	<input type="checkbox"/> xxxxx x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Any suggestion on the logistical arrangements and communication

1. Lack of translation in other languages
2. There is need to give arrangements more time
3. If it could be possible to contact participants within time
4. Provide clear and updated maps
5. It was well functioning, good practice to replicate
6. Communication regarding workshop presentation was a bit late, proper preparations were not done
7. Please continue, you are second to none!!!
8. No extra transport refunds were given, participants come from different sites (locations) with the country hence different costs of travel
9. Staying in Jacaranda was not well coordinated as people who arrived first stayed without lunch
10. Need to reconsider rate of incidentals
11. It was adequate and we were kept up to date, thanks
12. Participants should commit themselves at an early stage min 2weeks before and stay to the end
13. Should have communicated on the workshop requirements such as documents needed

c. On the strengths and weaknesses of the workshop in relation to the set objectives

What were the major strengths of this workshop to support the attainment of the objectives?

1. Sharing of experiences
2. The programme was very goal directed
3. The work group mixed all people
4. Some relevant presentations
5. Up- scaling
6. The presenters have vast information about the SADC countries
7. Strong moderator
8. Inclusion of presentations as well as group work discussions
9. Need to increase incidental allowance
10. Very solid presentations
11. Room for great discussions
12. The experience sharing and how it was structured
13. Setting up of indicators for the regional projects was also a great idea to give us a chance to seriously look at our projects and what our objectives are
14. Open, good facilitation
15. Free discussions

16. Strategic focus in alignment
17. Interactive
18. Case studies
19. Lesson sharing
20. Information materials distribution
21. Views/opinions exchanged between participants
22. To clarify and agree on understanding and way forward: good participatory value; participation well encouraged
23. Good mix of background/inspiration and group work
24. Good facilitation and preparation
25. Atmosphere and venue and amongst participants
26. The strategy of having participants work in groups was the major strength. This gave participants a chance to get involved
27. Time keeping
28. Material supply
29. Good presentations
30. Excellent facilitator
31. Meals were excellent
32. Organisation was excellent
33. Group work was rewording
34. Excellent facilitation, flexible but clear structures
35. Degree of involvement of participants
36. Widespread professional competences and experiences
37. Good facilitator, contributed to the attainment of the objectives
38. The sharing of experiences amongst countries in the region
39. Very interactive
40. Facilitation
41. Very well facilitated
42. Small groups, a lot came out of the sessions and they cleared matters which were vital for discussions and feedback
43. Experience sharing as we picked up method/processes which other countries used which we missed and which could prove valuable for our projects
44. Progress or improved relationship with local government
45. Ideas from the various participants were enriching and contributed to the strength of the workshop
46. Was very participative
47. Diversity (6 countries), 3 Danida programmes together
48. The few projects presented on practical experience

What were the major weaknesses of this workshop, what would you like to see improved next time?

- Would have liked to have presentations from other workshops
- The first day was little interactive, a one-way communication, resulting in loss of attention during important presentations
1. Clarity on indicators
 2. The time allocated to the work was too short especially when it is your first time to attend
 3. The facilitators should summarise with suggestions to assess the group works
 4. Need for more presentations from different countries
 5. I think the EU guy almost derailed the process with his views on indicators and he should have been called to order
 6. Other persons could not participate in plenary and group discussions due to language barrier
 7. Availability of IWRM information and electronic media sites distribution
 8. Clear definition of concepts (outcome, process, implications, indicators etc...) from the beginning could have helped a great deal
 9. A short background and status paper on the projects could have been useful to buy more time for group work
 10. Time management that resulted in country presentations not being possible
 11. Some presentations required for distribution to carry for future references
 12. Time was not adequate
 13. There was always no time to finish everything
 14. Case studies not well elaborated
 15. Time has been a constraint
 16. Every participant should be at least present at feedback session or be a scribe
 17. The weakness noticed was the absence of clear definitions of what actually was expected from the various projects
 18. People from the same country should not be sitting next to each other
 19. The presentations should be elaborate with good examples from practical projects (e.g. gender and up-scaling presentations needed this)

Suggestions for the next workshop

1. It was a well organized and objective driven workshop
2. Indicators and monitoring of the projects
3. Gender in the projects management
4. For good impact of the project implementation, need to be given more time to understand what needs to be done
5. To get participants from related sectors such as agriculture, environment

6. Also consider making venue arrangements close to shopping areas
7. Have a follow up workshop in another country, with maybe a site visit to one of the projects
8. Maybe exhibition formal
9. Maybe a session to encourage networking (ice breakers)
10. Accommodate people who can't speak English
11. Start at 8h30 and extend the finishing time
12. Consolidate day proceedings/group work and distribute the next day
13. Workshop on LFA will be useful next time
14. To be held in project sites for face to face (outside) sharing of experience
15. The time for interactions in some instances was not sufficient
16. Better preparation for participants coming to the workshop, forwarding documents participants in good time could have helped
17. Invite Lusaka Embassy again
18. Despite the time management aspect that needs to be improved, the next workshop should be an up-scale from this
19. To arrange one soon in order to keep the ideas alive before they soon run out dry
20. Improve on number of days (duration of workshop)
21. Consider variation in allowances depending on distance individuals originate from which are not uniform
22. Important to give adequate follow up based on results of this workshop
23. Include session for participants to address challenges cited in case studies
24. Time versus content need reconsideration
25. For the countries to be able to take experiences from the IWRM indicators and scaling up and fit them in a framework/strategic guide
26. Local government from all the countries should also be invited
27. Namibia
28. Circulate progress reports from all projects in advance
29. Need practical presentations with clear discussions and conclusions