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* Even within our thematic group MUS members not always have similar understanding of the concepts we use.
* Ecosan always requires donor funding.
* NGOs are too much focusing on the end-user groups while private companies look for financing. Interlinkage is needed!
* We need to try to get both funders and clients to focus on the outcome, not on water provision, IWRM, MUS or whatever you call it. It is about poverty reduction.
* MUS is as much about markets as about marketing.
* Find out if there are legal barriers to ecological sanitation or MUS. EU has strict rules for example.
* Health does not sell sanitation.
* Data constraints, especially financial data (Marieke´s presentation).
* MUS is a concept for which we need practical tools, other sectors are struggling with this too. Donors want solutions.
* Nice angle on livelihood protection and self-supply: let’s follow up on this.
* What happens if self-supply gets out of hand? Look at India´s groundwater
* Not to be afraid of complexity and avoid being too prescriptive – present options and benefits that may be realized
* IWRM in rural development context? Livelihoods approach lends itself to that. Operationalize it?
* Taking questions back – how to look at different options for making irrigation systems. How does it relate to poverty?
* Questions about the stakeholders – how to get them together and get them visioning?
* I like the complexity of MUS – it makes me clear that we can enjoy a lot of options without choosing the best one
* Decision making tools and approaches that can embody what this approach is all about? Is it an approach which allows irrigation and domestic sector to come together and consider different options?
* Nice to get a pragmatic approach to EcoSan. On MUS and self-supply – they are closely related and both try to sell a concept rather than a finite option. Time to get a better picture visually about what you’re talking about?
* The example of Beijing and EcoSan I’ll take home – spectrum of options available for wastewater reuse on a larger scale.
* Experiences on MUS with Government.
* Urban EcoSan was new for me. It’s the agents who make it complicated by having different sectors for different uses.
* Nice concepts behind money into water and water into money
* Let’s try it – go put it in the ground – pilot within a municipality
* Focus on rural settings was refreshing and although the differences are getting blurry. Showing the value of multiplicity of values for multiple users. Bring different funding streams together to show this concept, linked to markets and market forces.