

Minutes of the MUS Group meeting 25 Feb 2010

1. Welcome and introduction

Stef Smits provided a welcome to all attendants. He explained that a MUS Group meeting normally consists of a content- and a business-part. The content had been addressed in the preceding two days, so this day only focused on the business and activities of the Group.

As all had been participating in the previous days, no round of introduction was done. A full list of all participants can be found in Annex 1.

2. Introducing the MUS Group

As there were various new participants, Barbara van Koppen (as coordinator of the Group) provided background to the Group and its functioning. She did so using the governance guidelines that were reviewed since the last meeting in Rome. This then also served to confirm the governance guidelines, which can be found at <http://www.musgroup.net/page/738>.

3. Matters arising from the previous meeting

All participants had received the minutes of the previous meeting. Stef presented only the action points from that meeting. It was agreed that these would be addressed along the agenda of the day, under the following items:

- 2 pagers for MUS Group/FAO publication: see item 5
- CPWF synthesis paper: see item 8
- Gerardo van Halsema to check whether WUR would become core member: nothing heard back, see item 9
- UN task force: see item 6
- Membership survey: not done, see item 9
- Technical request MASSCOTE: pending, see item 9
- Workshop on CBA indicators: done in preceding days
- Update website with info on funders: done, see item 9
- Updating governance guidelines: done, see previous item

4. Matters arising from the CBA workshop

The topic of cost and benefits (and related financial and economic analysis) of MUS was exhausted during the preceding 3 days. The discussion then focused on how to take these deliberations forward in the form of concrete actions. Stef's proposal was accepted that the main way of direct documentation of the workshop was in the form of a synthesis report to be made available before end March, and he will be responsible. In addition, there will be a 2-3 page summary which contains guidance on how to use the discussed tools and methods.

This discussion was expanded to include broader issues of advocacy activities. It was agreed that for advocacy at global levels we will need an updated advocacy brochure. This can build upon the briefing note prepared by RiPPLE. There may be the need to make 2 or 3 versions of this to target different audiences, such as WASH investors (e.g. UNICEF) or irrigation system managers. In addition, we will make one brochure which will specifically highlight cost and benefits. Also AMCOW as regional body would be an important audience. For now, we will not organise a big global advocacy event, such as a donor roundtable, but rather take an opportunistic approach. Finally, there was acknowledgement for the need for more targeted advocacy at country level. We didn't discuss specific strategies for that. This is best left to members who can work on that together in their respective countries.

Finally, a discussion was held on the status of case material on the website, much of which contains relevant CBA information. However, it is not always easy to search the case study database as cases are spread out over the website, and do not have common key words. It is agreed that Stef will bring all the case studies under the same “link”, look into possibilities for improving the website structure to facilitate searches, and provide guidance to members on how to present case material.

Action points

- Write synthesis report of the CBA workshop: Stef Smits
- Drafting 2-3 pager guidance note on the use of CBA methods at project level: Stef Smits
- Drafting new advocacy brochure (with 2 or 3 versions) based on RiPPLE note: Barbara van Koppen
- Drafting advocacy brochure on costs and benefits: Daniel Renault
- Provide links and short abstracts according to Stef’s guidance on the MASSMUS and SADC/DANIDA cases: Daniel Renault and Barbara van Koppen
- Bring all the 300+ case studies under the same “link”
- Look into possibilities for improving structure of website: Stef Smits
- Provide guidance to members on how to present case material for uploading as case (or link) on website: Stef

5. FAO/MUS Group Publication

Daniel Renault explained the background to the idea of making a publication on MUS by the MUS Group, to be published as part of the well-renowned FAO publication series. See also the minutes of the Rome meeting <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1136>. In follow-up to the Rome meeting, 2 pagers were made with the outline of each chapter. However, in making this write-up, big conceptual discussions ensued, some of which have been resolved during the past few days. At the same time, Daniel announced that he has less time and resources than anticipated in 2009 to work on the publication, and that it would be safer to aim for completing the publication in 2010.

It was agreed that Daniel will work on addressing some of the issues in chapter 2 and send this to the reviewers (Martin Keijzer, Saskia Nijhof and Audrey Nepveu) by April. At the same time, he will work on a detailed plan for the resources required and time line. This can then help in identifying whether we need to hire a consultant, so that we don’t embark on writing without being sure whether there are resources to finalise it.

Action points

- Work on chapter 2, based on discussions: Daniel Renault
- Send all outlines to reviewers: Daniel Renault (early April)
- Make a plan for the outline, resources required and deadline: Daniel Renault (for decision-making end April).

6. UN Water task force

Daniel reported on progress made with the idea that came up in Rome to have a task force under UN Water on MUS. He had circulated a proposal to that end to a small group that contains four elements: 1) Mapping MUS globally, 2) Pilot and test assessment methodology, 3) MUS reflected in world water report and 4) Country level assessment and coordination.

UN Water liked the proposal but is still discussing how it can be operationalised and establish linkages with other UN Water Task Forces (see <http://www.unwater.org/activities.html>). Two entry points for operationalizing are at country level (in one or more of the following proposed focus countries: Mozambique, Pakistan, Rwanda, Tanzania and Vietnam), or linked to the thematic programme on IWRM. There could also be an opportunity to link to TF on Gender and Water. Neither is there clarity on resource allocation. The following points were raised:

- We will just wait and see what comes out of this, and not anticipate now any operational decisions. Daniel will keep us updated.
- The main things we can expect are: 1) making MUS visible at global level by addressing it better in global reporting and 2) making MUS visible in country level reporting and coordination at country level.
- The link with the IWRM thematic programme triggered a question on how to position MUS vis a vis IWRM. It was agreed not to open that discussion now, but re-emphasise what we formulated earlier at Istanbul: MUS is about water service provision and at the lower levels.

Action points:

- Circulate the proposal as submitted to UN Water: Daniel

7. Round of update with new activities and opportunities from members

- SEI: There is no direct MUS update. Monique is working on a database of case studies on agricultural water management at watershed level. This is only peripherally linked to MUS.
- EkoRural: writing a proposal on farmer-field schools, and inclusion of water management in these.
- Vietnam Academy for Water Resources: report of the audit for MASSMUS (as presented earlier this week) is ready and available on the FAO website http://www.fao.org/nr/water/topics_irrig_mus.html. Now busy establishing a team for auditing of irrigation systems, with a MUS lens.
- RiPPLE/HCS: in follow-up to the RiPPLE studies and visit between RiPPLE and RAIN, they are now busy in various stakeholder fora to ensure follow-up. There is also a scoping study on formal and informal water management arrangements. Last but not least, RiPPLE seeks to mould into a sector resource centre, in which MUS may play a role.
- Plan International. It is too big to give a full overview of all Plan offices. But, Plan Netherlands is supporting projects in Zambia, Ghana and Sri Lanka, which have a MUS focus. Martin asks whether members would like to review some of the project docs as that may help articulating MUS more.
- Intercooperation (IC): is mainly working with agricultural water management in many of the implemented rural development programmes. Since 2005 IC is also providing thematic support on Water for Food related issues to SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation). Through this backstopping mandate IC contributes to networking (e.g. by participation in MUS group). Furthermore, IC has recently entered into a strategic partnership with HELVETAS who covers more the expertise in drinking water and sanitation.
- RAIN Foundation. Starting work on MUS in Nepal, linking both water and sanitation to multiple-use, e.g. biogas production. There is ongoing work on MUS in Ethiopia with sand dams. Finally, they will do some awareness raising on MUS for partners. Both Plan and RAIN provided an update of funding for thematic programmes for Dutch NGO alliances. Plan participated initially in a WASH alliance, but for certain reasons it had to step out of it. RAIN remained in the alliance, and a framework proposal has been submitted, and news on proposal awarding will follow on 1 April. There is some space for MUS in the full proposal development phase as currently it is very much WASH only. Saskia Nijhof replaces Kirstin Neke as contact person for RAIN Foundation.
- DWA. Connie September highlighted that South Africa has been at the forefront of MUS. This is partially done through research by the WRC (see a recent report on productive use of piped water supply (http://www.wrc.org.za/Pages/DisplayItem.aspx?ItemID=8605&FromURL=%2fPages%2fKH_DocumentsList.aspx%3fdt%3d1%26su%3dc4%26ms%3d4%253b11%253b). The Department of Water Affairs has also engaged a lot with the MUS group, but a key issue is now to move to implementation and local government is key to that. Marna de Lange added that they need tools for RWH assessment.

- IWMI Ghana. Has been involved in research and documentation of de facto mus of small reservoirs in Ghana and Burkina Faso. Next month, an inventory of these reservoirs will be finished and then can be validated by sector stakeholders. This inventory will be followed by in-depth studies of a sample of 30 reservoirs. In November, there was the first Ghana Water Week, but it proved still difficult to bridge between different line Ministries.
- IFAD. Noted that some of the reservoirs in Ghana were financed by IFAD. But IFAD has now stepped away from such projects. Audrey requests further sharing of information with IFAD. More generally, links to MUS expertise for the need of IFAD design or implementation are made on an ad-hoc basis through Stef.
- FAO. Finalizing with current set of MASSMUS audits. Final reports will be available in summer, and the tool will be available on the website. They are also promoting Regional Centres of Excellence on irrigation management (which contains multiple-use), including in Bangalore, and eventually in Malaysia (for small scale irrigation). These are supported by FAO together with IWRMI. Furthermore, they are supporting the review of water policy in Karnataka. Last but not least, Daniel suggests we are alert for the WWF6 to come on the agenda.
- IRC. Busy with various secretariat activities to be reported on later in the agenda. Furthermore working on MUS in piped water supply in Honduras, even though this has been a bit quiet due to the political situation in Honduras. WASHCost is another project which looks into cost of WASH and where MUS keeps coming up.
- IWMI South Africa. Danida/SADC project has been finalised and documents are available as hard-copies and at www.sadcwater.com. Also working on a Gates-funded project on agricultural water management, where issues of gender and MUS become apparent. The African Development Bank has invited IWMI to submit a MUS proposal, for work on innovation and pilot testing MUS in Ghana.

8. Linkages between CPWF MUS TWG and MUS Group

Sophie Nguyen-Khoa presented an update of the Challenge Program on Water and Food, and particularly on the MUS Topic Working Group (TWG). The role of this TWG would be one of 1) synthesis, 2) cross-basin learning, 3) applying lessons learnt, and 4) quality control. It would work across basins. Besides, she highlighted the key basin challenges as emerging from the basins. See her full power point separately. In the discussion that ensued, the following questions were clarified:

- The TWG will work with projects in the basins through email and website, but also through physical meetings. But, it will be based on demand from the project.
- There will be projects in basins. You are encouraged to contact them, as they are expected to engage other project partners.
- In the first round, projects were commissioned but there was also an open call for proposals. CPWF is now in the process of finalizing contractual arrangements for the first 3 basins. Once this is concluded, more info on these projects will be available on the website. For the next round (Volta and Limpopo basins) there will be no open call for proposals. Rather, CPWF will ask for Expressions of Interest of potential lead partners. These are then expected to form consortia to work out full proposals.
- Tomorrow there will be a discussion with basin representatives on basin priorities. All are welcome to attend. The afternoon is focused on further development of these basin ideas. But, there is also space to make electronic contributions.
- One first area of synergy is to ensure that all basin representatives are on the MUS Group mailing list.

9. Update from the secretariat

Stef provided an update of the activities of the secretariat, thereby also highlighting the use of financial resources from both FAO and WSSCC to the MUS Group. He will shortly contact Wageningen University (Gerardo Halsema) on core membership. He will present on MUS to the

German KfW and WSSCC in May/June. The Power Point will be made available separately on the site. Stef posed some questions to the Group to direct further activities. The following was agreed:

- The next Newsletter will come in March. Till 25 March inputs are welcome. Stef will coordinate.
- The translation funds we have available should be used to translate the advocacy brochure into French.
- Technical exchange request. A first one was received for an exchange between WEDC and Cinara. This will go ahead. The other space we have will be reserved for an exchange around the MASSMUS auditing methodology. It is agreed to do this around an auditing session in either Vietnam or India. Daniel will send the request probably in the second semester of this year.
- The EU Water Facility call for proposals was discussed briefly. It was agreed that individual members may respond to this as they see fit. If members seek endorsement for their proposals from the MUS Group this can be provided on an equal basis.

Action points:

- Stef to send Daniel the format for the technical exchange request, and Daniel to fill it out as and when he knows more about the most appropriate opportunity.

10. Focus, date and venue of the next meeting

A short discussion was held on the focus of the next meeting. People felt we should stick to the focus defined in Rome of working further on performance indicators around MUS. The CBA workshop had focused particularly on financial and economic indicators, but there are many other sets of indicators. These will differ probably depending on sectoral entry point (domestic-plus, irrigation-plus, etc). It was agreed that a small group will prepare this meeting, including various inputs, that will be used as basis for discussion. The group would consist of Barbara van Koppen and Stef Smits (as coordinator and secretariat), as well as Martin Keijzer, Daniel Renault, Audrey Nepveu and Nidhi Nagabhatla, who will work on the elaboration of the inputs.

The next meeting will probably smaller (15-20 persons). It is proposed to hold the meeting in the week of 22 Nov (tentatively). The venue is to be defined in due time, seeking synergies with other events and travels. Audrey Nepveu proposed to organize it in Rome, pending there is no other proposals because 2009 meeting already happened in Rome.

Annex 1 – List of participants

Name	Organisation	Email address
Larry Harrington	CPWF	lwharrington@gmail.com
Monique Mikhail	SEI	monique.mikhail@sei-us.org
Nidhi Nagabhatla	World Fish	N.Nagabhatla@cgiar.org
Jacob Kalle	CSSEIP	jacobkalle@gmail.com
Jorge Merino	EkoRural	merinoklaassen@gmail.com
Trinh Ngoc Lan	VAWR	tngooclan@gmail.com
Zemedede Abebe	RiPPLE/HCS	zemededeab@gmail.com
Martin Keijzer	Plan Netherlands	martin.keijzer@plannederland.nl
Martin Fischler	Intercooperation	martin.fischler@intercooperation.ch
Saskia Nijhof	RAIN Foundation	nijhof@rainfoundation.org
Jean Philippe Venot	IWMI Ghana	j.venot@cgiar.org
Audrey Nepveu	IFAD	a.nepveu@ifad.org
Daniel Renault	FAO	Daniel.Renault@fao.org
Stef Smits	IRC	smits@irc.nl
Barbara van Koppen	IWMI South Africa	b.vankoppen@cgiar.org
Martin van Brakel	CPWF	m.vanbrakel@cgiar.org
Connie September	DWA	Septemberc@dwa.gov.za

Marna de Lange	Jabenzi	marna@global.co.za
Sophie Nguyen-Khoa	CPWF	S.NGUYEN-KHOA@CGIAR.ORG