



## REPORT OF THE MUS GROUP MEETING 19-20 January 2012

Venue:  
Winrock International office  
Arlington, USA



**WINROCK**  
INTERNATIONAL

Hosted by Winrock International

---

### Background and introduction to the meeting

The MUS Group expressed an interest in hosting a meeting in the USA and Winrock International agreed to host. The objective of the meeting was to provide a platform for sharing of experiences of USA-based organisations working on MUS, but who may not always be in a position to join the MUS Group meetings, which have been held mainly in Europe. Holding the meeting in the USA would also allow introducing MUS and the MUS Group to various organisations with an interest in MUS. Therefore, the first MUS Group meeting of 2012 took place on 19-20 January in Arlington, USA, hosted by Winrock International.

The MUS Group meeting in the USA had the following objectives:

- Establishing common understanding of key MUS concepts
- Sharing of experiences from American organisations working on MUS and exploring investment opportunities and modes of collaboration on MUS
- Presenting materials and discussions on 'how to do MUS'.

A total of 26 representatives from NGOs, research institutions and bi-and multi-lateral organisations participated in the MUS Group meeting. See Annex 1 for the list of participants. The meeting began with an introduction by Frank Tugwell, President and CEO of Winrock followed by a viewing of a short animated informational video on MUS (link—will provide).

The MUS Group meeting was divided into 5 blocks:

- Block 1: Introduction to Multiple-Use water Services
- Block 2: Multiple use of rural water supply
- Block 3: Opportunity areas for MUS
- Block 4: Guidance on how to do MUS
- Block 5: MUS Group meeting

The full programme can be found in Annex 2.

### Block 1: Introduction to Multiple Use water Services

As several of the participants had limited familiarity with MUS, but had expressed interest in learning more on the subject, the objective of the first block was to bring all participants on the same page, by introducing some of the main concepts related to multiple-use water services (MUS).

Stef Smits (IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre, and Secretary of the MUS Group) presented key definitions and concepts related to MUS. His presentation can be found here:

<http://www.musgroup.net/page/1417>.

Mary Renwick gave participants a tour of Winrock's work related to multiple-use water services for the poor. This included an introduction to Winrock International's research and advisory services, implementation activities in seven countries, awareness and capacity building activities (including a how-to guide with operational models, an animated video, and a 3 day MUS training programme), and key learnings. For Mary's presentation, please see <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1418>.

**Main issues discussed following the presentations in this block included:**

- **Self-supply and its relation to sustainability of water resources:** Evidence from countries such as Zimbabwe and Ethiopia suggests that family wells and other household level technologies acquired through self-supply, are generally used to provide water for multiple uses. Related to this, the issue of sustainability of water resources was mentioned. However, it was agreed that incremental amounts of water through self-supply are very small and thus have little impact on water resources.
- **Sanitation and MUS:** although not part of MUS per se, there are important links between sanitation and MUS. MUS does not replace good sanitation practices. Health aspects need to be taken into the account. Secondly, MUS may further encourage the use of ecosan. Thirdly, in peri-urban areas, there may be waste water reuse, which can be conceptualised in a MUS framework as well, as one of the multiple sources of water.
- **Institutional fragmentation and MUS:** Breaking down 'sectoral silos' is important, but challenging. Not only national governments, but also donors and funding streams are often structured according to sectors.
- **MUS and sustainability:** Will MUS imply the use of more complicated systems, which might be more difficult to manage in a sustainable way? MUS is a new approach, but WASH best practices still have to be applied. MUS projects can be impacted in the same way that poor practices can influence the performance of WASH projects. MUS is about meeting multiple demands for water in a sustainable way.

## **Block 2: Multiple use of rural water supply**

In this block, Prof Ralph Hall presented the work done by Stanford and Virginia Tech Universities and partners in Senegal and Kenya on productive use of domestic piped water. The analysis focused on the incremental costs and expected income generated by upgrading 'basic needs' systems to productive use capacity, and on financial sustainability of piped water systems used for income-generating activities.

The presentation on the Senegal case can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1424>.

The presentation on the Kenya case can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1425>.

**Issues discussed included:**

- Economic benefits are not only depending on water, but also on other elements of value chain, such as access to markets.
- The findings from the studies suggested a relation between multiple uses of water and sustainability. However, the cause-effect relationship was not clear: did more sustainable

water supply stimulate multiple uses, or did multiple use of water stimulate sustainability because of increased ability and willingness to pay?

### **Block 3: Opportunity areas for MUS**

In this block, a synopsis of the MUS scoping work undertaken by John Hopkins Institute, IDEO, Pacific Institute, IRC, IWMI and Winrock International at the request of the Rockefeller Foundation was presented. In the previous week, Rockefeller grantees had met in New York to present findings. The scoping studies attempted to find answers to the following questions:

- How could the MUS model be made more robust?
- How can MUS be scaled up?
- Where is the potential for greatest impact?

The block was kicked off by a presentation from Robert Marten from the Rockefeller Foundation, who presented the findings from the studies, with tentative answers to these questions. This presentation can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1419>.

Winrock International, IWMI and IRC presented some of the key findings in more detail. Mary Renwick (Winrock International) explained about the different tiers of countries that had been identified with MUS scaling potential. In order to make MUS a mainstream approach, Mary drew on the innovation literature, suggesting efforts should focus on reaching a tipping point, where MUS adoption becomes self-sustaining. First tier countries are countries with the highest potential of reaching this tipping point, such as Nepal and Tanzania. These are countries 'where the heat is'. In order to catalyze an innovation, you will need champions, evidence in the form of data and observable results and tools.

The key findings from IWMI and IRC on scaling potentials were presented by Barbara van Koppen. Her presentation can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1420>.

Following the findings of these scoping studies, Sharron Murray presented the perspective of USAID on MUS. Her presentation can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1421>.

#### **Key issues discussed:**

##### **Is the MUS approach robust enough? How to make it more robust?**

- There is a need for guidance on MUS, in the form of 'how to do MUS guidelines' but also on standard indicators and 'visual representations on what 'good MUS' looks like.
- We need agreed-upon principles and practices, rather than definition for MUS. What is in and what is out? What does MUS really look like?
- The concept of MUS needs to be communicated better. E.g. NGOs which are doing MUS without calling it that, need to be made aware.

##### **Where do we have enough evidence for MUS?**

- There is some evidence on a correlation between sustainability and MUS, but more research is needed on how they influence each other. What is the chicken and what is the egg?

- Economic and financial analysis of incremental costs and benefits of going from single use projects to multiple use projects would be powerful for donors, such as the World Bank. “Now you are getting this, but if you did MUS, you would get this”.
- Another outstanding research question is “What can be done in order for MUS to reach the poorest of the poor”.
- Evidence is needed for donors for accountability purposes to demonstrate aid effectiveness.
- Improved monitoring and evaluation could help provide the evidence needed.
- Besides developing and framing the evidence base, disseminating evidence is very important.

### **Opportunities and limitations for going to scale**

- Different stakeholders play different roles:
  - o According to Sharon Murray (USAID), “MUS is an easy sell”. There is money with different “flavours”, but there is the possibility of combining these into integrated programmes.
  - o Major counterparts of donors such as the World Bank are government development agencies. There is a need to convince national governments about MUS and come to the tipping point though concentrated effort. This needs to be done at country level.
  - o Private sector support for MUS at the country level is also important in order to reach the tipping point.
  - o NGOs can play an important role in bringing MUS to scale, but they need guidelines on ‘how to do MUS’ in order to guide them.
  - o Universities can educate the future generation of professionals on MUS.
- MUS can be applied in different types of contexts (e.g. emergencies and WASH in schools).

## **Block 4: Guidance on how to do MUS**

In this block, guidelines and training materials on ‘how to do MUS’ in practice were presented.

Marieke Adank (IRC International Water and Sanitation Centre) presented a set of generic guidelines for planning and providing multiple-use Water Services, developed by the MUS Group. This presentation can be found here: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1422>. The guidelines will be made available on the MUS Group website soon.

Emily Kovich (Winrock International) presented the 3-day MUS programme developed and tested by Winrock International. See <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1423> for the presentation on this training.

These presentations and the discussion that followed resulted in the agreement on the need for more standard performance indicators for MUS. This should include sustainability, process indicators and outcomes, taking into account different MUS entry points.

### **Open space**

An open space session was included in the programme in order to give participants the opportunity to take discussions raised during the previous sessions forward. The open space was kicked-off with a number of mini-presentations:

- A presentation from IDE, presented on their behalf by Barbara van Koppen (IWMI) on the IDE Nepal MUS Programme status. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1427>.
- A short presentation on Skype by Nelson Ekane (SEI) on sanitation: see <http://www.sei-international.org/publications?pid=1991> and <http://www.ecosanres.org/index.htm>.
- A presentation on the work of Catholic Relief Services in the area of MUS, by Chris Seremet (CRS). See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1426>.
- A presentation on World Vision's MUS programming, presented by Ron Clemmer (WVI). See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1440>.

Based on these presentations, and the presentations and discussions of the previous sessions, the following topics were identified for further discussion during the open space:

- MUS performance indicators
- How to do MUS on Mars (within a complicated donor landscape)
- MUS definition and principles

#### **Result of the open space discussion on “How to do MUS on Mars”:**

Elisabeth Kleemeier (Work Bank) suggested that NGOs are from Venus and IFI (International Financing Institutions), like the Banks, are from Mars. On Mars we don't start from community level, but from sector level. What to do next from that perspective? The following next steps for doing “MUS on Mars” were identified:

- Discuss and revise work plan for the Working Group for the MoU between USAID and the WB. This can involve academic institutes, the Water and Sanitation Programme of the World Bank (WSP) etc. Remaining question: how can the irrigation sub-sector be represented in this?
- Develop a webinar series, using off-the-shelf presentations.
- Organise strategic meetings with high level World Bank people

Develop (advocacy) publications tailored to the bank (briefing note, flagship reports). Remaining question: how to fund these activities? Rockefeller Foundation, WSP?

#### **Result of the open space discussion on “MUS performance indicators”:**

- Articulating performance indicators (costs, wellbeing dimensions, process indicators) is useful to better indicate what MUS is to service providers, and to monitor.
- The general principles for sustainable water service delivery apply to MUS, as well as to irrigation and WASH. This includes environmental sustainability, financial sustainability, appropriate technologies (technical sustainability), social and institutional sustainability.
- Does MUS increase sustainability? Not sure, but it was agreed that de facto multiple uses can decrease sustainability.
- For some more complex MUS systems, there are special needs for feasibility studies:
  - o Life-cycle costs
  - o Projected incomes
  - o True willingness and true effects on quality of life

### Result of the open space discussion on “MUS definition and principles”:

- There is general agreement on a definition of MUS. There are some creative differences (e.g. how does it link to sanitation, IWRM etc).
- There is a need to come up with clarity on what MUS is and what it is not and formulate how to relate to other approaches.
- **Agreed next step:** the MUS Group has been working on brochure, which includes a definition. This will be sent around for consonance of MUS Group members.
- It was agreed it would be good to have performance indicators
- **Agreed next step:** A core group will work on defining the principles. The MUS Group will compile the knowledge of group members and will come up with a common view. This work could be linked to Stockholm Water Week.

### Block 5: MUS Group meeting:

The MUS Group meeting was kicked-off by a presentation from Stef Smits (IRC), introducing the MUS Group. This presentation can be found on <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1442>.

#### Discussed issues:

##### Membership:

- There is an open invitation to all people interested in joining the Group, either on the mailing list, or as a core partners. The requirements for the latter are committing to attending at least one MUS Group meeting a year and supporting the Group’s activities. More details on this can be found in the governance guide for the Group at <http://www.musgroup.net/page/738>.
- There could be a possibility to start a USA chapter of the MUS Group, if there is interest for that.

##### Strategic direction of the MUS Group:

- The MUS website: It was agreed that the website has been a bit dormant, with low level of input of the MUS Group members. The following activities were identified to improving the website:
  - o Improve structure of the MUS Group website. This can include making presentations and case studies better available and accessible, including a list of recommended reading for different audiences/ target groups, etc.
  - o Improve quality control for materials on the MUS Group website
  - o Make videos on MUS better accessible.
  - o Include a blog in the MUS Group website, making it more dynamic.
  - o Integrate MUS into source newsletter series.
  - o **Action point:** MUS Group Secretariat to take up the recommendations
- Fundraising: an estimated \$US 250,000 is required to run the MUS Group for a period of 3 years.
- There is an interest in the development of a MUS module for academics.

- Different (academic) institutions have an interest in including MUS in their courses. This includes WEDC (Ian Smout), Virginia Tech (Ralph Hall), IRC guest lecturing at IHE and Wageningen University (Stef Smits and Marieke Adank).
- Sharing of MUS modules and possibly coming up with standard modules could be useful.
  - **Action point:** Ralph Hall to explore MUS modules for university courses.

Contributions to MUS Group Newsletter and website:

The following was highlighted as possible contributions participants could make to the newsletter and website

- Article for newsletter on findings of Rockefeller studies.
- Researchers at Stanford University, Virginia Tech, and the University of Oxford have a series of papers planned to disseminate the results of their WSP-funded MUS research. Each time a new paper is released, a link will be posted on the MUS website and included in the newsletter.
  - **Action point:** Ralph Hall will coordinate with MUS Group Secretariat on putting links to research papers on MUS Group website.
- Article on USAID-World Bank MOU on MUS Working Group
  - **Action point:** Sharron Murray to provide article to MUS Secretariat once more detail are there on the details of the MoU

Upcoming activities:

- World Water Forum: there are 2 MUS related slots: results from the Rockefeller studies; presentation of MASSMUS (FAO).
  - **Action point:** MUS Group secretariat will inform MUS Group members on this
- Stockholm Water Week: 26-31 August 2012: Rockefeller has offered to support the MUS Group to do a session of 2-3 hours. The host of this meeting should be a mix of countries, donors, researchers and NGOs. Suggestions for people/ organizations to be involved in co-organising or panel: Robert Hope, CINARA, WSP, USAID (Sharron), World Bank (Elisabeth), DFID (Sanjey), DGIS, Rwanda Minister, Bashir Jama (Agra)
  - **Action point:** Ralph will speak with the Stanford-VT-Oxford MUS research team about being involved in the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
  - **Action point:** Sharron and Liz to check whether they can be co-convening institutions of the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
  - **Action point:** Koen to ask Minister from Rwanda to sit in MUS panel at the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
  - **Action point:** Robert to follow-up with Bashir Jama (Agra) about being involved in the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
  - **Action point:** Stef to draft concept note for MUS session at Stockholm water week and send to co-conveners.

Next meeting:

- Suggestion: One day event, back-to-back with Stockholm.

- Suggestions for agenda points: performance indicators.

**Summary of action points:**

<b>Who</b>	<b>What</b>
MUS Group Secretariat	to take up the recommendations regarding improvements of MUS website
Ralph Hall	to explore MUS modules for university courses
Ralph Hall	to coordinate with MUS Group Secretariat on putting links to research papers on MUS Group website
Sharron Murray	to provide article on MOU to MUS Secretariat
MUS Group secretariat	inform MUS Group members on MUS sessions at World Water Forum
Ralph Hall	to ask research team about being involved in the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week
Sharron Murray and Elisabeth Kleemeier	to check whether they can be co-convening institutions of the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
Coen Voorthuis	to ask Minister from Rwanda to sit in MUS panel at the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
Robert Marten	to follow-up with Bashir Jama (Agra) about being involved in the MUS session at Stockholm Water Week.
Stef Smits	to draft concept note for MUS session at Stockholm Water Week and send to co-conveners.



## Annex 1:

	First name	Surname	Email	Country	Organisation	Job Title
1.	Marieke	Adank	<a href="mailto:adank@irc.nl">adank@irc.nl</a>	NL	IRC	Programme Officer
2.	Jeffrey	Apigian	<a href="mailto:japigian@hotmail.com">japigian@hotmail.com</a>	USA	Winrock International	Program Officer, Enterprise and Agriculture
3.	Ron	Clemmer	<a href="mailto:RClemmer@worldvision.org">RClemmer@worldvision.org</a>	USA	World Vision	Senior Technical Advisor, WASH
4.	Susan	Dundon	<a href="mailto:Susan.dundon@mwawater.org">Susan.dundon@mwawater.org</a>	USA	Millennium Water Alliance	Program Manager
5.	Nelson	Ekane	<a href="mailto:nelson.ekane@sei.se">nelson.ekane@sei.se</a>	Sweden	Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI)	Research Associate
6.	Ralph	Hall	<a href="mailto:rphall@vt.edu">rphall@vt.edu</a>	USA	Virginia Tech	Assistant Professor
7.	Fatou	Jah	<a href="mailto:fj21@cornell.edu">fj21@cornell.edu</a>	USA	N/A	Development Consultant
8.	Vongai	Kandiwa	<a href="mailto:Vk30@cornell.edu">Vk30@cornell.edu</a>	USA	N/A	Consultant
9.	Elizabeth	Kleemeier	<a href="mailto:ekleemeier@woldbank.org">ekleemeier@woldbank.org</a>	USA	World Bank	Sr. water Supply and Sanitation Specialist
10.	Emily	Kovich	<a href="mailto:ekovich@field.winrock.org">ekovich@field.winrock.org</a>	USA	Winrock International	Program Officer
11.	Robert	Marten	<a href="mailto:rmarten@rockfound.org">rmarten@rockfound.org</a>	USA	The Rockefeller Foundation	Associate
12.	Ari	Michelsen	<a href="mailto:amichelsen@ag.tamu.edu">amichelsen@ag.tamu.edu</a>	USA	Texas A&M AgriLife Research	Research Director and Professor
13.	Sharon	Murray	<a href="mailto:smurray@usaid.gov">smurray@usaid.gov</a>	USA	US Agency for International Development	Senior Water Resources Program Manager
14.	David	Norman	<a href="mailto:dnorman@winrock.org">dnorman@winrock.org</a>	USA	Winrock International	Vice President, Enterprise & Agriculture
15.	Patrick	Perner	<a href="mailto:pperner@winrock.org">pperner@winrock.org</a>	USA	Winrock International	Officer
16.	Rochelle	Rainey	<a href="mailto:rrainey@usaid.gov">rrainey@usaid.gov</a>	USA	USAID Washington	Technical Advisor, Environmental Health
17.	Mary	Renwick	<a href="mailto:mrenwick@winrock.org">mrenwick@winrock.org</a>	USA	Winrock International	Lead, water innovation program
18.	Clarissa	Segun	<a href="mailto:mwaampa@yahoo.com">mwaampa@yahoo.com</a>	USA	N/A	Consultant
19.	Chris	Seremet	<a href="mailto:Christopher.seremet@crs.org">Christopher.seremet@crs.org</a>	USA	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	Technical Advisor – Water Supply and Sanitation
20.	Stef	Smits	<a href="mailto:smits@irc.nl">smits@irc.nl</a>	NL	IRC	Programme Officer
21.	John	Thomas	<a href="mailto:jthomas@rockfound.org">jthomas@rockfound.org</a>	USA	The Rockefeller Foundation	Tom Ford Fellow in Philanthropy
22.	Barbara	van Koppen	<a href="mailto:b.vankoppen@cgiar.org">b.vankoppen@cgiar.org</a>	South Africa	IWMI	Principal Researcher
23.	Kees	Vogt	<a href="mailto:keesvogt@yahoo.com">keesvogt@yahoo.com</a>	Tanzania	Winrock International	Water, Private Sector and Livelihoods Lead
24.	Coenraad	Voorhuis	<a href="mailto:cvoorhuis@field.winrock.org">cvoorhuis@field.winrock.org</a>	Rwanda/USA	Winrock International	Director, Rwanda
25.	Patrice	Beaujault	<a href="mailto:pbeaujault@yahoo.fr">pbeaujault@yahoo.fr</a>	Senegal	N/A	
26.	Moffat	Ngugi	<a href="mailto:mngugi@usaid.gov">mngugi@usaid.gov</a>	USA	USAID	Climate change advisor

**DAY 1: 19 January**

08.30-09.00	Registration	
09.00-09.15	Word of welcome	Winrock International
09.15-09.30	Introduction to the meeting	Barbara van Koppen, IWMI
<b>Block 1: Introduction to Multiple Use water Services</b>		
9.30-10.00	Presentation on " <i>Key MUS concepts</i> "	Barbara van Koppen, IWMI
10.00-11.00	A tour of Winrock's work on MUS	Mary Renwick, Winrock International
11.00-11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
<b>Block 2: Multiple use of rural water supply</b>		
11.30-12.00	Presentation on " <i>Productive use of domestic rural water systems: Evidence on sustainability and distribution of benefits</i> "	Jenna Davis, Stanford University
12.00-12.30	Presentation on " <i>Productive use of domestic rural water systems: the Senegal case</i> "	Ralph Hall, Virginia Tech
12.30-13.30	<i>Lunch</i>	
<b>Block 3: Opportunity areas for MUS</b>		
13.30-14.00	Presentation on " <i>Synthesis of Rockefeller work on opportunity areas</i> "	Rockefeller Foundation
14.00-14.30	Grantee perspectives on opportunity areas on MUS	Stef Smits, IRC; Barbara van Koppen, IWMI; Mary Renwick, Winrock International;
14.30-15.00	Presentation on " <i>USAID's vision on MUS</i> "	Sharon Murray, USAID
15.00-15.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15.30-16.45	Group discussion on opportunity areas for MUS	Facilitator: Stef Smits
16.45-17.00	Conclusions and closure of the day	Stef Smits

**DAY 2: 20 January**

09.00-09.15	Recap of Day 1	One of the participants
<b>Block 4: Guidance on how to do MUS</b>		
9.15-9.45	Presentation of guidelines for planning, development and providing MUS	Marieke Adank, IRC
9.45-10.15	Presentation of Winrock MUS training materials	Mary Renwick, Winrock International
10.15-11.00	Group discussion on how to do MUS	Facilitator: Stef Smits, IRC
11.00-11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11.30-13.00	Open space: Opportunity for participants to share and discuss their own experiences on MUS	All
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14.00-15.00	Group discussion and next steps	Facilitator: Stef Smits, IRC
<b>Block 5: MUS Group meeting</b>		
15.00-16.00	Introduction to the MUS Group and its activities. Participation of USA-based organisations in the MUS Group	Chair: Barbara van Koppen, IWMI /coordinator MUS Group