

THE **WATER** DIALOGUES
Final Conference
7 – 8 December 2009

Federal Ministry for Economic
Cooperation & Development, Bonn

PROCESS RECORD

By Anne Weber Carlsen & Kate Martin





Contact details:

Kate Martin, International Coordinator

Email: kateelainemartin@aol.com

Website: www.waterdialogues.org



Contents

Section 1: Narrative Summary	5
Overview	5
The Conference Objectives	6
The Conference Programme	7
Major Outcomes: The Future of Multistakeholder Dialogue	8
Official Closure	10
Section 2: Detailed Record of Conference Proceedings	11
Day One: 7 December 2009	11
Conference Opening	11
Orientation to The Water Dialogues Process and Review of Objectives	14
The Market Place: engaging with processes and findings from the National Water Dialogues Groups	16
Plenary Session: inspirations and questions arising from National Presentations	16
Closing Day One	18
Day Two: 8 December 2009	20
Overview of Day 1 & Opening of Day 2	20
Presentation of International Summary Report by Kate Martin	21
Analysis: Group Work at Tables	22
Learnings from TWD Process	22
Group work continued	27
Plenary Presentations	27
Closing The Water Dialogues	32
The Future – by Mary Galvin	32
Presentations and Responses from Group Work	33
Closure and Way Forward	37

Appendices (attached seperately)

Appendix 1 – 5: International and Country Posters displayed during the “Market Place”, Day One of the Conference

Proceedings. This includes:

- International – Summary of TWD Principles
- International – Timeline
- Indonesia – History & Process
- Indonesia – Research
- Indonesia – Personal Reflections
- South Africa – Synthesis Report
- South Africa – Code of Conduct
- South Africa – Confrontative Dialogue
- South Africa – Community Voices
- Uganda – Mandate & Reflections
- Uganda – Case Study
- Uganda – Personal Reflections

Appendix 6 & 7: Presentation and statement by Dr. William Muhairwe – the usefulness of multistakeholder dialogue in a changing world

Appendix 8: Presentation by Kate Martin – the International Summary Report

Appendix 9: Presentation by Neil Macleod – Personal Reflections

Appendix 10: Presentation by Elsa Mejia – Personal Reflections

Appendix 11: Presentation by Budi Widianarko – Personal Reflections

Appendix 12: Evaluation Questionnaire





Section 1

Narrative Summary

Overview

Brief Background: The Water Dialogues were a series of national multistakeholder dialogues and research processes focusing on examining whether and how the private sector can contribute to the delivery of affordable and sustainable water supply and sanitation services, especially to poor communities. The Water Dialogues project traced its origins to the 2001 Bonn Freshwater Conference where the German Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul expressed support for a “stakeholder dialogue” to review issues surrounding private sector participation.

In 2004, following an in-depth scoping review involving over 300 interviewees, participants of a Conference in Berlin mandated the Working Group – *the Brazilian Association of Municipal Water and Sanitation Public Operators, Consumers International, the Environmental Monitoring Group, Public Service International, RWE Thames Water, the Ugandan Association of Private Water Operators, and WaterAid* – to advance a project linking national dialogues under an international umbrella. National Dialogues were established in five countries – Brazil, Indonesia, the Philippines, South Africa and Uganda – with an International Working Group providing an overseeing and linking function.

By December 2009, Brazil, the Philippines, South Africa and Uganda National Dialogues had all closed their operations and completed their research. At many of their final meetings, however, the Working Groups were encouraged by external stakeholders present to continue their Dialogue, so some of the National Groups are exploring options for continuing. The exception is the Indonesia National Dialogue, which will definitely be continuing their activities beyond the cessation of the International Project and has begun planning for a second phase of research.

Publications & Website: As outlined by Kate Martin, International Coordinator, on Day Two of the Conference Proceedings, the core principles of The Water Dialogues as well as some of the crosscutting thematic issues emerging from the National Dialogues work are examined in *“The Water Dialogues: An International Summary Report”*. Many other publications that have been produced at International and National level provide detailed insights into the processes and research outcomes of the project. These can all be found at www.waterdialogues.org.

Future Support: The knowledge base and individual skills and experience developed within The Water Dialogues will not be lost after the closure of the project. The website provides the basis for ongoing learning and sharing, whilst the members of The Water Dialogues will join a **“Practitioners Group”** advertising their specific interests, background and availability for providing advice, training



and support to other organisations/projects/endeavours wishing to adopt multistakeholder methodologies and approaches to strengthen their work.

The Conference Objectives

The Final Conference, hosted by the German Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development in Bonn, took place on 7th and 8th December 2009 with 57 participants. The Conference objectives included the aim to share experiences of dialogue, findings from National Water Dialogues processes, and the International Summary report and messages; the desire to reflect on the value and limitations of multistakeholder processes; and the intention of exploring the future of multistakeholder dialogue. When asked to share their hopes for the Conference many participants expressed the desire to better understand the potential for implementing multistakeholder dialogue in the future, and in addition many hoped that the Conference would highlight the impact of The Water Dialogues (TWD) on governance in the water sector, improving services, and meeting future targets such as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).



The Conference Programme

Day One: 7th December 2009

- 13:30** Conference Opening
- 14:15** Orientation to The Water Dialogues Process and Review of Objectives
- 15:00** Market Place: Engaging with processes and findings from the national water dialogues
- 16:30** Plenary session: Inspirations and questions arising from national presentations
- 17:10** Closing Day One
- 17:30** Round Table and dinner

Day Two: 8th December 2009

- 08:30** Overview of Day 1 & Opening Day 2
- 09:00** Presentation by Kate Martin on International Summary Report
- 09:30** Group Work Part 1
- 10:30** Break
- 11:00** Learnings from The Water Dialogues process
- 11:45** Group Work Part 2
- 12:15** Plenary presentations
- 12:45** Closing The Water Dialogues
- 13:00** Lunch
- 14:00** The Future – presentation by Mary Galvin on concept note, followed by group work
- 15:30** Plenary presentations and responses
- 16:00** Break
- 16:15** Evaluation (questionnaire)
- 16:45** The way forward, official closure and thanks



Major Outcomes: The Future of Multistakeholder Dialogue

The detailed verbatim notes of the *full* Conference proceedings are outlined in Section 2 below. Here a brief summary of one of the major outcomes – ideas for the future of multistakeholder dialogue – will be outlined.

In the afternoon of Day 2 participants were asked to divide into three groups, depending on their main area of interest.

Group 1 – National level: other countries interested in exploring multistakeholder dialogues on water (Ghana, Chad, India, Kenya etc). The group considered questions such as:

- What steps are needed to pursue dialogue?
- What expertise/support is needed? Where can one get it?

Group 1 discussed a variety of key topics that might spark a National Dialogue, including the “three A’s” – availability, accessibility, affordability. Those present in the Group, including stakeholders from Ghana, India and Kenya, agreed that dialogue was definitely a good way forward but the question remained “what structure/platform is there to support dialogue?” Interestingly, the question “how risky is it to engage in a dialogue with an open agenda?” was also raised. The Group proposed the following elements would be required for the start-up of a dialogue:

- A clear purpose/focus – start with a scoping exercise to hone the focus
- Identify major stakeholders – and keep the doors wide open. Note who is *not* there.
- A very good/acceptable coordinator/facilitator of the right mindset
- Funding
- Committed people
- Peer support from other countries.

During the plenary report back, participants from Ghana expressed a clear intention to work towards establishing their own water dialogues process in their country. Representatives from Kenya, India and Chad expressed their interest without committing to a specific course of action.

Group 2 – Institutionalisation into own work/organisation:

- What would it mean within your organisation? Other organisations?
- How do you institutionalise multistakeholder dialogue within local government?
- What support/expertise is needed? Where to get it?
- How do you catalyse institutionalisation?

Group 2 began with a discussion about what ‘institutionalisation’ meant – participants clarified that

I am very happy and proud that you are at this level now. The dominating result is more clarity on where private sector involvement makes sense and where not.

Manfred Konukiewitz



'institutional' was not interchangeable with 'organisation' but was instead understood effectively as a 'process of naturalisation' i.e. the process whereby multistakeholder dialogue would become the natural way of engaging in service delivery. Hence, it would be crucial to advocate multistakeholder dialogue in terms of why it is "good for business" and adds value, before concentrating on the methodology for conducting dialogue. Furthermore, when contemplating how dialogue can be used to improve service delivery participants agreed that dialogue is very important and effective at local level. At the same time, TWD members of the group stressed the importance of an international umbrella – their experience has shown its importance for maintaining the necessary critical mass and motivation to sustain dialogue.

Dialogue brings you face to face with people who have different views – some of which you do not want to hear

Neil Macleod

Some proposed avenues for advocating multistakeholder dialogue included:

- In South Africa participants proposed that the Local Government Association could be a champion for multistakeholder work, also influencing the United Cities and Local Governments of Africa
- The representative of WaterAid felt that a case could be made for incorporating multistakeholder dialogue into their existing Global Transparency Fund programme
- Participants proposed the use of multistakeholder dialogue in other existing initiatives:
 - International Water and Sanitation Centre (IRC) "learning alliances"
 - The SWITCH Consortium (co-funded by the European Union)
 - The Global Framework for Action
 - GTZ proposed that dialogues could be used as a tool to highlight the role that the private sector plays

Group 2 participants agreed that individuals should be encouraged to act as ambassadors of Dialogue, but that in addition an information "nest" would be needed where exchange and learning could take place. They discussed whether this should be virtual i.e. through use of the existing TWD website, and if so how to ensure the website would be used.

If you go to real dialogue you must be ready to leave your weapons outside and take risks – without being naïve.

Jean-Pierre Mas

Group 3 – Is there motivation for another internationally driven Dialogue?

- What are the key issues people are committed to taking up? – Governance, financing, corruption, Climate Change, other topics...
- At what level e.g. International, national? Who and how?
- What next steps would need to be taken now?



Group 3 participants included representatives of IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) and Actionaid whose interests were similar – transboundary issues in relation to the management of water resources, sub-regional impacts, and other issues related to climate change.

We still exist, and strong relationships have been developed and will last.

Jessica Wilson

IUCN noted that they already had a regional dialogue spanning Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam focusing on governance. Other potential issues of interest included financing (in relation to the poor and marginalised, and issues of gender), and legal frameworks (using dialogue to examine policy at national level and reality at local level). Participants from Uganda and the Philippines then went on to label the key obstacles to water delivery in their contexts. Obstacles included financing and resources, corruption, and climate change.

There was discussion regarding the ongoing use of the website (mirroring Group 2's concerns) and the best way of ensuring its ongoing maintenance as a learning resource.

In the case of the Indonesia and Philippines Working Group members who participated in this Group, some concrete next steps were outlined for the continuation of dialogue in their countries.

The attendance here and the content of the conference has lived up to what we hoped for, and indeed our colleagues that are with us for the first time have given us a sense of new interest and enthusiasm.

Robin Simpson

Official Closure

As outlined in more detail in Section 2 below, Jessica Wilson, Kate Martin, and Robin Simpson gave closure speeches. Robin gave comprehensive information on the many individuals and organisations involved in the successful cycle of The Water Dialogues and thanked both them and the participants of the Conference for their valuable insights and feedback.

Kate Martin informed all that the International Secretariat would be closing its operations by the end of January 2010. Hence, any requests for information or interest in using multistakeholder dialogue was in the meantime welcomed but thereafter a base for ongoing communications would be put in place.



Section 2

Detailed Record of Conference Proceedings

DAY ONE: 7 December 2009

Conference Opening

Kate Martin, International Coordinator of the The Water Dialogues (TWD), welcomed everybody to the final conference of the project. She was very appreciative that so many had taken the time and effort to be in Bonn. She then invited Mr. Manfred Konukiewitz, BMZ, to speak:

Welcome address by Mr. Manfred Konukiewitz, BMZ:



I am happy to welcome everybody to BMZ and to open this very important conference. I remember when it started – I see two people here, David and Belinda, the mother and father of TWD. I was the “midwife” so to speak and very much involved in the beginning. Private sector involvement was the big issue of that time.

The first step was the Fresh Water Conference in 2001. It was the first time civil society had participated at the same level as government. I am very happy and proud that you are at this level now. The dominating result is to achieve greater clarity on where private sector involvement makes sense and where not.

I am happy that we, BMZ, are able to start such a process and bring it to an end – and continue the work in other ways. There are so many open-ended processes around the world. Thank you for 8-9 years of hard work!

Day One Programme

- 13:30** Conference Opening
- 14:15** Orientation to The Water Dialogues Process and Review of Objectives
- 15:00** Market Place: Engaging with processes and findings from the national water dialogues
- 16:30** Plenary session: Inspirations and questions arising from national presentations
- 17:10** Closing Day One
- 17:30** Round Table and dinner



The Final Conference facilitator, Warren Banks, introduced himself as an Organisation Development (OD) practitioner and facilitator from Durban. He has worked with the South Africa Water Dialogues (WD-SA). He then introduced the TWD Support Team: Anne Weber Carlsen, co-facilitator, Sue Hugill, logistical assistant, Donna Arrondelle and Kate Martin, International Secretariat.

Participants were invited to introduce themselves at their tables and share their hopes for the conference:

Task Outline

At your tables:

1. Individually, respond to the following question:

- What do you hope this Conference will achieve?

2. Introduce yourselves to each other at the table – share:

- Your name
- Where you come from (organisation, county)
- Your hopes for this conference

Hopes listed by participants:

- Learn more about how multistakeholder work operates on the ground
- Gain a good idea about the private sector role in water in small countries
- Report-back on what TWD achieved and lessons for the future
- Institutionalise the ideas of world water governance
- Exchange ideas and best practices
- Improved and informed governance in the water sector
- Give strong recommendations on how to improve water services for any government
- Review the strategy on achieving the MDGs for the Water Sector
- Joint understanding of results
- That the success and challenges will provide learning points to make the impacts of The Water Dialogues sustainable in and between countries
- That we learn from each other
- Fruitful deliberations on challenges, experiences and the way forward for the water sector
- Better understand how The Water Dialogues were done in each country, and what are the participants' expectations of the impact of this work afterwards
- Stakeholders looking forward! The issue is not PSP
- Learn about points of consensus & of conflict
- Clearer picture about PPPs in the water sector
- Some clear conclusions, experiences that can be used in future decisions/recommendations
- Challenges of multistakeholder dialogue



- That the achievements and lessons of the dialogues will be well-communicated and appreciated by all participants
- identify implementable steps to take good practice forward
- Clear messages for the future and how to disseminate them
- Social aspects of PSP to be better understood and included in the messages
- Share experiences for better results
- Impact that can be achieved in practice & the way forward
- A good understanding of the multistakeholder dialogues and how consensus is reached on issues
- The conference will enable participants to define the way forward for dialogues
- Actions to build on success of dialogue
- Vivid exchanges of perspectives, demonstrations of best practices and what has been preached so far – share lessons learnt
- Build confidence in using multistakeholder dialogue approaches in the policy making process
- Fruitful discussions on the results of activities of all participating countries
- Definite conclusions/decision regarding the future of The Water Dialogues
- Results or outcomes will address water issues
- Further intensification of dialogue between the public and private sectors in the water sector
- Show how The Water Dialogues can contribute to delivery of WATSAN services, especially to those unserved today
- Come up with resolutions on the way forward for The Water dialogues
- Hope to review the strategic challenges and draw operational lessons and also an opportunity to link policy gaps
- How to involve other countries to be part of TWD
- Share lessons
- Clarify, dispassionate and reinforce dialogue between all stakeholders, including private operators
- To understand the key outcomes of TWD process
- Network for future world
- Inspire others to read, discuss, engage with what has come from TWD to further sustain development & WSS
- Show the importance of PSP in the services of water and sanitation
- Gain a better understanding of achievements, processes and challenges of the country dialogues
- Deepening understanding about engaging in multistakeholder processes
- To appreciate how TWD/MSH influenced improvements in the sector (services)
- A common understanding of the best way to deliver water
- To see the 'added value' of the process
- To see that the conference is perceived as successful
- To identify any pathways that exist for further use of TWD's approach
- Share experiences
- How best to achieve MDGs in water, sanitation
- Learn from others
- Share what other countries did and what they agreed on
- Learn better about TWD's problems and other countries and their future
- Bring closure & perhaps opening? Improve policy
- Agree that there are roles for public sector, civil society and private sector in the provision of water services.



Orientation to The Water Dialogues Process and Review of Objectives

Two of the founding members of the International Working Group, David Boys from Public Services International, and Belinda Calaguas from ActionAid, shared the history of TWD:



David: I represent workers not able to provide water. Lack of tools. A massive false hope, that the private sector would solve all problems. The flavour of the day at the time.

The UN for the first time recognised the 9 major groups – The Commission on Sustainable

Development. When you open up to other groups you don't know what will happen – and that was how it started in Bonn.

Belinda: Not a strong commitment to a multistakeholder involvement.

David: Serious pressure to create a truly open atmosphere for the dialogues. No basis for trust.

Belinda: How are we going to do this? We threw ourselves in each other's arms. How about doing this as a feasibility study? Manfred agreed.

David highlighted some important points:

1. There was no established organisation to run the show
2. How do you access the funding without being the holder?
3. The personal relationships are key. Trust, risk taking, no weapons
4. We hired very professional people to run the project, do the research

The scoping process: the key factors → we need a multistakeholder review.

In Berlin: Go in at country level. We as coordinators lost control of the process. We provided a solid framework.

The countries were chosen through personal connections, network, energy (i.e. where energy was coming from). At the end of the day: it's about people!

The values and limitations of the dialogues:

The decentralized ownership is both a value and a limitation; it is difficult to report back to donors around outcomes.

We did not have the funds for the national processes – they had to attract funding themselves.

An issue to explore: The role of research in a multistakeholder process. Research **is** important –



although time-consuming. However, research is not **the** only way forward and it can be limited in terms of its real impact on policy.

One of the key issues: We provided an umbrella for the national projects to come together.

The role of the donors:

- Manfred/BMZ: risk taking
- DFID: took a lot of effort to convince.

TWD has shown a different way of making policy and informing policy-making.

How do you make policy in a contentious sector? It is difficult for donors to engage in, and it took hard campaigning to get donors into it.

Not just technical – also political. Those who do have power do not want to give it up! The political process in these countries has become richer.

Where are we going?

Warren Banks introduced the Final Conference Objectives:

- Share experiences of dialogue, findings from national Water Dialogues processes, and international summary and messages.
- Reflect on the value and limitations of multistakeholder processes by exploring The Water Dialogues' experiences and outcomes.
- Explore the future of multistakeholder dialogues in supporting effective service delivery and development.

How will we work?

Warren explained that the Conference would be a facilitated process – one step leading directly into another. It was therefore important to be fully present throughout the process. There was potential for the programme to shift slightly – however the overall timeframe would remain fixed.

Many languages and cultures were represented so participants were reminded to speak clearly and pace themselves!

Warren also reminded everyone that the conference was an opportunity for dialogue. Dialogue differs from discussion and debate.



A few guidelines for dialogue

- Listen:** pause before you make your contribution
slow down
fully receive what others have said
- Inquire:** ask from a place of curiosity and wondering
suspend your assumptions
- Speak:** from the intention to explore and discover
no speeches
tell what's present for you here and now
wait to be moved to speak



The Market Place: Engaging with processes and findings from the National Water Dialogues Groups

Anne introduced the next exercise:

Procedure

- Participants have 1 hour 15 mins to visit as many “market stalls” as they choose.
- Move on when you want to move on; manage your time yourself - i.e. you could aim to get an overview of all the stalls (i.e. spend about 15 mins at each) or scan all of them and then select a few to focus on. If a stall is overcrowded consider moving elsewhere and coming back after the rush.
- We will be engaging with the overall outcomes and process in plenary on Day 2; the purpose of this session is to share some of the richness and diversity of The Water Dialogues outcomes and process in an efficient manner.
- The stalls will stay up throughout the conference so there will be opportunities to engage with country specific issues during breaks if you do not have enough time now.

Anne encouraged participants to listen, engage, and bring back findings:

- What was valuable?
- What was most interesting/inspiring: story/idea/method/finding?
- What was significant?
- Questions to lead us into tomorrow; how is it pointing into the future...

Plenary session: Inspirations and questions arising from national presentations

Participants were asked to comment on significant, interesting, inspiring findings from national dialogues presentations

Notes from plenary session:

- Women’s role in dialogue: calming people down, making things happen
- Success came about through dialogue – requires some formalisation → interest in initiating a process in Ghana...
- Impressed: full engagement with government → and real impact (e.g. changing tariffs Indonesia)
- Innovation: collecting fresh info; not picking research that ‘makes our case’ – ensuring research has wide legitimacy – agreeing on terms of reference, questions, scope of research in multistakeholder forum
- A useful idea: MSH analysis – beyond narrow interests, purely donor-driven interests...



- An idea: Perhaps some things are worth translating (e.g. the new Brazilian law and small provider's business plans)
- Missing: Absence of media from Working Groups.... (just used to spread message) – they are stakeholders too.
- Gender: mainly women represented for water in households – women could have been more involved in the process → cost of water to the poor is high... Head of households are men – may prioritise water less than women....

Questions:

- Representation: Who are the members of the dialogues? How quickly did this translate into action?
- Dialogue: a neutral space to share → trust building is key – through consultation. Municipal level dialogue between: operators, government, users – transparency, accountability. 'A governance of trust'
- Did you observe a gender bias in the surveys – more men than women?
- How to mainstream dialogue processes to ensure sustainability? (In countries) – why? We can't keep on going with externally funded processes
- What emerged in relation to a common model across national dialogues?
- In what kind of contexts/situations do you need such a process? When is it required?
- Process result – principles/model result?
- How much?
- Representation in TWD – impact
- Existing structures + processes – link between TWD and these?
- Impact of TWD on governance?
- Simultaneously: EU initiative → dialogues – 2 global dialogues – where they connected? Success of the EU-initiative in your countries – in comparison to TWD?

Responses:

SA: 2 types of research

- Key informant → more women in positions of power
- Participatory → women well represented.

Indonesia: Focus on women's involvement

Uganda: young girls and boys affected – fetching water – both gender affected. Poorest of the poor – tend to have more equal division of labour.

EU: Did not work where there were existing structures... need to identify a gap... Otherwise rejected.



Internationally driven, direct country level engagement did not work.

SA and Uganda: No linkage. NB. Distinguish the use of the word dialogue beyond consultation.

Struggled to get dialogues to start at national level.

Challenge: needs to be owner-driven – needs to be held by many individuals.

Summary:

Warren summarised what had emerged from the market place-exercise:

There were a number of How-to questions as well as broad questions about impact. They will be addressed on Day Two of the Conference.

Also issues around sustainability and funding, and strategy questions: When are dialogue processes the right thing to do?

Some comments and questions pointed towards the future of TWD: What is the big controversy – is there still one? If not, what is then the new goal of a new round of dialogues? And how to develop mechanisms for sharing?

The questions raised are outlined below in the overview of Day Two.

Closing Day One

The summary brought the programme of Day One to a closure. After a short break the Roundtable Discussion commenced followed by dinner for participants at the Bonn University Club.

Belinda Calaguas chaired the Roundtable session. She introduced the topic: “the usefulness of multistakeholder dialogue in a changing world”, explaining that the speakers had been asked to make their own interpretations about what “changes” in the current context are most significant. Belinda introduced the three speakers by informing participants how she personally had first met each of them – David Hall, PSIRU, in 1999 as a reviewer in a project Belinda was working on; William Muhairwe, NWSC Uganda, when Belinda interviewed William as part of a review of this well performing public utility; and Philippe Marin, World Bank, when Jamal Saghir approached civil society to start a dialogue and Philippe was a key participant in resulting activities.

The content of the speakers’ slots has been recorded separately as the Roundtable was not a part of the official Conference proceedings.





DAY TWO: 8 December 2009

Overview of Day 1 & Opening of Day 2

Day Two Programme

08:30	Overview of Day 1 – opening Day 2
09:00	Presentation by Kate Martin on International Summary Report
09:30	Group work 1
10:30	Break
11:00	Learnings from TWD process
11:45	Group work 2
12:15	Plenary presentations
12:45	Closing The Water Dialogues
13:00	Lunch
14:00	The Future – presentation by Mary Galvin on concept note followed by group work
15:30	Presentations and responses
16:00	Break
16:15	Evaluation (questionnaire)
16:45	Closure and way forward
17:00	Thanks and official closure

Warren briefly took the group through the programme of Day 1. He said that the questions from Day 1 had informed Day 2's programme, which would focus on 'how', outcomes, and learnings.

He presented the following clusters of questions linking Day 1 and 2:

■ The HOW:

- Who needs to be involved in MSH Working Groups? And how to make these groups happen?
- Linking TWD with other national/international processes to enhance impact?
- How much? (Financially)

■ OUTCOMES & LEARNINGS

- What impact has TWD had on governance?
- What emerges from TWD as a common model and/or common principles for effective MSH dialogue?

■ SOME STRATEGIC QUESTIONS

- How can this kind of process (MSH dialogue) help us to move towards universal water provision?
- In what kind of contexts/situations/boundary conditions is this kind of MSH dialogue necessary?
- What kind of issues in the water sector could be the focus of MSH work at international level (burning/controversial issues)?

■ The FUTURE

- Mechanisms for sharing learning?
- Sustaining dialogues at national level:
 - Institutionalising it?
 - Financing it?
- Practical options: What shall we do going forward?

Additional burning questions/comments were invited and noted:

- How do you use MSH dialogues for policy advocacy? Beyond the Working Group members
- Policy outcomes – national, international, local
- Emphasis on sanitation and hygiene



Presentation of International Summary Report by Kate Martin

Kate Martin presented the International Summary Report (written by Karen Bakker and Kate Martin) as an overview of the process and evidence from the five National Dialogues (National Reports available on The Water Dialogues website – www.waterdialogues.org). She explained that the report draws out major crosscutting themes applicable at international level. Members from varying perspectives and viewpoints examined the Report's content. For the full presentation see attached Appendix 8.

Additions by members of TWD were welcomed – bearing in mind the HOW, outcome & learnings questions from Day 1 and the morning. There were these contributions:

South Africa Working Group Member:

One project in SA specifically focused on sanitation. Findings - from a union perspective: Cape Town – one of the richest towns. The study took place in slums. Choking conditions for workers and users. No indication that the city takes it seriously. This study is a continuation of a study 3 years earlier. Photographic evidence was produced but since then: nothing happened. It has got worse rather than better. Privatization → contractors → smaller contractors → no control!

Two South Africa Working Group Members:

The Water Dialogues in Cape Town continues to advocate for a campaign. The challenge: How to use the research to effectively make these changes?

Representative of IRC:

Sanitation is treated very different from water - crucial to get a better idea of what happens in sanitation. Different levels of sanitation at national level – data gathering ✗ comparable. There is a new base of information – the AICD (Africa Infrastructure Country Diagnostic) produced by the World Bank and WSP that is being enriched by new countries. Has a website (<http://www.infrastructureafrica.org/aicd/>) – all reports can be found here. Raw data also available.

Uganda National Working Group Member:

The Uganda Water & Sanitation dialogues. Sanitation is the 'junior partner' of water. Private – a household responsibility. The responsibility scattered around many more Ministry's. Avoid responsibility.

Representative of GTZ:

German experiences (women) from slums: What to do about it? Kenya – public toilets. Ecosan-systems operated by small scale private operator who keep them clean. Good practices to be found in Kenya.

Philippines Working Group Member:

We are using MSH-approach in developing a national roadmap on sanitation.

South Africa Working Group Member:

MSH can be used as a tool for advocacy-policy work. More power when data comes from parties previously conflicting. Relationships are a crucial element – 'the chain of trust', e.g. bringing Jean-Pierre in.



Representative of IRC:

The value of the process: well-informed citizens and well organised. A stronger voice in 'the choir'.

Indonesia Working Group Member:

The customer issue: Set up a customer association for consultations.

Two levels of polity: local and global.

Analysis: Group work at tables

Group work is based on national presentations Day One, the International Summary Report by Kate and Karen, and the additional comments shared during proceedings:

The Task outlined by Anne was as follows:

There will be two opportunities to engage with these questions. After the second step you will be invited to present a summary of your key findings on 1 flipchart in 4-5 minutes.

Please assign a group member to take notes as you go. It may be helpful to have one group member facilitate the discussion. Final consensus in your group is not the goal: your findings will assist us to move towards discussing the future after lunch.

FOCUS ON THE QUESTIONS THAT RESONATE MOST FOR YOU.

Step 1: 30 minutes

1. What is new?
2. How can this kind of process (MSH dialogue) help us to move towards universal water provision?
3. In what kind of contexts/situations/boundary conditions is this kind of MSH dialogue necessary?
4. What kinds of issues in the water sector could be the focus of future MSH work at international level (burning/controversial issues)?

The group broke into smaller groups to engage in discussing the questions and issues above. After half an hour the group work was put on hold and it was time to listen to lessons learned at a personal level from members of The Water Dialogues.

Learnings from TWD process - shared by:

- Neil Macleod, eThekweni Municipality Authority, South Africa NWG Member
- Elsa Mejia, Small-scale Independent Provider, Inpart Waterworks and Development Corporation, Philippines NWG Member
- Budi Widianarko, Unika Soegijapranata Semarang University, IWG Indonesia Link Member
- Jean-Pierre Mas, Suez Environment, IWG Member



Neil Macleod, South Africa, eThekweni Municipality Authority:

The beginning:

The South Africa Water Dialogues (WD-SA) began with very limited expectations given the entrenched views of the private sector's role in the water sector in South Africa. I thought I might be able to turn others to my views. At the first meeting it was clear that all participants were wary and that it would take time to build the kind of relationship that could lead to meaningful change.

A code of conduct was formulated. Agreeing on the 'rules of engagement' was a big step forward and it seemed to give us all confidence to participate more fully and more openly. The code of conduct existed in the background but never intruded into proceedings. The relationship between the parties was much more positive at the end of our dialogues process

What changed?

- I was used to the concept of multistakeholder partnerships from my association with Building Partnerships for Development (BPD)
- We started engaging civil society more vigorously through initiatives like user platforms and citizen's voice, which has taken us far closer to our customers
- The benefits have encouraged us to take these initiatives further
- Our service delivery model makes use of community-led initiatives that give communities a voice in decision-making – this does not always involve formal civil society structures, but does always involve small private sector companies.

The process:

- Dialogue is not consultation
- Dialogue brings you face to face with people who have different views – some of which you do not want to hear
- The outcome of this meeting can be positive or negative, or worst of all neutral (whatever!)
- It becomes harder to ignore the views of others when a relationship develops with them
- If the public sector is not interested in dialogue it is virtually impossible for it to happen
- Dialogue is complex as some participants (like civil society) have very differing views, even within their own group, that need to be considered.

What is the public sector's role?

- We agree that the public sector ultimately has to ensure that all its citizens have access to acceptable services
- I better understand the interpretation of others on exactly what this means
- I remain convinced that the private sector has a significant role to play, but in a way that addresses the concerns about the 'privatisation' of these services.



Conclusion:

- Partnering with communities has enabled us to provide more than 80,000 toilets in rural areas and 100 sets of communal toilets over the past 5 years
- Sustainability of our projects depends on a sound relationship between communities and the municipality
- 'Private sector' now has a wider meaning and includes local small-scale private sector players.

"The dialogues for me have opened my mind to a whole new play ground."

Elsa Mejia, Philippines, small-scale provider:

Elsa first became involved in TWD after she was invited to an international meeting in Berlin, 2004.

The status of small-scale water service providers in the Philippines before the dialogue:

- Not recognised
- Not regulated
- In some areas, seen as illegal operators
- No access, or very limited access to financing
- Vulnerable to political intervention

The aim of the Philippines Water Dialogues was **to enhance pro-poor service coverage and accelerate progress towards sustainable and affordable universal access to clean water in the Philippines.**

The Philippine Water Dialogues (PWD) coordinated, in collaboration with Streams of Knowledge, the Philippine Water Partnership (PWP) and the National Water Resources Board (NWRB) a series of roundtable discussions with active participation of the following stakeholders:

- Water providers
- Financing institutions
- National government agencies including the legislative body
- NGOs / CSOs.

Roundtable discussion aims:

- Review options for service delivery and identify constraints to effective services
- Review the demand and supply side for financing the expansion of existing services to achieve 100% access to water and sanitation services
- Surface policy gaps and bring together relevant stakeholders who can address these issues
- Explore good practice and regulation for both public and privately run utilities including facilitating and constraining factors, and whether effective regulation could encourage more investment in the sector.



Outcomes:

- NAWASA (National Water and Sanitation Association of the Philippines) was organised
 - MOA with National Water Resources Board (NWRB)
 - CDA MOA with NWRB
 - Member of the Inter Agency Steering Committee- NEDA-INFRA-COM-SCWR
- Different models of water partnerships were formalised
- Concessionaires willingness to work with small water providers through bulk-selling with special tariff arrangements
- Regulatory guidelines for the small-scale providers working with main utilities
- The Government Regulatory Agency (NWRB) formulated light-handed regulation guidelines for SWSPs
- Financing Institutions created alternative models and financing windows.

Targets 2010 and beyond:

- Increase membership to establish SWSP database
- Organise regional conferences for SWSP capacity development
- Pilot test available financing model
- Link with different agencies for technical knowledge training
- Assist SWSP's in procuring NWRB permits as per NWRB-NAWASA MOA
- Philippine Water Dialogue members agreed to continue the dialogue with Streams of Knowledge taking the lead.

Budi Widianarko, Indonesia:

This is a personal reflection of the process. It's not a smooth journey!

The Context:

PSP pros and cons debate (Indonesia's Water Law, 2005)

Dialogue is probably culturally compatible to most Indonesians (*natural aspiration towards harmony*):

"Like that is like that, but not like that".

Successful dialogue needs an environment of

- Mutual respect
- Trust building
- Patience



- Persistence
- Embracing

Note: An acceptable COORDINATOR is a MUST!

Activity state:

- Careful distribution of responsibilities and roles (e.g. hosting the meeting)
- Collectively agreed activities: form and focus (i.e. roundtable discussions, comparative study)... It took time!
- Funding
- Full-time Coordinator
- Capable and active Secretariat

Outcomes:

Parties with fierce opposing views can sit on the same table, share ideas, and engage in a productive discussion.

Natural shift - from discussing mainly the pros and cons of PSP to more "fundamental" (real) issues of water provision, e.g. financing, tariffs, access of the poor etc.

Growing ownership among members on the NWG activities as the process rolls on.

As time is approaching the end of the current phase of the NWG: some tangible contributions and potential impacts of MSH dialogues.

There is a need to follow up the current outcomes.

The role of international process of TWD has been instrumental to the success of the NWG

- Set a benchmark: pace, time frame, activities, outcomes
- Fundraising support
- Collective sense: we are not alone.

Jean-Pierre Mas, South Africa, Private sector/Suez:

Jean-Pierre has been involved in The Water Dialogues since 2005.

I was running Johannesburg Water – Johannesburg was very visible and our attempts to make changes were resisted. Between 1997-2001 I worked in rural areas hearing a lot about the private sector not working with the poor. This was incredibly frustrating, as I couldn't see this stereotype as being a reality at all. So, TWD came at the right moment. I saw it as a tool that could lead to better governance. However, I was only interested in joining if certain rules were established – in South Africa this involved establishing our Code of Conduct.

If you go to real dialogue you must be ready to leave your weapons outside and take risks – without being naïve. Each institutional player has a role. If you take one player out, there is no dialogue.



Outcomes:

- A big boost to get the window opened and get fresh air in
- Better understanding of positions beyond stereotypes
- Establishing some overarching principles that all agree on: universal water supply
- Movement from a positioning debate to a principles one
- Debate on the means, but agreement on the goal.

The question of institutionalising Dialogue is unnecessary – it is not about institutionalising, it is about emerging naturally. Engagement with other stakeholders is guaranteed to add value and increased the sustainability of your work. In the case of the Soweto Project for example, I believe better solutions would have emerged, avoiding the court cases that took place, if a Dialogue had taken place prior to the project.

Group work continued

After the personal reflections participants returned to their groups to add new ideas and insights to their presentations.

The time frame for Step 2 of the group work was:

- 15-20 minutes to continue the conversation
- 15 minutes to prepare flipcharts and
- 4-5 minutes to present in plenary.

Plenary presentations

Group 1 – Stanley Marley, AVRL, Ghana:

How can multistakeholder dialogue processes move towards universal water provision?

It cannot address the global power imbalances.

But at the national level it has made a difference

- By influencing policy makers (Indonesia)
- Empowerment in tariff structure (Philippines)
- By showing different perspectives (Indonesia)
- By overcoming conflicts among stakeholders
- Allows for a release of energies and resources that might influence policy makers (Indonesia).

Context conditions: conflicts, large numbers, power imbalances...

Future: Climate change, CSR...



Group 2 presented by Belinda Calaguas, ActionAid

What is new about TWD multistakeholder work?

- Not one-off consultation
- Process of knowledge building: informed continuing discussions → dialogues have a 'training' element
- 'Dynamic consultation'
- Dialogue in 'private sphere'; so not public grandstanding
- Problem-focused, problem solving focus → constructive framing of problem/question.

FUTURE:

Issues:

- Financing – subsidies, cost-recovery, capital investments
- How to make enterprises work – PuPs-PPPs contracts
- Equity
- Modes of delivery to achieve universal access
- Policy and regulation.

Donors to future dialogues: What performance indicators for multistakeholder dialogues, e.g.

- Levels of government representation
- Types of stakeholders involved, especially grassroots, poor
- Processes
- Activities.

International & National

- Champions + leaders – e.g. to promote MSH processes to AMCOW, donors, national/local actors
- National Policy-makers need to be lobbied
 - At international level by national & international actors
 - At national level by national actors
- To assist new countries to start their own MSH dialogues
- To continue experience sharing and inspiration sharing amongst different dialogue participants in different countries.

Group 3 presented by Ulrike Pokorski da Cunha, GTZ

What was NEW?



- Personal experience

- Institutional experience

MSD as process towards universal provision

- Focus was different (PSP)

- See potential

- Can help bridging gap between policy & implementation

In what kind of context is MSD necessary?

- Pressing issues (trigger)

- Controversy

- Key stakeholders under spotlight

What kind of issues could be focus of future MSD?

- Reduce policy vacuum around WatSan

- Vulnerability of the poor in context of Climate Change

- Infrastructure planning.

Group 4 presented by Robin Simpson, Consumers International

New elements:

- Process

- SSIP

MSD as process towards universal provision

SSIPs - incorporation into dialogue

Role will evolve as system changes if not then risk of destructive competition

Universal service linked to service to non-connected

In what kind of context if MSD necessary:

BOUNDARIES

1. SSIPs also boundaries issue

2. Boundaries between connected and non-connected

3. Boundary between local & national

4. MS Forums could raise those issues not dealt with by reforms

What kind of issues could be the focus of future MSD?



Corruption – identifying levels/violations of rights to workers

Resource competition – local, regional

Investment sources

Legal framework – can MS help

Group 5 presented by Patrick Apoya, CONIWAS, Ghana

1. What was new?

- i. Former antagonists at table
- ii. Donors not driving the agenda
- iii. A goal but results are open-ended
- iv. Controversy generated interest
- v. Focuses engagement & more in-depth involvement
- vi. Case studies one method as a basis of engagement with reality (Reality imposes itself over & above paradigms).

2. Universal provision

MHS is a tool of good governance to deal with service delivery.

Q: What do we mean by institutionalisation? Not institutions but a way of doing things.

3. Conditions/context

- i. Huge controversy, contested issue
- ii. Desire for knowledge/learning
- iii. Clear goal/target but not on track
- iv. A minimum level of enabling environment (democracy)
- v. A clear question that needs to be interrogated
- vi. Survival as the issue.

4. Future issues

- i. Financing
- ii. Corruption
- iii. Rights & obligations
- iv. Water conservation/security.



Group 6 presented by Johann Mettler, South African Local Government Association

1. General

From donor perspective MSD not clear priority. Perspectives from consumers, workers, and civil society not sufficiently heard. Different messages: Unions/business organised – which views prevail. MSD not a silver bullet.

2. Burning

Need regulator to give consumers input into affairs of PSP/WP

Depending on local cost ext. MSD can give small WP's recognition → can lead to improved SD

Participation must be a conditionality just as contracts, indicators...

3. Context

MSD appropriate in

- Planning
- Review
- Delivery can involve civil society in rolling out service, infrastructure.

Warren thanked the groups for the materials generated and specified these would influence the afternoon sessions. He then invited Jessica to formally close down TWD.



Closing The Water Dialogues



Jessica Wilson, South Africa National Working Group and International Working Group Member: Closure and goodbye

The journey began in Bonn, then Berlin and now: clarity from the mass hallucination!

Closure is the ultimate loss of control – we are giving it back. We as individuals of course still exist, and strong relationships have been developed and will last.

Our thanks to donors, National and International Working Group members.

The International Working Group will no longer be operating. Kate and Donna will be closing the International Secretariat by the end of January.

Goodbye to this phase and welcome to the next phase.

The Future – by Mary Galvin

Mary Galvin posed two key questions:

Where do those things that are valuable go now?

And

Do any of you want to take this up?

She suggested that the participants divided themselves into three subgroups:

1. National level: Other countries wanting to take up MSD dialogues on water (Ghana, Chad, India etc):
 - What would be the key questions for you?
2. Institutionalisation into own work/organisation:
 - What would it mean within your organisation?
 - How do you institutionalise MSD within local government?



3. Future:

- Governance, financing, corruption, Climate Change, other topics...
- International/national level? Who and how?

Presentations and responses from group work

1. National level (facilitated by Anne)

Guiding questions

What steps to take to pursue dialogue?

What expertise/support is needed? Where to get it?

Outcomes

Ghana: Sufficient water provision – how to get it?

The three A's: Availability – Accessibility – Affordability

Status: All stakeholders ready to engage in dialogue. The missing link is a structure/platform to support the dialogue. TWD is an obvious way forward.

India: How risky is it to engage in a dialogue with an open agenda?

Status: A proposal and some funding.

Ideas: you need

- A clear purpose/a focus – start with a scoping exercise → focus
- To identify the major stakeholders – and keep the doors wide open. NB: who is not there?
- A very good/acceptable coordinator/facilitator of the right mindset
- Funding
- Committed people
- Peer support from other countries.

2. Institutionalisation (Facilitated by Kate)

Guiding questions

Within your organisation? Other organisations?

Within local government/municipalities?

Other? National level?

What expertise/support is needed?

Where to get it? - & how to catalyse?



Outcome group work

- In South Africa – Local Government Association → feeding into United Cities and Local Governments of Africa
- WATERAID – “Building the case” to incorporate in existing Global Transparency Fund programming

Connecting with existing initiatives:

- IRC – “learning alliances”
- SWITCH
- Global Framework for action – still being designed so opportunity there to make the GF4A more specific
- GTZ – role of private sector – using dialogues as a tool
- UN-HABITAT example – use of dialogue in design of programmes

People part of group already act as ambassadors but must be a “nest” to see what has changed & share new information

- Virtual?
- How to ensure use?
- Incentives? Who drives it?

GTZ need specifics of what TWD brings exactly so can more effectively use it?

3. Future dialogues? (Facilitated by Warren)

Guiding questions

What are the key issues you would be interested/committed to taking up?

At what level, e.g. international, national?

What next steps?

Issue 1 →

Issue 2 →

Outcomes

What are the key issues you would be interested/committed to taking forward?

Leaders: champions....

Financing: guarantees (NB: to unpack what difference the dialogue process will make)

**IUCN:****India Bangladesh**

- transboundary issues
- Fact-based advocacy
- Navigation
- Climate change

Action Aid shares similar interests:

- transboundary issue (management of water resources)
- SUB-REGION: national → implications for subregion

IUCN:

Regional Water Dialogue (Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam)

- governance
- 4 years

TWD – no international dialogue – a different role, facilitated, synergies + exchange + support new countries.

How can we establish a dialogue project at both International and National levels?

Future of the website: maintaining? Ongoing learning resource.

GWA – 1800 members – E-CONFERENCE (challenging)

Explore possibilities + financing: effect on the poor, marginalised, different genders (use methodology of TWD; etc.)

Legal frameworks:

- Policy issues (exchange be to parliaments)
- Lessons learned → legal positions
- Dialogue at local level: easier, practical.

What are the key obstacles to water delivery in your context?**Uganda:**

Financing – inadequate

Resources

Dividing the cake

Philippines:

Corruption in the water sector (many stories, hard to pin down)

Climate change – of immediate relevance

2. Indonesia + Philippines: focus remains on universal provision... – in current context



Process: include local dialogues.

Policy: Focus on how policy is made in the sector

- National policy
- Local problems

Public enterprises

Transboundary: How are the players situated, which subregions/basins? (E.g. Nile basin issues)

National	Local
<p>Indonesian WG: Prepare new concept note (interview all members, identify topics e.g. water shortage – climate change) 15 departments – integration needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Public sector efficiency ■ Financing ■ CWW (?)-boundaries, local, other levels of ... 	<p>NB: necessary parts of national level processes</p> <p>Ghana</p>
<p>SA: Government representatives – feed into turn around Start + WD next steps</p>	
<p>Philippines: Streams of knowledge → Issues: e.g. corruption</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Try the method ■ Approach organisations/networks that are doing the work. 	<p>Institutions</p>

The group presentations signaled the end of the Final Conference main content.

The International Secretariat will continue to exist until the end of January 2010. The website will stay live until 2012. Belinda said that the IWG will think about how the website can continue.

Evaluation (questionnaire)

Everybody was asked to fill in the conference evaluation questionnaire. See attached Appendix 12.



Closure and way forward

Kate Martin thanked all participants for their time, presence, and valuable contributions, and for making the Final Conference a success. She said that the Process Record and the Evaluation would be sent out in January.

She then called on Robin Simpson to officially close the conference:

Closing speech and acknowledgments by Robin Simpson, IWG member:

Firstly thanks to all present for coming. When we discussed the final conference in June in Pretoria, I was one of the more pessimistic members of the IWG when it came to prospects of attendance, as we were competing with other important events such as the Copenhagen summit and the International Water Association conference. And indeed we have lost some people to those events, but nevertheless, I am delighted to say that I was wrong and the attendance here and the content of the conference has lived up to what we hoped for, and indeed our colleagues that are with us for the first time have given us a sense of new interest and enthusiasm.

Our German hosts here deserve double thanks. As Manfred indicated in his speech of welcome, BMZ were there right at the start and things have come full circle for them to be with us as hosts at the end of the current project. Their initial support was vital to make way for the second phase of the funding which came from DFID, UK, who took us through the central period of the project. We had a well-attended report-back seminar in London with DFID on October 14th which is why they are not with us here today. And in 2009 we have been supported by PPIAF represented here by Clemencia Torres and without that support we could not have completed the programme on the productive note that is demonstrated by the documents that you see presented here. To all our three big funders we give thanks for their financial support and advice.

But we should also record that members of The Water Dialogues contributed significant resources in money, in kind and in staff time. Thames Water and WaterAid both contributed to running expenses during the early phases, and WaterAid also made a significant contribution in terms of administrative support, as did Environmental Monitoring Group South Africa and my own organisation Consumers International which provided an office home for the International Secretariat and during this last year administrative help as well for the PPIAF funded activities.

The National Working Groups also raised funds from donors quite separately and their respective members also provided help in cash and kind. Running alongside all of that has been the very substantial and long-lasting help in staff time provided by all the partners of the IWG and the respective NWGs, members from the private and public sectors, labour unions, universities, NGOs, regulatory bodies, local government. It is among the membership that the decisions have been taken by the partners and the responsibilities assumed. And yes it was a lot of work and speaking as





a member of the IWG, I must point out that there were members of the national groups that also had the double responsibility of working for the international group too, and this must have been a heavy load to carry. And the reality is that for many individual members of both NWGs and the IWG, even when they were sponsored by their organisations, a great deal of this time was voluntary.

I have set this out in some detail not just to go through the process of giving credit where it is due, important though that is, but also because anyone embarking on such an exercise in the future, (and we hope there will be some), needs to know that this was a very multifaceted activity, a major team effort of great complexity. That complexity was a source of strength as at different times different members came forward to take responsibility to keep things going.

But there is a limit to how much can be achieved by voluntary effort and without our International Secretariat we could not have functioned. Our first Secretariat was provided jointly by Penny Urquhart from South Africa and Deborah Moore from the US, with Penny taking charge after the Berlin 2004 conference, when we ceased to be a scoping review and took on our present form. But without core funding, progress proved to be very difficult, and it was the arrival of DFID funds that allowed us to move on to a solid footing with Hilary Coulby who really gave us a corporate identity, anchored our funding base, appointed staff and consolidated the spread of the Dialogues to Indonesia and Philippines, thus completing the five NWGs. Although Hilary has been laid low by a bug and cannot be with us, it is good to see Ganesh Pangare a previous member of the Secretariat with us for this conference.

Hilary also appointed Kate Martin and Kate has steered us to this final phase with the invaluable assistance of Donna Arrondelle and for this conference organisation, Susannah Hugill. The Secretariat does not live in some glossy office in London pulling strings and disbursing travel costs. They have operated out of a shoebox next to my office with a leaking roof and blocked drains. And right in the middle of the preparation phase the office moved. We had originally intended to have the conference for September but the timing proved too tight and so Kate and Donna had to reorganise their lives around this continuation and I can assure you this was not an easy task. I cannot speak too highly of the huge efforts they have made to take on board these changes and steer us so efficiently to the culmination.

Some very expert consultants, including Karen Bakker whose name you see on the Summary Report and Sophie Tremolet who had to cancel her attendance here at the last minute, have complemented the work of the Secretariat. Mary Galvin from South Africa gets a special mention for having worked with us in three capacities, IWG, NWG and consultant. We have also been advised by our academic panel David Hall, with us here today, Richard Franceys and Miguel Solanes and guest participants as in our round table here William Muhairwe and Philippe Marin.

And of course we cannot name all those participants who took part in surveys and meetings in the five countries. We cannot do justice to that work here, we can only envisage the many town hall or village meetings, we thank them too and our NWG members who made those events happen.

And finally here Warren Banks (his second time with us) and Anne Weber Carlsen have kept us to time, kept us on the issues and kept us looking forward. And on that note I make two points in conclusion. Firstly good luck to all those who carry this work forward including some of the existing NWGs and, we hope, any NWGs that might emerge in 'new' countries. We hope we have illustrated



some of the pitfalls and the many rewards. Secondly, I want to put on record that any project in which so many founder members have carried on for over six years and whose first funders come back at the end to help complete what they helped to start, must have done something right.

Thank you for your attention and thank you so much for coming.

My Way

And now, the end is near,
We hope it's not the final curtain.
We brought you all
To hear our case of which we're certain.
Our panel guests, David Hall,
Philippe Marin, William Muhairwe;
Each one can say with pride:
"I did it my way"

Regrets, we've had a few,
As through our national groups we wander
Cape Town, Brazil, the Philippines,
Indonesia and Uganda.
In town hall meets, in flooded streets
It was not quite the IFI way.
But at the end, say all our friends:
"I did it my way".

And so my friends we have to dash
But please hand in your boarding pass
Tear down the flip charts, dim the lights
Switch off your power points and skypes
And tell your friends back home tonight:
"I did it my way"

Bonn December 8th 2009