

Water Dialogues : South African Working Group Meeting 18 January 2006

Present

Bev Pretorius (WIN, *facilitator*), Abri Vermeulen (DWAF), Bheki Ngubo (DWAF), JP Mas (Jowam), William Moraka (SALGA), Jeff Rudin (SAMWU), John Connelly (SAAWU), Jessica Wilson (EMG, *minutes*), Kathy Eales (Jhb-CMU), Jay Bhagwan (WRC, *partial attendance*)

Apologies

Neil McLeod (Durban Metro), Robert Giron (SizaWater), Hamed Deedat (SAWC), Martin Rall (Mvula Trust)

Participation

A concern was raised that some important and/or regular participants were absent. However we were very happy to have representatives from SA Association of Water Utilities and SA Local Government Association office for the first time. It was agreed that we should also invite the Dept. of Provincial and Local Govt. (Matoto Sigidi) and National Treasury (Karen Breytenbach or other).

Purpose of the meeting

- get up to speed (for new comers)
- share methodology from international process
- concrete way forward, including funding

Introduction

Jessica and Abri provided a brief overview of the project and its history (see minutes of previous meetings and proposals for details). We are managing a balance between process and content. Challenge now is to set up a secretariat.

New Name: The Water Dialogues

The PSP Review has been renamed *Multistakeholder Dialogues on Water and the Private Sector*, or The Water Dialogues (for short). There will soon be a web-site.

Funding and secretariat

We will appoint a secretariat including a coordinator and researchers. This needs to happen as soon as possible. The SA Working Group (WG) will oversee the content and quality of the research. The contractual signatory (e.g. DWAF or another member of the WG) won't sign off unless the WG approves.

Funding status: only DFID has money available for this financial year. DCI and Danida (via DWAF) might have money in the future. The WG has had some concern re how DFID allocates money, i.e. it has to go through an open tender.

It was agreed that the tender should call for both individuals and companies. In both cases we would need to see personal CV's.

Action: Abri to ensure all the paperwork gets done, tasks are:

- revise proposal and give to DFID (**Abri, 30 January** – Kathy, JP, Bheki, Bongani can help)
- alert DFID that they need to finalise their decision during week 30 Jan to 3 Feb (Abri + team)
- negotiate / agree with DFID and Deloitte (**Abri, 3 February**)
- advertise (by Tuesday, **7 Feb**)
- get responses (within 2 weeks)

Selection panel: Hamed, JP, Abri, Jessica (Jessica is only available if interviews happen before March). Anyone else who is available and interested is welcome to be part of the panel.

Methodology Workshop

JP, Jeff, Abri and Jessica attended the international methodology workshop where representatives from the 5 case study countries met for the first time. Draft proceedings from the workshop were circulated to the SA Working Group.

JP's perspectives:

- learnt about International Working Group (IWG), their responsibilities and mandate, e.g. are members representing their sectors; useful to meet IWG
- learnt about international secretariat (working part time)
- saw time-lines and issues from other participating countries. Brazil and SA most advanced. Brazil discussing institutional review of water sector and want this process to feed into the institutional review, Brazil already seen progress in improving understanding and communication between public and private sector.
- Uganda: focus on small-scale local private sector
- Indonesia and Philippines: people at methodology meeting did not represent the whole of the water sector. Still early in their processes
- Didn't really discuss methodology, more exchange of ideas and experiences. Don't have solid tools to make sure research is correct.
- SA shared our process with respect to our broader focus (including public sector) and code of conduct

Jeff's perspectives

- agree with JP's points
- struck by fact that Uganda and Philippines not asking the first of the questions, i.e. *whether* the private sector have a role (they are assuming it does and so are only answering *how* it performs its role); Indonesia will ask both questions (probably); Brazil couldn't answer clearly
- Brazil getting money from Brazilian government because they see that the Review will feed directly into policy
- Brazilian equivalent of SALGA agreed a while ago not to support pre-payment metres

Questions:

Did we talk at all about SWAP (sector-wide approach)? SA and Uganda are both doing SWAPs – SA through Masibambane. *No.*

How will we pick up absence of research methodology? *Some resource material is available particularly on participatory methods. The secretariat will provide additional info. We don't need to wait for others to develop our national research methodology.*

Comment: different institutional set-ups in each country so ask different questions. Process needs to be beneficial for each country.

Process recording

We need to reflect and record process as it unfolds. All members of the WG are encouraged to keep journals. Our minutes will also assist with process recording.

Action: WIN (Bev) will think about how we can record process effectively in South Africa and make suggestions at the next meeting.

Evaluation criteria – national

Martin has sent draft evaluation criteria for discussion (hard copies were circulated at the meeting). This is the task of the WG. These criteria are used to evaluate the quality of research against the reframing questions.

Action: All to send comments to task team by 30 Jan. Task team will revise and link to the reframing questions by 28 Feb. Task team: **Martin – lead person**, Jeff, Neil, John

Evaluation criteria – international

A list was circulated of evaluation criteria identified at the Berlin workshop in June 2004. Most people didn't feel that the list was terribly helpful, but agreed to look at it in conjunction with our problem statement and select 4 or 5 relevant criteria.

Action: Kathy will do a first draft, circulate for comments, and submit to the international secretariat by 14 Feb.

Case-study selection

Acronym help list: WSA: water service authority, WSP: water service provider

Abri's proposal: It would be helpful if we can use case-studies that are already documented. Look at approximately 8 case studies. Need to look at range of options, e.g. 2 metros, 2 district municipalities (that are WSAs), 2 local municipalities (WSAs), 2 regional service providers. Within this, we want a spread between urban, peri-urban and rural. We should produce an analytical report as a separate activity that compares between two like examples and between the different categories.

Jeff: identify different types of service providers then find 1 or 2 case studies to go with each of these.

Kathy: if we go with Abri's approach, will we ask same questions of all?

John: if we want to do justice... then clusters of questions will inform who we go and ask questions of. Not all will be asked the same questions.

JP: agree with Jeff; focus on WSP not WSA. Need to look at the questions as well as best practice. Some research already done on some WSP – see what we can use.

Jeff: agree with JP. Before we tackle Kathy's question, let's agree on our case-studies; then revise the questions so they make sense for those case-studies (i.e. some flexibility with the questions). Don't leave these challenging issues to the coordinator.

Jay: why are we looking at a case study? Could the questions be the case studies themselves – i.e. go and look for answers in different areas. What does the international process think?

Jessica: we had this discussion at a national level, and had decided geographic case studies would provide the possibility of bringing evidence to specific areas and make it harder to pick evidence out of context to support a particular argument. We had also begun a process of looking at the questions and deciding how they could best be answered (e.g. through case study or desk-top research).

Jeff: DWAF should draft something for comment

JP: the other reason for case studies was that we were going to go to the areas as the WG to listen and ask questions.

Bev: need broader consultation on case study selection; this is an opportunity to share the problem statement and public-private relations. Are we going through provider or authority route? What are the optimal learning sites?

Abri: what is critical is the *comparative analysis* between the case studies. It doesn't matter as much if it is through authority or provider route.

Jay: its too early to say. Let's keep talking.

Action: various options for case study selection put forward for further discussion and sharing with our sectors – William

World Water Forum

There is a possibility of a presentation to Koffi Annan's advisory board on water on the 14 or 15 March (i.e. immediately before the 4th World Water Forum). The international secretariat will co-ordinate the presentation and would like representatives from the national processes to speak. JP and William are attending the Forum. Both are available to speak on behalf of the SA WG. The international secretariat will make the final decision on who the presenters are, based on an overall balance across sectors and countries.

Action: Jessica to let the international secretariat know that JP and William will be attending the 4th world water forum and could present on the SA process. JP/William to develop 1 or 2 slides on SA process as part of the international presentation.

International academic review panel

Suggestions for the international academic review panel are:

David Hall, Greenwich University, UK d.j.hall@gre.ac.uk

Patrick Bond, KZN University, SA

David MacDonald, Queen's University, Canada

Prof. John Langford, Univ. of Melbourne * John

Anthony Turton, UP / CSIR

Richard Franceys, Imperial College, UK * JP

David Hemson, HSRC

Action: Submit names to international secretariat - Jessica

SA academic review panel

Should we have a South African academic panel? Good idea! We will do some more thinking, revisit this at a later date, ask people if they are interested, get their CVs and make a selection.

Suggestions: Patrick Bond, KZN University; Anthony Turton, UP / CSIR; David Hemson, HSRC; Pete Ashton, CSIR; Kevin Pietersen, WRC; Laila Smith, Independent.

Code of Conduct

Signed copies received from: City of Joburg, SAMWU, EMG, JOWAM. The original hard copies are kept at WIN. Outstanding: SALGA, DWAF, SAAWU, WRC, SAWC, + others

Action: All to send signed copies to Bev, or bring to next meeting.

Reframing questions

The latest version of these questions is dated 5 October 2006. Since then, SAMWU have written comments but they have not yet been circulated to the whole WG. It was agreed that one of the new coordinator's tasks is to finalise the questions, incorporating SAMWU and others comments. Jeff will forward SAMWU's comments to all.

Admin issues

Jessica is on sabbatical for March-May; Kathy is the alternate for the International Working Group.

Next meeting

Thursday 9 March 2006 10am to 3pm, WRC. Bev is responsible for booking the venue, coordinating the agenda and reminding participants.

Summary of Actions

Action	Who	When
Circulate SAMWU comments on questions; new coordinator will revise	Jeff	30 Jan
Think about how we can record process effectively in South Africa and make suggestions at the next meeting	Bev	9 March
Write-up various options for case study selection for further discussion and sharing with our sectors	William,	20 February
<i>National evaluation criteria:</i> Send comments on Martin's draft evaluation criteria to task team Revise and link to the reframing questions	All Martin (lead person), Jeff, Neil, John	30 Jan 28 Feb
<i>International evaluation criteria</i> Circulate draft for comment, and submit final to the international secretariat	Kathy (lead person), all to comment	14 Feb
Finalise funding proposal with DFID (see detailed tasks in minutes)	Abri (lead person) Kathy, JP, Bheki, Bongani	3 February
Interview process	Abri to keep us updated	14 Feb
Invite DPLG (Matoto Sigidi) and National Treasury (Karen Breytenbach or other) to join working group	Abri	28 Feb
Prepare 1 or 2 slides on SA process as part of the international presentation to Koffi Annan's advisory board prior to WWF4.	William and/or JP (to be briefed by international secretariat)	15 March
Admin / coordination tasks - update email list (add Abri, William, Bheki) - Ask Secretariat to date and list author of Methodology report - let the international secretariat know that JP and William will be attending the 4 th world water forum and could present on the SA process - suggested names for academic panel to international secretariat	Jessica	25 Jan
Send signed copies of code of conduct to Bev, or bring to next meeting.	All	Asap, 9 March latest
Organise next meeting for 9 March	Bev	9 March