

Minutes

Water Dialogue WG Meeting

Wed 26th July 2006, Mvula Trust, Johannesburg

Present: Stephen (Chair), Bheki (DWAF), Abri (DWAF), Martin (Mvula), JP (Jowam), Jeff (SAMWU), Hamedra (SAWC), Jessica (EMG)

Arrived Late: Kathy

Apologies: William Moraka (SALGA), John Connelly (SAAWU), Ndala Duma (WIN), Mmule Majola, Jay (WRC), Bricks Mokolo (APF)

Observers: Emily Huc (IWG Secretariat) and Antonella Mancini (process recording consultant to the IWG)

Jessica recused from the short-listing discussion and joins meeting at 12.45

(As with the last minutes, there were only a few of us, and that things are now at a critical stage, I've made these minutes rather more detailed so that absentees can keep up)

Agenda

1. Shortlist candidates, agree on selection process
2. Other funding options
3. Representation on the IWG
4. Reportback from London research / methodology workshop (Jessica)
5. Process recording

Shortlisting candidates for co-ordinator post

Funding update + bridging loan

The issue of funding and timing for appointment of the coordinator was discussed. **Malcolm** (Irish Aid) is confident that we will get the funds, because the funds are with IA in Pretoria and have been ring-fenced for the Water Dialogues and IA in Dublin is supportive. But the formal process has to be completed and external consultants must be satisfied. Funds will only be available from 21st September, or if we fail this attempt, there is another window 3-months later.

At last meeting **Martin** indicated that Mvula may be able to provide some "bridging" money to allow work to start sooner.

*Action – **Martin** to confirm whether this is still possible*

Shortlisting

EMG was tasked to screen out the no-hoppers from the 70+ responses received. Stephen sent his selection of the best 9 CVs to WG regulars. A quick whip-around revealed that of the 9 CV and motivation letters under discussion, there was general agreement regarding the best 3 with 3 others also in the running. The WG looked at the CVs of the latter in more detail and agreed that:

1. Five candidates would be interviewed
2. Interviews will be secured with the WG's top 4 candidates (as unanimously agreed)

-
3. **Stephen** and **Hameda** would phone 2 other candidates for more clarification on their CVs, and between them propose the 5th candidate.

Interview process

The ad stated that interviews would be held on 3rd Aug. **Hameeda** and **Martin** not available. An alternative Fri 11th (9am to 3pm latest) was agreed, and given that all but 1 candidate is Cape Town based, interviews should happen in Cape Town. WG members who can, should pay their own fare. EMG will cover candidates travel. EMG agreed to find a venue, with DWAF as an alternative. (Top candidates were phoned and confirmed their availability). The roster of interviews would be random, except for candidates who can only make a specific slot.

The process:

1. **Stephen** as chair, **Jeff** as timekeeper – welcome, etc. explain the process, etc.
2. Candidate gives a 10min verbal presentation (they are briefed a few days in advance)
3. Questions and discussion - 10min
4. Set questions from panel – 30 min
5. Any final questions/comments from the candidate or panel – 5min
6. Thank you and goodbye – 1min

The presentation:

A few days in advance of the interview, refer candidates to the EMG website for more info and ask them to prepare a 10min verbal presentation (no powerpoints please) to the selection panel – *"What is your understanding of the current private/public sector debate in the water services sector in SA. What do you see as the key challenges for this MSP initiative? What do you see as the objectives and success criteria in relation to this initiative? Finally, what do you think you will bring to the process and will get out of it?"*

The set questions:

1. Multi-stakeholder processes (e.g. Can you give tell us about your experience of MSP. What was your role? How did you manage the process? What were issues you faced and how did you manage these?)
2. Research methodology (e.g. Based on your experience what are the critical areas for designing a research process?)
3. Knowledge of water services sector locally & possibly internationally
4. Process mgt – managing this entire project – juggling a whole series of balls at the same time
5. Project mgt – researchers and nitty-gritty of project
6. Any questions they want to ask the group?
7. Why do you think you are the best person for the job? tell us your strengths and weaknesses.

Action - Abrie will formulate the questions and circulate to the WG by Friday.

Making a decision

It was agreed that we all do individual rating based on candidates presentation and answers. The suggestion is 30 points for presentation and 10 points for each question. Also note any general sensitivities or concerns (political bias, character, etc.). No formal de-brief after each interview. Consensus decision at the end.

Feedback on the methodology workshop in London

Jessica handed out a 2-pager (attached below) on the 3-day workshop she attended in London. Full minutes are being prepared by the IWG Secretariat.

The workshop was attended by some of the Intl Academic Panel members and reps from each of the National Processes except for Philippines.

Academic Panel member Miguel Solanes will draft a set of "contextual questions" which may aid our research programme design.

Action – Nothing immediate required. WG members should read the report and think about its implications for the SA Process.

Representation on the IWG

Jessica gave background to how the IWG came into being, and why EMG's current seat on the IWG needs to be reviewed.

In short, the role of the IWG has changed with the establishment of the 5 national dialogues. EMG's "seat" on the IWG should be reviewed given that the SA Dialogue's "link person" should be selected by the WG.

The role of IWG is:

- ensure that national dialogues conform to some common set of criteria/principles but not to dictate to national processes
- ensure good communication between IWG (including Sec) and National WGs
- provide oversight of the Intl Secretariat (management, staffing, contracts, etc.)
- ensure that there is feedback to a broader set of stakeholders who are interested in project
- ensure sharing across case-study countries, regarding research and analysis
- explore possibility of dialogues in other countries

IWG Members sit on one or more of 3 task teams, namely Management (oversees secretariat, finance etc , Research, and Advocacy.

Also, while the IWG members do not necessarily have a mandate from sectors, it should have a good multi-stakeholder balance.

Subsequent discussion raised the following points (not necessarily agreements):

- It is clear that while the IWG has a multi-stakeholder makeup, members do not "represent" their sectors
- Nominating an SA link-person is relatively easy, but we also have questions about the overall makeup and functioning of the IWG which we may have to deal with over time.
- The next IWG meeting is in Berlin in late October (30 October – 2nd November). We need to make a decision on a SA representative and preferably also alternate well before then.
- We need to recognise that the IWG has a greater role than just coordinating work in the 5 case-study countries.
- IWG members who are not directly nominated by their national processes should not have voting or decision-making rights.

Emily Huc noted:

1. It would be helpful to the IWG and the Secretariat if the SA WG could write a letter documenting the above concerns.
2. The IWG will pay for the SA-link and 3 additional delegates to attend the meeting

It was agreed to postpone the selection of the SA link person and the other 3 reps to Berlin until after the co-ordinator recruitment. (possibly this could be done directly after the interviews... or maybe by email)

Next meeting

The interview panel will meet in Cape Town on the 11th. No agreement on the next full WG meeting until after this date.

The meeting closed at approx 2pm with thanks to Mvula for hosting and providing lunch

— end —