

Global Multi-Stakeholder PSP Review South African Working Group Meeting 5 October 2005

*Held at the Water Research Commission,
Notes compiled by Jessica Wilson*

PRESENT

Brick Mokolo (Anti-Privatisation Forum), Laila Smith (City of Joburg CMU), Neil Macleod (Durban Metro / SALGA), Abri Vermeulen (DWAF), Lufhuno Tshikovhi (DWAF), Bongani Msimang (DWAF), Reyno Seymore (DWAF), Jessica Wilson (EMG / International Working Group), Jean-Pierre Mas (JOWAM), Martin Rall (Mvula Trust), Charles Reeve (Facilitator), Hamed Deedat (SA Water Caucus), Jeff Rudin (SAMWU), Jay Bhagwan (Water Research Commission)

APOLOGIES

Tony Sanders (WSSA), John Connelly (SAAWU)

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The problem statement circulated prior to the meeting was revised and agreed as follows:

Municipalities in South Africa face many challenges in meeting the constitutional requirements to ensure effective, equitable and sustainable delivery of water supply and sanitation to all. This is taking into account the highly skewed distribution of wealth, service provision and water resources.

In the efforts to address these challenges a number of different approaches to service delivery including commercial approaches and PSP have been used.

This Multistakeholder Review provides the opportunity to create a constructive dialogue to identify, critically analyse and evaluate these approaches leading to greater understanding of service delivery models. It is envisaged that this understanding will lead to more effective service delivery models to contribute to universal supply of safe water and sanitation.

CODE OF CONDUCT

The code of conduct circulated prior to the meeting was revised and agreed (see separate attachment).

ACTION: **Jessica** to circulate by Friday 7 October and **all** to bring SIGNED copies to next meeting.

FINANCING AND STAFFING

Development Co-operation Ireland (DCI)

- positive indication, could have funds for next financial year

Danida

- no additional funds available for the Review

DFID

- positive indication, have funds available for this financial year (up to end March 2006); potential funds for next year
- need to submit scope of study and deliverables for them to develop Terms of Reference
- their procedures include call for competitive tender
- this WG would be the steering committee for the project

Discussion

Concerns: we don't want to hand over this process to DFID (or anyone else). It is important to keep the integrity of the MSH process. Can we engage with DFID and do it a different way? Unlikely, but worth trying.

Proposed outputs for this financial year (to be elaborated and submitted to funders)

Agreed criteria, methodology, case studies etc.

Arrange 1st MSH forum

Detailed methodology for next year (phase 2)

Establish secretariat to do the work

ACTION:

The following actions to be completed by October 31 by the fundraising task team:

DWAF (convener), Martin Rall, Laila Smith, JP Mas

1. Speak to DFID to see if we can do something differently
2. Develop detailed proposal including output and budget for this financial year and submit to DFID (and others)
3. Explore finance options from AFD (French) – JP to lead
4. Continue discussions with DCI (Irish)
5. Approach other possible funders
6. Develop proposal for rest of the project (could be done once money for this financial year is secured)

INTERNATIONAL PROCESS

The international process is in itself exploring and finding its way forward. How do we relate to it and how do we use the international Methodology workshop to ensure it adds value for South Africa?

The international process is of benefit because:

- international learning
- peer review
- show-case South African models
- share learning from South Africa

We want to be able to influence the international process so that it supports our process. At the methodology workshop, we will:

- a) explain why we are broadening the scope to look at commercial approaches and the public sector and suggest that other countries do the same
- b) share our methodology and learn from others.

It was suggested that DWAF might host an event or cocktail party to welcome the other countries and demonstrate DWAF's commitment to the Global MSH PSP Review.

Nominations for the methodology workshop: It was agreed to send representatives from DWAF, Civil Society and the Private Sector. **Abri Vermeulen** is not available but will ensure someone from DWAF is there. **Jeff Rudin** and **JP Mas** are in principle willing to attend, subject to their availability.

ACTION:

Abri to check possibility of DWAF hosting a cocktail party

Jessica to circulate exact dates and venue

Representatives to prepare presentation or whatever is needed to participate in the methodology workshop. If possible, formal presentations should be shared via e-mail with the rest of the WG for comment prior to the meeting.

METHODOLOGY AND APPROACH

The following steps were suggested as a logical way of moving forward on the methodology:

1. The questions must address the **problem statement**
2. Where possible we will use **case studies** as this focuses the debate to a specific area and allows people to bring evidence to the review process
3. Agree on a shortened, focused list of **questions**
4. Agree on **criteria** and analyse different service delivery models (case studies) according to those criteria
5. Select case studies according an agreed **matrix of parameters**, to allow for comparison. Parameters could include:
 - * scale (number of people serviced, wealth of municipality)
 - * rural / urban
 - * extent of PSP (need to define)
 - * type of management arrangement
6. Check selected case studies against agreed questions and revise if necessary
7. Identify questions that can not be answered by a case study and agree on how they will be answered (e.g. supporting desk-top research)
8. Group questions according to **review area** and aspect to be **measured**, if useful, especially in aligning with other countries.

The first two steps were agreed as statements of principle and approach. Progress was made on the ensuing steps as follows:

Questions

The questions dated 23 September 2005 circulated prior to the meeting were discussed in terms of:

- are there things missing
- are there things we want to add
- are we happy with how they are written

Unfortunately not everyone had had a chance to read and discuss the questions with their sectors prior to the meeting. At the same time, participants expressed concern that we are continuing to revise and revisit the questions and it is becoming tedious and a seemingly never-ending process.

It was therefore agreed that we will accept the questions as they now stand as the basic framework for the Review. People will go back their sectors and (if necessary) make specific comments that can be incorporated when the terms of reference for the research team are drawn up. Any comments on the questions will be circulated to all via e-mail.

The agreed questions are attached.

Evaluation criteria

These are the criteria against which we will compare the models and/or evaluate their success. A preliminary list was drawn up at the meeting on 5 August 2005. We need to define some of these more specifically and put measurable indicators against them.

Preliminary evaluation criteria:

- affordability for people
- cost-effectiveness of service delivery
- sustainability of service/delivery chain
- community consultation/participation
- participation of labour
- capacity to deliver services
- customer/consumer/user service – to ensure quality service to user
- definition of basic water supply and sanitation (including quantity of water)
- governance – relationships, regulation etc.
- extent to which water is universally available
- legislative aspects – is legislation supportive
- institutional arrangements

ACTION: flesh out what these criteria are and develop indicators – **Martin (lead person), Jeff, Neil** – first draft by end of October to full WG; revised draft by end November.

Parameters for choosing the case-studies

These were not discussed at the meeting.

ACTION: DWAF (**Abri**) to table proposal on how to select case studies by end of October. **All** to comment and include suggestions for actual case studies in their comments.

NEXT MEETING

10am – 3pm on 18 January 2006 at WRC

Jay to book venue and organise lunch

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

What	Who	When
Circulate code of conduct	Jessica	Friday 7 October
Bring signed copy of code of conduct to next meeting.	All	Next meeting (18 January 2006)
Fundraising: - Speak to DFID to see if we can do something differently - Develop detailed proposal including output and budget for this financial year and submit to DFID (and others) - Explore finance options from AFD (French) – JP to lead - Continue discussions with DCI (Irish) - Approach other possible funders - Develop proposal for rest of the project (could be done once money for this financial year is secured)	DWAF/Abri (convener), Martin, Laila, JP	31 October
Check possibility of DWAF hosting a cocktail party linked to the methodology workshop	Abri	21 Oct
Circulate exact dates and venue of methodology workshop	Jessica	14 Oct
Prepare presentation or whatever is needed to participate in the methodology workshop. If possible, formal presentations should be shared via e-mail with the rest of the WG for comment prior to the meeting	DWAF, Jeff, JP (or alternates)	5 December 2005
flesh out evaluation criteria and develop indicators for them	Martin (lead person), Jeff, Neil –	31 Oct (1 st draft) 30 Nov (2 nd draft)
Table proposal on how to select case studies Comment and include suggestions for actual case studies in their comments.	DWAF (Abri) All	31 Oct (1 st draft) 30 Nov (2 nd draft)
Venue and catering for next meeting	Jay	18 January 2006
Send out minutes.	Jessica	7 Oct