

REPORT OF THE MUS GROUP MEETING 31 MAY / 1 JUNE 2011

Venue:

IFAD building, room 303
Rome, Italy

Hosted by IFAD

Background and introduction to the meeting

During the last MUS Group meeting in November 2010, the MUS Group discussed planning and implementation guidelines, as developed by several of its members. Based on this, a commitment was made to consolidate more generic planning and implementation guidelines for MUS. The MUS Group meeting held on 31 May and 1 June at the IFAD office in Rome focused on discussing these generic guidelines further. To feed the generic guidelines with practical experiences, NGOs, research organisations and the host of the meeting, IFAD, shared experiences in applying the MUS approach during the meeting.

Objectives of the meeting were:

- Sharing of experiences in MUS implementation
- Furthering work on generic planning and implementation guidelines for MUS
- Sharing IFAD's experiences in MUS and exploring opportunities for collaboration on MUS

A total of 27 representatives from NGOs, research institutions and multi-lateral organisation participated in the MUS Group meeting. See annex 1 for a list of participants.

The MUS Group meeting was divided into 4 blocks:

- Block 1: Experiences of IFAD in MUS
- Block 2: Towards guidelines for implementing MUS
- Block 3: MUS Group "business" meeting, including an update from member activities (see <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1371> for the separate minutes of that)
- Special creative session on "developing working models"

This was followed by a fifth block, organised as a briefing session for IFAD portfolio managers. During this briefing session, IFAD portfolio managers were briefed on what MUS is and what the MUS Group can do for them. The full programme can be found in annex 2.

Welcome by Rudolph Cleveringa (IFAD)

The participants of the MUS Group meeting were welcomed by Rudolph Cleveringa, Senior Technical Advisor at IFAD, which hosted the MUS Group meeting. He welcomed all "*Boeren, burgers, buitenlui*" (farmers, citizens and villagers), referring to the different uses and users of water, and wondering why the meeting was not in Dutch, as so many participants were from the Netherlands.

Rudolph mentioned that Multiple Use (water) Services as an approach to water development is highly relevant in IFAD at present in the context of its work on ENRM policy and Climate change, Defining an IFAD Gender Policy, Bolstering drive for food and nutrition security. With the development of a New Strategic Framework (2011-2015), IFAD is swaying from the Sustainable Livelihoods Approach towards an inclusive Value Chain approach, while safeguarding ecosystem services. In IFAD, there is a need to ensure that the multiple rural water needs of our beneficiaries are not overlooked in a current drive for simpler yet bigger projects but understood and addressed in the most efficient and effective ways possible by the key stakeholders, primarily rural women and men.

Rudolph wondered whether we really need another set of guidelines, with yet another 5 feet of documents on a shelf somewhere, yet another website with tons of publications, yet another interactive CD. In his view we need to learn from other contentious issues, like HIV/AIDS, and how these were mainstreamed into public debate, and later supported with plenty money and institutional capacities.

We need to change our mindsets in order to mainstream MUS and then scale it up. A different mindset in which the decision makers and policy shakers ask themselves and listen to their constituencies what it is that poor rural men and women need and can handle themselves.

If form follows function, and should we then still decide Guidelines to be a suitable entry point, well fine, let's have them based on convincing evidence, facts, figures, faces. Finally, he urged participants to address the simplest of questions like the "5 Ws and H", as well as the "who not", "why not", "where not", "when not", "what not" and "how not".

In response, **Dr Barbara van Koppen**, coordinator of the MUS Group, explained that the generic guidelines are intended as a way to celebrate progress we have made so far. We are beginning to understand how to do mus, how to plan and implement mus. During last MUS Group meeting, there were several presentations on mus guidelines from different countries and different organisations. The generic guidelines will help synthesising and harnessing the knowledge that is already there.

Block 1: experiences of IFAD in MUS

Audrey Nepveu and Jeanette Cooke, IFAD, gave an **overall introduction to IFAD and its work on MUS**. After introducing IFAD as the financial component of the Rome based UN organisations, with a turn-over of about 1 billion per year, a mapping exercise was presented, which showed that most IFAD funded projects address more than one type of water use. Examples of multiple use projects were given from Niger (open wells for domestic use, open wells for livestock, open wells for gardening) and Laos (gravity fed system for both domestic and gardening and canal system for irrigation). Furthermore, a technical, financial and economic tool for assessing Rooftop Rain Water Harvesting was presented.

For the presentation, see: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1352>

Main issues discussed:

- The innovative aspect of the tool is that it stimulates economists working together with water experts

- Besides domestic and productive uses of water, cultural, spiritual and leisure use of water proved important in the mapping of water uses of IFAD funded projects
- The accuracy of data for financial and economic analysis. The question is whether to go for expensive data collection or use estimates, e.g. based on standard DALYs? There is a need to be clear on what data the presented analysis is based. It would be good to share data as much as possible to build up a good data set.
- Use of the tool is for better planning, but also for construction, O&M and monitoring.
- There are different MUS working models, which will require different tools and guidelines.
- The analytical tools on costs and benefits can help policy advocacy. This is most useful for mus working models in a certain context, rather than in general.

Block 2: towards guidelines for implementing MUS

In order to go towards generic guidelines for implementing MUS, this block consisted of a number of presentations, which were followed by discussion on issues related to the generic guidelines. The presentations in this block included a presentation on the outline of the generic guidelines and a number of presentations of different cases, presenting different mus working models in different countries and contexts. This section of the report gives an overview of the presentations, with links to the actual presentations, which can be found at <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1370>. The main issues discussed are summarised in the section on going towards generic guidelines for mus implementation.

Presentations

Generic MUS Guidelines

Barbara van Koppen (IWMI) presented a suggested outline for generic MUS guidelines, as coat hanger to bringing together the existing experience. Four MUS entry points were presented: Domestic +, Irrigation+, Technology driven mus by design, Community driven mus by design. The guidelines follow a project cycle, with 7 steps, of which the first 2 are focussed on the service provider and the next 5 on the user. For the presentation, see: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1353>

Eau Vive experiences of MUS in Burkina Faso and Niger

Two cases of Eau Vive's experience with Domestic plus were presented:

- The Burkina Faso experience, presented by Juste Nansi (Eau Vive Burkina Faso), focusing on the case of Wiboria village, where water supply for domestic use and livestock was improved through the implementation of 5 boreholes. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1354>
- The Niger experience, by Oumarou Hamani (Eau Vive Niger), focusing on the Commune of Karguibangou, where water supply was improved for domestic use, irrigation and livestock. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1355>

In both cases, the intervention cycle included assessment of demand, Participatory planning, design of facilities to address multiple needs, setting tariff, implementation and M&E.

MUS through rainwater harvesting in Ethiopia and South Africa

Two cases were presented on mus through rainwater harvesting:

- MUS through rainwater harvesting in Ethiopia, where 3 initiatives focus on implementing mus through Rain Water Harvesting and where guidelines for this are under development, presented by Ard Schoemaker, RAIN Foundation. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1357>
- Experiences of MUS in South Africa, where guidelines on MUS had been developed in 2006, but are contradicted local government practices (use of water from drinking water supply is discouraged) and are therefore hardly applied. The presentation focussed on a household level MUS in RAIN project in 2 provinces, in 2005-2008. This was presented by Virginia Molose (Mvula Trust). See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1356>

MUS in gravity flow piped systems in Nepal

Nepal can be considered one of the “mus pioneer countries”, where currently effort is being made to scale the approach up. Two cases of gravity flow pipes systems for mus were presented:

- Planning for MUS, the iDE experience in Nepal, where planning and implementation guidelines had been developed through a stakeholder engagement project, covering Pre-construction, Construction, Post construction and Evaluation presented by C.G Raj, iDE Nepal. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1358>
- Integrating MUS in WASH projects as a Domestic+: An Initiation of WaterAid Nepal, presented by Kabir Das Rajbhandri, WaterAid Nepal. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1359>

Intermezzo: Developing working models for MUS – creative session with wine and cheese

Mary Renwick (Winrock) and Patrice Martin (IDEO) presented and discussed via Skype on the identification and further development of mus working models. See <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1360> for their presentation.

Discussed points:

Things that work well:

- Working models should be based on a project-cycle approach, from demand assessment, planning and then going to implementation and monitoring.
- A step wise approach should be followed. First you need an eye-opener before people can get engaged.
- Getting people of different background together around the table
- Talking to people who need water for multiple uses

Obstacles:

- Include a broader range of water users
- Political will

What would we like to see in MUS working models?

- Entry points for the guidelines: Community driven mus; irrigation +; domestic +; technology driven mus by design
- Working from existing, context-specific models, such as the gravity-fed schemes in Nepal or MASSMUS for large irrigation systems.
- Start at household level if that is the most convenient option.
- Delivery of services, capacity building, evidence-based advocacy.
- Range of technological options with management models.

- How to include multiple uses through multiple sources?

Application of the MASSMUS approach in large scale irrigation systems

Two cases were presented about the application of the MASSMUS approach, a tool developed by the FAO to support assessing multiple uses of large scale irrigation systems and supporting planning modernisation of these systems to address these uses. The presented cases were:

- Understanding multiple uses of water in China, using the MASSMUS approach, where the MASSMUS approach was applied in 5 large scale systems, presented by Zhanyi Gao (National Centre for Efficient Irrigation Technology Research). See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1361>
- Insights on elaborating a domestic use module to MASSMUS; case from Andhra Pradesh, India, presented by Stef Smits (IRC). In this case, different domestic uses of irrigation water had been identified (bulk supply, in stream use, indirect use from groundwater, use of domestic for homestead production, waste water reuse) and for each, service characteristics and implications for irrigation service provider had been assessed. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1362>

Participatory planning and implementation of water assets for MUS in NREGA, India

Two presentations focused on the planning and implementation of MUS under the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MG NREGA) in India:

- Shilp Verma (IWMI India) gave an introduction to participatory planning of water assets for multiple uses under NREGA, in India, explaining that NREGA is an Act to ensure 100 days minimum wage labour for all on public works. The lowest level of government decides how the NREGA labour will be used. Halve of a third of activities go into water development. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1363>
- Malik Ravinder (IWMI India) presented the case of including MUS in the NREGA in Madhya Pradesh, India. See: <http://www.musgroup.net/page/1364>

Going towards the generic guidelines

Issues to be taken into account

A number of issues which need to be taken up in the development of the generic guidelines emerged from presentations and the discussions that followed. These included:

- **MUS entry points:** The presentations covered a variety of entry points:
 - Domestic plus: Eau Vive experiences of MUS (Burkina Faso and Niger)
 - Irrigation plus: application of MASSMUS (India and China)
 - Community focussed mus by design: MUS in NREGA (India)
 - Technology focussed mus by design: MUS through Rainwater harvesting (Ethiopia and South Africa) and through gravity flow piped systems (Nepal)

The different entry points have different implications for:

- Participation of users (e.g. difference between household or community based domestic + and large scale irrigation +).
- Water quality: The guidelines should include what quality is required for what use and what are the implications on water quality (and quantity) of selecting a specific mus working model.

- The scale at which to look: The guidelines will have to take into account different levels: Household - Local – scheme - basin level. What can be considered a water loss at one level (e.g.), might not be considered a loss at another level (e.g. water losses from unlined irrigation canals, which contribute to ground water recharge).
- **Advocacy:** Evidence-based advocacy is needed to convince government. The guidelines will however not be an advocacy tool, but should rather give direction on how data can be collected, analysed and presented for advocacy.
- **Sustainability** of multiple use water: There is a need to explicitly address post construction issues in the guidelines.
- **Regulation:** This includes both regulating uses, setting priorities in case of water scarcity, as well as regulating private sector.
- **Prioritisation** of water use for particular uses, especially in water scarce areas: This includes mapping the various demands for water, both within and between communities:
 - **Within communities, taking into account gender and equity issues** of multiple use services, as the need to differentiate between people within the community, not just think about the “community” as a homogeneous unit.
 - **Between communities, taking into account head and tail end issues.** The guidelines will have to take into account downstream rights and water resource issues, taking into account the boundaries between levels (upstream downstream coordination)

Other issues that came up included:

- **Institutional fragmentation:** different water uses are often addressed under different ministries and different departments. Often different departments have their own tools and guidelines. There is a need to trash out how to promote inter-departmental cooperation and promoting integrated development. It was found that the application of mus tools and methodologies, like the MASSMUS methodology, can help bringing together different ministries and departments
- **Capacity to implement:** Capacity to implement guidelines is often missing at local level. Therefore, the generic guidelines have to come with an element of capacity development. In order to improve basic knowledge on water supply of local government, private sector and civil society, which is often missing, there is also a need for (vocational) training.
- Guidelines are not always followed because of **time constraints**. The proper application of the MASSMUS methodology for example, would take about 1 month.

Target audience and objective

It was agreed that the generic guidelines should:

- Present the experiences gained over the last 8 years.
- Provide guidance on planning, implementing and sustaining multiple use water services.
- Target organisations like member organisations of the mus group, who already have an interest in mus (which means less emphasis on advocacy) and who can use the guidelines for the development their own procedures related to mus.

Format of the guidelines:

The guidelines should:

- be simple and usable.
- be like a resource guide, with links to existing guidelines
- include a good glossary of terms and concepts
- include tips and tricks from the case studies. This should include both things that you really should not do and things that you should not do (best and worst practices).

The idea was raised of including a menu on the mus entry points, showing the entry points with their different technologies, management models, services to be delivered , possibly in the form of a flow chart. This would help give “gestalt” to what mus is about.

In addition to the guidelines themselves, linked publications could be:

- Advocacy materials derived from the guidelines to bring in other stakeholders.
- A catalogue of mus technologies, as resource guide. This could take the form of a publication in the Smart Solution series: Smart MUS solutions.

Wrap-up:

Summing up, it was agreed that the generic guidelines would serve as an overall resource guide, usable by MUS group members. Tool should have issues of advocacy in it, but focus on planning and man. Furthermore it should contain links to existing guidelines, case studies, tips and tricks. Through a flowchart readers can then be guided to reference materials, making it specific for the type of scale one would be interested in.

Annex 1: List of participants

First name	Country	Organisation
Stef Smits	Netherlands	IRC
Marieke Adank	Netherlands	IRC
Amélie Dubé	Netherlands	IRC
Kurian Baby	Netherlands	IRC
Raj Kumar G.C.	Nepal	IDE Nepal
Juste Nansi	Burkina Faso	Eau Vive
Shilp Verma	India	UNESCO-IHE, Institute for Water Education / International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
Virginia Molose	South Africa	Mvula Trust
Ravinder Malik	India	CGIAR
Oumarou Hamani	Niger	Eau Vive Niger
Kabir Das Rajbhandari	Nepal	WaterAid Nepal
Gao Zhanyi	China	China Institute of Water Resources and Hydropower Research
Barbara van Koppen	South Africa	IWRM
Mascha Singeling	The Netherlands	Plan Netherlands
Ard Schoemaker	The Netherlands	RAIN Foundation
Audrey Nepveu de Villemarceau	Italy	IFAD
Jeanette Cooke	Italy	IFAD
Robina Wahaj	Italy	FAO
Domitille Vallée	Italy	FAO
Sam Carmalt	Switzerland	International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development (ICTSD)
Fuad Abu Saif	Palestine	Union of Agricultural Work Committees
Ihab H. M. Mujahed	Palestine	Union of Agricultural Work Committees
Chris Morger	Switzerland	Intercooperation
Emily Kovich	USA	Winrock International
Henk Holtslag	The Netherlands	Connect International

Annex 2: Programme

DAY 1: 31 May

08.30	Registration	
09.00-09.15	Word of welcome	Rudolph Cleveringa, IFAD
09.15-09.30	Introduction and round of introductions	Barbara van Koppen, IWMI, coordinator MUS Group
Block 1: experiences of IFAD in MUS		
09.30-10.30	Overall introduction to IFAD and its work on MUS	Audrey Nepveu and Jeanette Cooke, IFAD
10.30-11.00	Discussion on lessons learnt	
11.00-11.30	<i>Coffee break</i>	
Block 2: towards guidelines for implementing MUS		
11.30-12.00	Presentation of draft generic guidelines on MUS, followed by discussion	Barbara van Koppen, IWMI
12.00-12.30	Case 1: MUS in Burkina Faso	Just Nansi, Eau Vive Burkina Faso
12.30-13.00	Case 2: MUS approach in Niger	Oumarou Hamani, Eau Vive Niger
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14.00-14.30	Case 3: MUS through rainwater harvesting	Robert Meerman, RAIN Foundation - tbc
14.30-15.00	Case 4: Experiences of MUS in South Africa	Virginia Molose, The Mvula Trust
15.00-15.30	Case 5: planning for MUS, the IDE experience	C.G Raj, IDE Nepal
15.30-16.00	Case 6: experiences with MUS implementation in Nepal	Kabir Das Rajbhandri, WaterAid Nepal
16.00-16.15	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16.15-16.55	Discussion on commonalities and differences between cases, leading to lessons learnt for guidelines	Facilitator: Stef Smits
16.55-17.00	Conclusions, and closure of the day	IFAD

DAY 2: 1 June

09.00-09.15	Recap of Day 1	IFAD
09.15-09.45	Case 7: understanding multiple uses of water in China, using the MASSMUS approach	Zhanyi Gao, National Centre for Efficient Irrigation Technology Research
09.45-10.15	Case 8: insights on elaborating a domestic use module to MASSMUS; case from Andhra Pradesh, India	Stef Smits, IRC
10.15-10.45	Case 9: MUS in the NREGA, India	Shilp Verma, IWMI India
10.45-11.15	Case 10: including MUS in the NREGA in Madhya	Malik Ravender, IWMI India

	Pradesh, India	
11.15-11.45	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11.45 – 12.30	Discussion on commonalities and differences between cases, leading to lessons learnt for guidelines	Facilitator: Stef Smits, IRC
Block 3: activities of other Group members		
12.30-13.00	Presentations on other activities of members.	Facilitator: Stef Smits, IRC
13.00-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
Block 4: MUS Group meeting		
14.00-16.00	<p>Agenda:</p> <p>Activities of the MUS Group</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strategizing on MUS Group as Learning alliance Update from the secretariat (Stef Smits) - Flyer on MUS Group - Website and case studies - Newsletter - Technical exchanges - Update on support funds - Next meeting MUS Group 	Chair: Barbara van Koppen, IWMI
16.00	Closure	Barbara van Koppen, IWMI
Block 5: What is the MUS Group and what can we do for you?		
16.00- 17.00	<p>Briefing session for IFAD portfolio managers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What is MUS? - What can the MUS Group as learning alliance do for country portfolio managers for their portfolios? 	