REPORT OF THE MUS MEETING 22/23 NOVEMBER 2010

Venue:
De Haagsche Kluis
Plein 20
The Hague
The Netherlands

Hosted by the RAIN Foundation

DAY 1

Opening by RAIN Foundation

Ard Schoemaker, Programme Manager of RAIN Foundation opened the meeting and presented RAIN Foundation. RAIN Foundation (established in the Netherlands in 2004) implements rainwater harvesting projects in close partnership with other non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Priority intervention regions are water scarce and water stressed areas in Nepal, Ethiopia, Burkina Faso, Mali and Senegal. RAIN got involved in multiple use water services (MUS) some years ago and is currently implementing MUS pilot projects in Nepal and Ethiopia. RAIN is a core member of the MUS group. Ard facilitated the workshop together with Saskia Nijhof (RAIN), Stef Smits (IRC) and Barbara van Koppen (IWMI).

Subtheme 1: Implementation Guidelines for Community-scale MUS

Presentation Barbara van Koppen (IWMI): Community-driven MUS, what and why?

Also called "local-government planning plus", the approach of community-driven MUS is based on creating a supportive environment and on participatory planning, implementation and monitoring. Advantages are: More livelihood benefits for own priorities, especially by the poorest and women (if targeted); More water resource and technological efficiency & resilience; Stronger and more sustainable local institutions; Local government planning–plus is scalable nation-wide. Guidelines have been developed by IWMI. The next steps will include pilot testing and tool development, including cost-benefit analysis and support at intermediate and national levels.

Subtheme 2: Implementation Guidelines for Irrigation-plus MUS Projects

Presentation Daniel Renault and Dr. P.S. Rao (FAO): MASSMUS guidelines for assessing MUS in irrigation systems and their application in Naryanpur, India

Mapping systems and Services for Multiple Uses (MASSMUS) is a module for assessing noncrop water uses in an irrigation scheme within the general approach developed by FAO for auditing the irrigation system management called MASSCOTE (Mapping Systems and Services for Canal Operation Techniques). The need to develop specific approach to multiple uses of water in an irrigation system stemmed from an analysis of 20 irrigation schemes (Renault, 2008), which revealed that non-crop water use and multiple functions of irrigation schemes were more of a norm than an exception. The MASSMUS module is developed in the same way as MASSCOTE and follows a number of steps:

Step 1: Rapid Appraisal Process (RAP). What are the reported multiple uses? (E.g. irrigation, flood control, drainage, domestic, environment, industry, recreational.)

Step 2: What is the integration of MUS in management versus the degree in MUS? (Management attitude); What is the capacity and the sensitivity? (Problems for providing services, e.g. raw water, physical access, distance to water).

Step 3: What are the perturbations? (Share of water used, share of benefits generated, share of cost management, operation and maintenance (MOM)).
Step 4: Sizing MUS: Water & benefit shares (water accounting, valuing water).
Step 5: Share of cost of MOM.
Step 6: Users and services to users.
Step 7: Management.
Step 8: The demand for operation.
Step 9: Improvement.
Step 10: The integration of Service Oriented Management (SOM) and MUS.

A specific excel sheet for multiple uses (MUS) is included in the RAP Excel workbook with specific information on all the services provided by an irrigation system and the value generated by these services. This RAP sheet and the MASSMUS module are being tested in irrigation systems which have multiple functions, and where multiple uses are practiced. One of the testing sites is the **Shahapur Canal in Naryanpur Karnataka, India**, where water was originally used for irrigation of rice and cotton, but where now multiple uses are practiced in the form of diversified cropping, domestic use, cattle, drainage, flood control, small business, power production, and environmental recreation. After the assessment, measures were recommended to improve the capacity of the system by more animal ramps and better (safe) access to canal water.

Presentation Mastewal Ademe (IFAD): IWRM and MUS in Ethiopia; Rainwater management based on IWRM principles for a chain of water uses. Household and community experience in Amhara region, Ethiopia.

There is potentially enough water in Ethiopia but inefficient management and lack of concern are causing water scarcity, leading to land degradation and poverty. Although IWRM is accepted as a guiding principle for attaining water use, there are a lot of problems like land erosion, degradation, flooding, sedimentation to the lake & reservoirs, low/no groundwater/baseflow during dry period for water supply/irrigation. In the region rainwater, which is the major water resource, having the highest water value is not managed explicitly for ecological and social development, in well-organized and sustainable manner. Despite its tremendous water potential and value, water scarcity, poverty and land degradation in the region remains rampant. There is a huge gap between annual runoff and the remaining groundwater reserve. That is probably due to a lack of proper rainwater management activities based on IWRM principles in most parts of the region. In addition, there are significant evaporation losses. The objective of the study in Amhara region was to evaluate farmers' practice on rainwater management based on IWRM principles. From the observed 240 farming-community members only 20 % had adequate knowledge to implement rainwater management with IWRM principles. Good practice observed for optimized rainwater use by families within micro-watershed areas was the treatment of upland with appropriate soil and water conservation measures reducing runoff and evaporation losses to recharge groundwater, while at the outlet of the micro-watershed, wells are used for irrigation and domestic water supply. Other measures observed included terracing, water ways, check dams, stone-faced soil bunds, agro-forestry, cattle troughs, green manure, mulching using crop residues, composting and irrigation with excess water. Guidelines for MUS in (micro-)watersheds in Ethiopia in combination with capacity building would enhance up-scaling of these good practices.

Subtheme 3: Implementation Guidelines for Domestic-plus MUS Projects

Fungai Makoni (IWSD): Guidelines for planning for water for livelihoods, Zimbabwe

People need water to meet various needs for domestic and productive uses. In the past, water services did not take small scale productive use in account. Water services planning needs to accommodate these uses. In Zimbabwe various organisations have taken a livelihood approach to water supply services (in high water table areas). Livelihood approaches have often been ad hoc with

little clarity on types of use, the way of targeting and sharing of costs, which resulted in some inconsistency in addressing livelihoods between organisations. There is a need to address livelihoods and water for multiple uses in a more structured way in water projects. Therefore guidelines were developed to address water for livelihoods in a structured way in different steps of the project cycle. It is targeted towards DWSSC members and NGOs, and it does not replace existing water supply provision. Under the ZimWASH project this guide was developed, piloted and implemented in 6 districts. It has three parts: (1) Conceptual framework which defines key concepts in relation to the provision of water for livelihoods; (2) An explanation of how to address water and livelihoods issues in each step in the project cycle; (3) Tools and methods. Piloting of the guideline was done to pre-test the usefulness of the tools. The conclusions of the pilot were that action planning helped the DWSSC and the communities identify the livelihoods activities, and also what actions they can take on their own, and what actions need external assistance. As way forward there is still need to support the DWSSC to roll out the action planning.

Isabel Domínguez (Cinara/WEDC): Water balances for MUS in Colombia

The La Palma Tres Puertas case study was presented to illustrate the use of Water Balance concepts and budgets. Water availability (inflows) and demand (outflows) in the study area were mapped. The per capita domestic consumption varied from 88 to 109 lpcd. The per capita consumption for productive purposes varied from 19 lpcd to 413 lpcd. Water balance concepts and budgets probed to be flexible tools to: (a) Understand the dynamics of the hydrological cycle and the human cycle in a MUS system; (b) Suit the objectives of a study, scale, and availability of information; (c) The stratified analysis allowed estimating water consumption for domestic and productive uses, making clear differences between categories of subscribers within the system. Guidelines were developed to design and manage of multiple uses of water supply systems for rural areas in Colombia. Underlying principles include equity and poverty reduction, multiple uses, multiple sources, sustainable use of water, technological alternatives, cost recovery, tariffs and management rules.

Tupac Mejía (FHIS/RASHON): Testing guidelines for planning and implementation of multiple use services in Honduras.

When WorldBank staff attended the inauguration ceremony of a new water supply system in a community they made a walk through the community and observed that already on the first day the overflow of the distribution tank was used to irrigate potato fields. This triggered many question of the WB staff on the future of the system. Why not develop a MUS system from the onset, to prevent unauthorised and unregulated water use for irrigation? After this, FHIS proposed to carry out 2 MUS pilot projects, supported by the WB, with the objective of assessing of what needs to change to the project cycle to include MUS in each of its steps. Hence, the idea arose to develop a guideline for planning and implementation MUS to support these two pilot projects, but also for subsequent upscaling. Activities carried out so far are a training and discussion workshop with engineers and technicians to get inputs for the guidelines; Development of the guideline document; Selection of communities where the guidelines would be tested; Further induction of engineers and technicians; Applying the assessment and feasibility steps of the guidelines in 6 communities in the Department of La Paz. The guidelines consist of 3 parts: Part 1: conceptual framework, summarizing key concepts and findings related to MUS; Part 2: MUS in the project cycle: detailing for each step in the cycle how to address MUS; Part 3: An overview of different (participatory) tools and methods to address MUS in each step. The first lessons learnt from the tests are that the guidelines allow to systematically assess the community demands and expectations, but in order to capture those, a good level of trust is needed between the community and the outside engineers and technicians. The quality of the application of the guidelines also depends on the skills and attitudes of the engineers and technicians: they demand more openness and creativity. When presenting alternatives, it is important that the community understands both the benefits and the cost implications of each alternative. One difficulty in applying the guidelines is still the extrapolation of actual water use patterns to expected future needs.

Group Discussions

Q: What were the differences and the similarities of the guidelines presented?

Differences

- Entry points differ, e.g. irrigation-plus, domestic-plus; differences between users/groups.
- Guidelines are being developed for different scale levels. Linkages between scales need to be ensured.
- The target groups for the guidelines differ – most are for field staff (technicians, local government, engineers) but are these people available? Still need to get good numbers for decision-makers/managers/local field staff/users.
- Some guidelines are for improving existing water supply systems, others for new systems.
- More context specific vs more generic guidelines.
- Difference in goal: most have a livelihood approach, others are more about equity. The ultimate goals are not clearly defined.
- Some are for design, others for operations.

Similarities

- All guidelines presented use a livelihood approach and were interdisciplinary
- Most include the project cycle, with participatory tools for assessments (ranking, FGDs,). But technical/managerial tools seem to be missing.
- Capacity building came up in all guidelines;
- Most of the guidelines are not yet finalised or tested;
- Most have some elements of capacity development and community awareness to change behaviour.

Q: The way forward in relation to implementation guidelines.

Target groups

Guidelines need to recognize different user groups, and be gender sensitive. Guidelines are also needed for higher levels for institutionalisation.

Linking different scale levels

Linkages between scales need to be ensured, and how to scale up local watershed interventions.

Linking different sectors

MUS usually means that certain new services of the system will fall under the responsibilities of different administrative departments. Since this involves a lot of bureaucracy, it can be a real challenge. Guidelines need to take this into account.

Capacity building

Lots of capacity development (trainings etc.) will be needed next to guidelines.

Policy development

Guidelines include audit, assessments, planning, but few have links with policy making. Need to think more about the links between planning guidelines and policy development around MUS.

DAY 2

Q: Any new thoughts?

- There is lots of rich material coming out of the workshop; is there possibility for a publication?
- Can all presentations by synthesised into 1-2 pages?
- Still missing evidence of successful experiences. You need to get evidence from the process.
- You need to first provide awareness; mapping of experiences.
- Guidelines start from existing evidence base; this needs to be made explicit in the guidelines that are being developed.

Recap from previous day

Lessons learnt on MUS:

- Link between multiple-use and livelihoods is striking and important. But, we shouldn't pretend we can offer everything to improve livelihoods; there is need for other inputs as well.
- To make MUS effective, cooperation and integration is needed between all stakeholders.
- Accounting is important: knowing the uses, users, beneficiaries, what value is generated, taking into account the benefits as well as the duties of beneficiaries.
- Need to consider people's own priorities, demands and solutions; match supply and demand
- MUS is there, but are not always efficiently managed. What we can offer is improved management.

Lessons learnt on MUS guidelines:

- Guidelines must be developed along with test results (evidence based), to convince policy makers.
- Guidelines need to be context-specific, but inspired by experiences from elsewhere
- They need to be scale and level sensitive
- In rolling out, they need to be integrated into existing sectors
- Guidelines are important; and their implementation needs to be institutionalised along with IWRM, and piloted in different countries, to validate them.
- Guidelines need to be accompanied by in-country capacity building at all levels.

Subtheme 3 - continued: Implementation Guidelines for Domestic-plus MUS Projects

Bharat Sharma (IWMI New Delhi): Multiple Use Water Systems for Alleviating Water Poverty in the Northeast Himalayas, India.

The project hypothesis was that if the rural poor in the region used the water and land resources more fully and surplus food can be easily marketed, household incomes would rise leading to save and invest in agriculture and other economic activities on one hand and to an increased demand for goods and services not produced by the household on the other. Should both these happen, the level of the rural poor in the region would go an upward ratchet. Water Poverty Index (WPI) Composite Index Scores were calculated for each cluster of the village Lempong Sheanghah, Mon, Nagaland. For the construction of the index, five components were identified: Resource (availability of water supplied); Access (access to water for household use); Capacity (people's ability to manage water); Use (the ways in which water is used for different purposes); Environment (Environmental integrity related to water and of ecosystem goods and services from flora and fauna in the area). The results showed that it is not the Resource *per se*, but the Access and Capacity components which are most important for alleviating water poverty. This is true even in water abundant villages of Nagaland and north east region. Improving the per capita income and the accessibility to water resource would lead to a much improved Water Poverty Index and thus improved livelihoods. The next objective was to design (and help in implementation of) appropriate water harvesting and multiple water use

systems and assess their impacts on livelihood security. Lessons were learned from similar systems in Nepalese Hills for homestead gardens. Homesteads have the potential to provide main nutrition and livelihoods to the families, especially for women if they are provided with water, related inputs and markets (collection centres). The conclusions are that MUS has benefited users in terms of availability of water both in terms of quality and quantity, increased income through vegetable farming. Upscaling of MUS through improved technology to cover more areas needs to be explored.

Indira Shakya (BSP/RAIN Nepal): Multiple use of rainwater in Nepal

In Nepal, BSP in collaboration with RAIN Foundation runs a MUS programme in areas where rainwater is the only water source. Types of MUS systems implemented are: (1) Upgrading water harvesting systems for biogas production by installing an 'add-on' for drinking water; (2) Single-plus: in which a system is designed to meet drinking needs with provision for using overflow for micro irrigation (by default); (3) MUS by design where services are designed for multiple use from the start – drinking, operation of biogas systems, micro irrigation, livestock. The impacts of the third type; the MUS systems are many. Families no longer have to make difficult journeys to rivers. MUS provides families with water for cooking, drinking, washing, feeding livestock and irrigating crops: reducing hazards and saving time up to 3 hours a day. People can grow high value crops. With more water available for irrigation, many farmers have high nutrition value vegetables for their families as well as grow new vegetables that fetch a high price at market. With MUS, poor families have no more worries about whether to use the water they have collected for drinking or irrigation; with this new technology there is enough for both. Households have access to clean energy. They can also operate the biogas thus eliminating the task of collecting fuelwood and the burden to endure a smoky kitchen which has implications on their health. Households also have enough water to meet their hygiene needs. Many people in the poorest areas had no water for washing, which often leads to disease. Women and Children have opportunities for livelihood enhancement. Being released from the task of collecting fuelwood and water, time saved provides opportunities for education for the children (girls in particular) and income generation activities for women.

Group feedback on guideline development

On the process:

- Comprehensive guidelines vs generic - 70/30%
- Generic guidelines: Technological handbook with overview, including costs and implications for water quality. Overview of management practices
- Guidelines are a learning tool, part of it is fixed and can be printed or put on a website, but we also need to pilot the guidelines.
- Make a project out of it.
- Need to clarify the target groups.
- Testing and adjusting through various experiences
- M&E: how?
- Who will finance all this? Need partnerships and collaboration.
- Need cost-benefit analysis of the pilots.
- Typology of situations/contexts.
- How to take these guidelines forward in different countries; continue piloting, creating space for doing the piloting, update guidelines with lessons learnt.
- Endorsement for guidelines from different sector agencies. Need to ensure guidelines fit in policy.
- Give a menu of guidelines to people that they can select from.

On the dissemination:

- Synthesizing knowledge and dissiminating it. With links to centres of excellence and to different country initiatives.
- Revamp our website of the MUS group to facilitate shared learning and disseminate it.
- Briefing notes for the various groups
- Promotion of guidelines among different actors

On the implementation

- Training and exchange
- Responsibility lies with all of us. Group effort.

Plenary discussion

Q: What can we start doing? Who's responsible for what?

Barbara/Stef:
The MUS group would like to be regularly updated of developments on guidelines. We had some funding for MUS group 2010 to allow South-South exchange and to do more in depth technical exchange. For 2011, we need to find follow up funding, focus on outlines and website, and develop guidelines. We can pull together what we have now, bring small group together. Maybe develop the guidelines into a project, with the collaborative council, FAO?

Daniel:
The new FAO MASSMUS Guidelines will be printed, few thousand copies, to be distributed within FAO to country directors. Some training materials will be developed. There will be a centre of excellence in Asia, on irrigation and MUS; developing case studies, on-the job- training for FAO staff, one case study specifically for MASSMUS (no financing confirmed yet).

Conclusions:
We need to continue to share experiences on MUS. We could try to work through the centres of excellence. Developing principles on the development of guidelines is easy but we'll need dedicated funding for more specific guidelines. We could develop a booklet in the Smart Solution series (Stef with discuss with NWP). The MUS group website needs to be though out a bit more (is also related to principles).

MUS Group meeting 23 November 2010

The second part of the event consisted of the meeting of the MUS Group, going more into ongoing activities and management of the Group. These are the minutes of that meeting

Update of activities
Participants gave an update on ongoing MUS-related activities (apart from what was already presented before) and other relevant news.

RAIN Foundation (Saskia):

- Will document the lessons learnt from the MUS pilot projects in Nepal. Based on that, it will expand this approach into other countries.
- The Dutch WASH Alliance, of which RAIN is a consortium member, has got their subsidy request approved. An attempt will be made to try and promote MUS into this programme but this might need co-funding, since the approved proposal is mainly a WASH programme.

IWSD (Fungai):
- Will continue developing the guidelines presented yesterday, and undertake capacity development activities around it. This will also result in a publication on water and livelihoods
- Was very interested in the Nepal presentation on water and biogas, and will explore ways of piloting this in Zimbabwe

IWMI (Barbara and Bharat):
- Developing a proposal for the AfDB on piloting MUS in South Africa and Burkina Faso. This will be done in a consortium involving IWMI, IRC and local partners Mvula Trust and Eau Vive (both to be confirmed)
- The experience with MUS in the Northeastern Hills will now be taken also in pilot form to another State in that part of India (Sikkim)
- Bharat is involved in a CPWF project on rainwater management systems in Ethiopia. He sees opportunity to include MUS in 3 sites there and collaborate with Mastewal.

FAO (Daniel, Robina):
- Working on a project on agricultural water management solutions in West and Southern Africa (funded by Gates Foundation, in collaboration with IWMI), among other on livelihood mapping, and exploring options to include MUS
- One addition to the MASSMUS guidelines to be included is on gender. This will be the flexible part of the guidelines and is expected to be done in 2011.
- Follow up to the MUS work in Karnataka is difficult, due to the political situation. Hope they can take pilot ideas forward, in Andhra Pradesh.
- Robina will present the experiences of FAO in irrigation modernization, including MASSMUS, at the next ICID conference, to be held in 2011 in Teheran.

Cinara (Isabel)
- Soon, Cinara/Universidad del Valle will publish a book and guideline on MUS in Colombia. She will share the details with the Group, but is not sure whether the book will also be available as PDF.
- Isabel has drafted a journal article on the basis of the MSc research and is now looking for the right journal to publish it in.
- Has got an offer for a PhD scholarship. She is considering whether to take this on. In that case, the topic would be around MUS.

Connect International (Henk)
- Working in projects in 7 countries in Africa. In these projects, focus is on building knowledge and training of local private sector to provide low-cost technologies, including for MUS.
- EC has evaluated the experience in Zambia. The report can be made available.
- Expanding cooperation with faith based organisations, who are active in poverty reduction, huge potential to share knowledge
- A cooperative programme with Winrock in Tanzania has started as a result of one of the previous MUS meetings

DorcasAid (Jorge)
- Jorge is now working with Dorcas Aid, working in Africa. They have water projects in various countries and will be looking to include MUS as pilot project

Dr. Rao
- Is working on case studies on groundwater management. Will try and analyse these also from a MUS framework

BSP Nepal (Indira)
- Will be undertaking an exercise of mapping water poverty for the Dutch WASH Alliance (DWA) programme
- Will have training programmes in RWH and MUS (Biogas, irrigation of gardens)
- Will start an analysis of different technologies that are being used in Nepal

IFAD (Jeannette)
- Will look into the potential to incorporate MUS approaches in IFAD programmes, e.g. add-ons to optimize water use in irrigation projects.
- Will look into collaboration with other actors in the Nile basin, e.g. IWMI
- Will share information on MUS in Ethiopia Water Forum
- Jeanette will speak to Audrey on results of this meeting, as MUS is very relevant for IFAD. Many IFAD programmes are 60% cross-sector initiatives in which MUS features de facto. However, it is not always done efficiently and we need to be more pro-active. IFAD has a specific interest in guideline documents

RASHON/FHIS (Tupac)
- Will continue work on the guidelines, applying these in 6 communities, with the hope to develop at least 2 specific MUS projects

IRC
- Will continue working with Tupac and Fungai on guidelines
- Is involved in a capacity development project, involving amongst others Wageningen University, IHE, Cape Peninsula University of Technology and University of the Western Cape. This will include curriculum development and training on IWRM and water supply and sanitation. One aspect in which there is lots of interest to be included is MUS.
- Got an EC-funded project approved which focuses on technology innovation processes in Uganda, Burkina Faso and Ghana. Likelihood to include MUS among technologies to be studied
- Proposal submitted to Partners for Water on MUS in Ethiopia together with RAIN and RiPPLE.
- Colleague John Butterworth met with USAID at the Stockholm water week. There is a lot of interest by USAID in MUS. It might be an idea to meet specifically in the USA with US-based partners and potential donors somewhere next year.

Group activities

This was followed by discussions on various ongoing and planned activities of the MUS Group. This included the following:
- Next steps on a **guidelines** document. Following the discussions of the previous days on how to move forward in guideline development, the following action points were agreed:
    - Stef to inquire with NWP about the “smart” series for technology guides
    - Stef and Barbara to inquire with NWP and IFAD about funding possibilities
    - A small group will draft a framework of generic guidelines, including what it could include, and how different experiences can flow into the generic document. This group is suggested to consist of Barbara, Saskia, Indira, Isabel, Tupac and Fungai. Barbara to start the discussion via email

- **FAO/MUS Group publication**. Last year a start was made with an overview document on MUS. The idea was that this would be published in the FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper series, a well-known and widely distributed series. Initial drafting of an outline for the overall structure and some of the chapters had started. However, in the course of 2010 this came to a stand-still as FAO had to focus on the MASSMUS guidelines. Now that this nearly finished, there is possibility to take this up again. It is agreed that Robina will take up this plan again in FAO, as it has

implications for both funding and her own workplan. In order to facilitate that discussion within FAO, Daniel and Robina will revisit the original table of content with the input from this and previous meeting.

- **UN Water task force**. Last year, a proposal was developed, led by Daniel, to establish a task force on MUS under UN Water. However, with the change of the chairmanship of UN Water, it seems decision-making has come to a stand-still on this proposal. We probably have to wait for a year for a decision. This is a pity as this could have been an entry-point for publication, and getting recognition from other UN agencies. The meeting suggests that the content of the proposal for publications be taken forward through other mechanisms; for example, we could seek other ways of support for publications. In the meantime, FAO, through Robina, will investigate what is the best way to continue following up with UN Water.

- Next **World Water Forum in Marseille**. Daniel gave a briefing on the status regarding the preparations for the next World Water Forum. There is one topic called "balancing multiple-use through IWRM", which is one of the 12 topics or priority actions. The focus of the entire Water Forum will be on actions and targets. However, he also explained that there are problems with the process as it is not very open or clear which organisations can get involved at which time. The Societé du Canal de Provence is leading the topic on multiple-use, and there is a committee who lead the process up to the next meeting. After that there will be a core group. The next preparatory meeting is in Jan in Paris, but we are not invited. In the discussion that followed it was felt that the added value of a big investment in the World Water Forum lies particularly in the preparatory process. So, if that is not very clear, we feel it is best not to lead a topic. Daniel recommends that the chair of the MUS Group writes a letter to the topic organisers with the wish to explore being part of it, not to lead it. Daniel to provide the contact details. Robina will be FAO representative and also liaising for the MUS Group. Daniel recommends talking to Alain Vidal, as he is closely involved.

- Development of an **advocacy brochure**. This is an action point from last meeting. After that meeting, Barbara started drafting a brochure, but realised it is too much to put much content in such a brochure. Stef suggests an extended "business card" as brochure, more to draw people to the topic and the MUS Group, rather than providing detailed advocacy messages. Stef to make a draft brochure for the Group.

Next meeting

One of the suggestions (see above) is to have a meeting in the USA, a kind of dialogue between US donors and US-based people interested in MUS . Barbara will approach Mary Renwick to explore interest and availability for hosting and then also set a date, probably in the first semester.

Another option is to discuss with IFAD whether they are interested in hosting the next meeting. The suggestion is somewhere in April or May. Stef will communicate dates once these are checked with possible hosts.

As far as a topic for the meeting is concerned, ideas include: follow-up to guidelines, technologies and financing MUS.

Annex 1: List of participants

1	Mastewal Ejigu	Ademe	IFAD	mast962004@yahoo.com
2	Jeanette	Cooke	IFAD	j.cooke@ifad.org
3	Isabel Cristina	Domínguez Rivera	WEDC	isabel_doming75@hotmail.com
4	Henk	Holtslag	Connect International	holtslag.dapper@kpnmail.nl
5	Barbara	Koppen van	IWMI South Africa	b.vankoppen@cgiar.org
6	Fungai Sexton	Makoni	IWSD Institute of Water and Sanitation Development	fsmakoni@iwsd.co.zw, fsmakoni@gmail.com
7	Tupac	Mejia Medina	FHIS/RASHON	tmejia@fhis.hn
8	Jorge	Merino	Dorcas AID	merinoklaassen@gmail.com
9	Saskia	Nijhof	RAIN Foundation	nijhof@rainfoundation.org
10	Polisetti Somasekhar	Rao	Consultant to the FAO	faorao@yahoo.co.in
11	Daniel	Renault	FAO	Daniel.renault@fao.org
12	Ard	Schoemaker	RAIN Foundation	ard@aidenvironment.org
13	Indira	Shakya	BSP Nepal	ishakya_bspnepal@yahoo.co.in
14	Bharat R.	Sharma	International Water Management Institute	B.Sharma@CGIAR.ORG
15	Stef	Smits	IRC	smits@irc.nl
16	Tom	De Veer	Connect International	T.deVeer@ConnectInternational.nl
17	Olaf	Verheijen	OV Consult	olafverheijen@hotmail.com
18	Robina	Wahaj	FAO	Robina.Wahaj@fao.org