

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, WATER & RURAL  
DEVELOPMENT**

**POLICY FOR COST RECOVERY  
FOR  
RURAL WATER SUPPLY**

**WORKSHOP PROCEEDINGS**

**DRWS/GTZ WORKSHOP**

**Swakopmund, November 5 -8, 1995**

**WORKSHOP AGENDA****6 - 7 November, 1995****Monday 6 November**

- 8.00 Introduction Mr. I Kaulinge, Chairman
- 8.15 Opening Address: The Honourable N Mbumba,  
Minister of Agriculture, Water and  
Rural Development
- 8.30 Purpose of Workshop: Mr. R Fry
- 8.45 Discussions/Questions
- 9.00 Introduction to group work,  
including Definitions: Mr. JM Kalbermatten
- 9.15 Dividing into 4 Work Groups:
- 9.30 Coffee/Tea Break
- 10.00 Group Work
- 12.30 Lunch
- 14.00 - 17.00 Group Work

**Tuesday 7 November**

- 8.00 Presentation of Group Work (15 minutes each)
- 9.00 Plenary Discussions/Questions
- 10.00 Coffee/Tea Break
- 10.30 Continue Plenary Discussions
- 11.00 Finalise Group Work
- 12.00 Lunch
- 13.30 Presentation of Policy and Strategy Statements of each  
individual Group
- 14.30 Acceptance of Policy and Strategy Statements, Plenary
- 15.00 Coffee/Tea Break
- 15.30 Evaluation of Workshop and Closure

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0 WORKSHOP INTRODUCTION	4
2.0 OPENING ADDRESS	5
3.0 PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP	8
4.0 DISCUSSIONS/QUESTIONS	11
5.0 INTRODUCTION TO GROUP WORK, INCLUDING DEFINITIONS	12
6.0 OVERHEAD/SLIDE PRESENTATION BY THE DRWS	14
7.0 GROUP III: TARIFFS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION	20
8.0 GROUP II: SOCIAL EQUITY, GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND EXTERNAL ASPECTS	24
9.0 GROUP I: COVERAGE AND INVESTMENT NEEDS	28
10. PRESENTATION OF MODIFIED POLICY STATEMENTS	30
11. WORKING GROUP IV	36
12. WORKSHOP EVALUATION	37
13. CLOSURE OF WORKSHOP	37
14. ANNEXES	38

ISBN 13203  
824 NA95

## 1.0 WORKSHOP INTRODUCTION

Mr. I Kaulinge, Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, opened the workshop:

Honourable Minister of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, Comrade Nangolo Mbumba; Honourable Regional Governors and Councillors; Mr. Richard Fry, Deputy Permanent Secretary of the Department of Water Affairs; Dr. Harry McPherson, from the sponsors GTZ; Mr. John Kalbermatten, from Kalbermatten Associate, Inc., consultants for GTZ; Senior Government officials; invited, distinguished guests; Ladies and Gentlemen.

Allow me to extend a warm word of welcome to all of you in the true African tradition. KARIBU! and Asantesan, in Kiswahili means you are most welcome and thank you very much indeed for undertaking this very important pilgrimage to the gem of Namibia's coast. Your attendance of this crucial strategic planning workshop on cost recovery policies for rural water supply underscores total community participation and the bottom-up approach adopted by our government.

Dr. Kwame Nkurumah proclaimed, at the time of Ghana's attainment of freedom and independence, that the tree of freedom was watered with blood. The latter is indeed true of the now accomplished liberation of the African continent.

The currently unfolding phase of economic reconstruction and development, however, places a cardinal responsibility on all of us to articulate and elaborate practical, realistic and workable policies and implementation strategies in order to achieve our objectives and milestones in all spheres of human endeavour. Water is synonymous with development. Water is Life! Our focal point at this august gathering in Swakopmund will be to define specific Cost Recovery Policies for rural water supply in response to the overall Water Supply and Sanitation Sector Policy directives, to guide the development of detailed pricing policies and their implementation.

Furthermore, to draft an indicative work programme for the development of detailed sector pricing policies as well as practical measures for their implementation. In this connection, I am honoured to introduce to you the Honourable Nangolo Mbumba, who will set the scene for us with his opening address, thereby conveying to us clear parameters within which to accomplish our paramount responsibility and Task efficiently and effectively at this very conducive venue.

I wish to thank the Department of Water Affairs and GTZ, our sponsors, for the superb organisation at which is characteristic of this highly suitable and conducive venue with all its attendant amenities. I thank you for your attention. Honourable Minister, the floor is yours.

## 2.0 OPENING ADDRESS

The Honourable N Mbumba, Minister of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development, then gave an opening statement:

Mr. Chairman; Honourable Regional Governors and Regional Councillors; Municipal Councillors; Public Servants; Representatives from the various non-governmental organisations active in the Water Supply Sector; Ladies and Gentlemen.

We are gathered here for the coming two days to talk once again about one of our most precious economic commodities and natural resources: WATER.

More specifically, the objective of this workshop is to promote discussion in an open and frank manner about a very sensitive but necessary topic, that of payment for the vital services which provide water to the rural population of Namibia.

Ladies and Gentlemen, it is a known fact that Namibia experiences very difficult hydroclimatic conditions. The development of water resources and the establishment of water supply infrastructure in an arid country like ours calls for an appropriate policy, as well as skillful and intelligent planning and design to ensure that water of acceptable quality is available in reasonable quantities at an affordable cost to the users.

Shortly after Independence, my Ministry, in consultation with the various consumer groups and other Ministries, prepared a Water and Sanitation Policy document which was approved by the Cabinet in September, 1993.

The following overall Policy was adopted:

- That essential water supply and sanitation services should become available to all Namibians and should be acceptable at a cost which is affordable to the country as a whole.
- This equitable improvement of services should be achieved by the combined efforts of the Government and the Beneficiaries, based on community involvement, community participation and the acceptance of mutual responsibility.
- That communities should have the right, with due regard for environmental needs and the resources available, to determine which solutions and service levels are acceptable to them. Beneficiaries should contribute towards the cost of the services at increasing rates for standards of service exceeding the levels required for the provision of basic needs.
- An environmentally sustainable development and utilisation of the water resources of the country should be pursued in addressing the various needs.

Furthermore, I would like to highlight that:

- community user ownership and management of facilities should be adopted as the strategy of choice for the water supply sector in general and
- Government support services should be seen as a medium for self sufficiency and not be extended free of charge but be priced according to a pricing policy to be worked out and agreed upon.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The reason we are here is to start working out together an appropriate pricing policy for rural water supply which is acceptable to all Namibians.

I would also like to indicate that the frank discussions to be embarked upon here will lead to the formulation of this very important pricing policy and will be the first step in the process of accepting mutual responsibilities. The next step will be the development of a suitable strategy making it possible to implement this pricing policy.

With the policy and the strategy in place, plans may be drawn up identifying the resources required, defining the institutional requirements and estimating the time required for implementation; in short, defining what will be done by whom, when and with what.

The next step will be the presentation of the proposals to the newly created Water and Sanitation Co-ordination Committee, WASCO. This Committee comprises the Permanent Secretaries for Agriculture, Water and Rural Development; Health and Social Services; Environment and Tourism; Regional Local Government and Housing, Lands, Resettlement and Rehabilitation as well as Works, Transport and Communication. After consensus is reached on pricing, WASCO will recommend the proposals to the Minister who in turn will submit it to Cabinet for approval.

Honourable and distinguished Participants,

Water in our country is not an easily reachable commodity; it needs capital investments and hard work to access in reasonable quantities. This investment and hard work has to be achieved in partnership between we, the citizens as Beneficiaries and our Government, if we are to reach a sustainable level of water supply by constructing adequate water infrastructures, eliminating wastage and thus safeguarding this vital and scarce resource.

The Communities will, through payment, acquire user ownership of their water supply facilities. They will not only have the right but also the responsibility to manage their facilities in a caring manner commensurate with their needs. The role of Government will be to facilitate and support the communities through guidance and training of the Water Committees and caretakers and the provision of maintenance services where the technology involved is too complicated for the communities to handle themselves.

Empowerment of the people in terms of their water supply is a further step away from the pre-independence approach of the provision of a free but inadequate water supply; where our people had no choice but to accept what was given to them, towards a reliable and sustainable water supply of their choice, having due regard to sustainability.

Our freely elected Government is an integral part of the entire Namibian population and only the Namibian Nation, as a whole, will be able to reach the objective of providing water to all its citizens.

Payment for water supply services will be one of the most important responsibilities of every Namibian where our joint objective is to improve the standard of water supply services to a reasonable and acceptable level. This will lead to a substantial improvement in the overall living standard and health of our people.

Payment for water is not only a contribution of the people to the provision of water services by the Government but is also the medium through which the water sector sufficiently will be achieved. Without leading the workshop participants to conclusions, I can foresee that payment for water on pipeline schemes would have to be based on metered consumption charged against a consumer cross subsidised tariff per cubic metre, where the Water Committee collects the amount due from the individual consumers and pays the bulk water supplier (NAMWATER) directly.

At borehole schemes, the water committee could collect contributions at a set rate per family, keep the money in a bank account and buy diesel and spare parts directly from local shop owners, as and when needed without the involvement of Government at all. The Directorate of Rural Water Supply would, in both cases, assist the Water Committee Treasurers in performing their respective duties. In both cases, trained caretakers would also be necessary members of the water committees.

The underlying reasons for payment for water are, therefore, much wider. They are related to empowerment of the communities, sustainability of the water supply, safeguarding a scarce resource, controlling wastage of water, enhancing ownership and self-reliance and reducing down-time of the equipment.

The acceptance of mutual responsibilities to operate and maintain the facilities will encourage our rural communities to look after them well and make sure that water is always available.

Empowerment of the communities is a political goal which is fully endorsed by the Government. It is the leaders' task to convey to the citizens the message that empowerment is the highest achievement that people can aim for and that assuming certain responsibilities and making some financial sacrifices are inherent elements needed to achieve this aim.

Through community based management, the people accept these responsibilities and make the necessary sacrifices to assist and enable the government to provide

water for all, with full community commitment and the right of the people to voice their opinion.

Payment for water will be one of those responsibilities that people have to assume to improve the poor standard of services which they had to endure in the past.

As mentioned earlier, the task of this workshop will be to formulate a Pricing Policy Statement on Payment for Water in the rural areas which fits in with the Government's overall development objectives and to work out a common strategy for the implementation of the policy.

The Pricing Statement should address the following issues:

- objective of the pricing policy
- financial implications
- institutional implications
- strategy for implementation
- time horizon
- overall responsibilities.

The Strategy Formulation must address the following issues in detail:

- tariff structure
- different recovery methods for different water supply schemes
- legalising the various Water Point Committees
- ownership of infrastructure
- institutional requirements both in Government and in the communities
- time frame of implementation

During the workshop, there will be a number of presentations which will introduce the various aspects of the proposed pricing policy and strategy and which will provide you with sufficient background information to enable you to formulate an acceptable and practical pricing policy as well as strategy statement.

I wish you a fruitful workshop, and I now have the honour to declare the workshop officially open.

I thank you.

### 3.0 PURPOSE OF WORKSHOP

Mr. Richard Fry, the Deputy Permanent Secretary of the Department of Water Affairs, had the task of giving the purpose of the workshop. He began by giving the background to the workshop.

In November, 1991, the Cabinet appointed an interministerial committee to draft a policy for water supply and sanitation.



From 1991 through 1993, the country experienced drought which taught many that the measures of intervention would not have been required if rural water supply had been accorded the status it deserved prior to the drought.

December, 1992, the Cabinet directed a restructuring of the Public Service, and the Ministry formed a working group to investigate the integration of rural water supply into the Department of Water Affairs.

The year 1993 saw the inception of the Directorate of Rural Water Supply after the Cabinet approved the report on the restructuring of the Department of Water Affairs. In July, the DRWS began operating in its new form. Also during 1993 and as a function of the rationalisation process, Cabinet further directed that the feasibility of commercialising bulk water supply (Urban centres, mines, industry and irrigation) be investigated. In September of 1993, the Water Supply and Sanitation Policy was approved.

Why are these matters important?

- An organisation was put in place (DRWS) with potential to accord rural water supply its proper status.
- A policy was identified to guide the Department of Water Affairs and particularly the new Directorate.
- The relationship between and development of both bulk and rural water supply was defined.

Mr. Fry pointed out that the Minister's speech had covered the 1993 policy in detail, but he wanted to highlight the third point of the policy:

- Community oriented planning
- Community guided design
- Community based implementation
- Community managed operation and maintenance

It is now a partnership!

He also pointed out that although the good Lord provides the rain and thus the water free of charge, the Ministry must make sure that the water is pure and available to everyone and to do that there are costs and infrastructure involved which rural communities must help to supply.

There are also certain sector objectives:

1. The provision of improved water supply should contribute towards improved public health, reduce the burden of collecting water, promote community based social development, support basic needs for subsistence and promote economic development.

2. The provision of improved sanitation should contribute to improved health, ensure a hygienic environment, protect water resources from pollution, promote the conservation of water and enhance socio-economic development.
3. The development of irrigation should promote improved nutrition and surplus production at household level, improve sustainable national food self-sufficiency and promote economic development.

The priorities are the following:

Firstly, water for domestic purposes, which includes water for livestock watering for both subsistence and commercial farming, and secondly, water for economic activities such as mining, industries and irrigation. Priorities for these activities will in each individual case have to be determined by their respective value in relation to the overall development objectives and plans for the country.

Development of the Directorate of Rural Water Supply began with staffing in the regions to move away from the "ivory tower approach" where staff migrated to Windhoek to work from there as in the past. The services must be available in the regions with the people. Because bulk water supply for technical activity is quite different from rural water supply, the principle of using people from the regions who know the problems of the region as extension officers was incorporated.

The first focus of the Directorate was to train its staff including the following:

- Top and Middle Management Rural Water Extension Officers
- Maintenance Teams
- Community
  - Central Water Committees
  - Local Water Committees
  - Water Point Committees
  - Water Point Caretakers

What strategy should be followed? How are the directives to be achieved? A series of strategy papers were finalised to provide a framework for success in transforming Government approach to the practicalities of rural water supply:

- S1 Ownership of Rural Water Supply Schemes and Individual Water Points
- S2 Introduction of Payment for the Service of Water Supply
- S3 Sector Co-ordination
- S4 Legal status of Water Committees
- S5 Monitoring and Evaluation System
- S6 Relationship between the Water Point Committee, the Local Water Committee, the Central Water Committee and the Department of Water Affairs

- S7 Implementation of Rural Water Supply Schemes
- S8 Operation and Maintenance of the Rural Water Supply Equipment

Mr. Fry asked the participants to note especially S1 regarding how can this be achieved to promote partnership and custodianship; S2 on how do we go about introducing the policy of payment to promote a real belief in ownership; and S4 which involves in order to assign ownership, how can water committees be accorded legal status? These papers relate directly to the work of this workshop.

He also observed that it is interesting that people are quite willing to pay about N\$2 for a bottle of beer but are not happy to pay slightly more for a tonne of water. Why is that?

In conclusion, Mr. Fry pointed out some achievements which had been realised:

- Water and Sanitation Policy 1993
- Rural Water Supply Strategy 1994
- Restructured Department of Water Affairs 1995
- Successful implementation of community based management of rural water supply construction
- Workshop on policy for cost recovery of rural water supply, November, 1995

He was positive that the last achievement on this list would in fact happen very successfully.

#### 4.0 DISCUSSIONS/QUESTIONS

Mr. Kaulinge opened the floor for questions and took a few at one time in order to expedite the answering of the questions.

- Ms. T Basson brought up the issue of the regional traditional leaders being involved in the water management to alleviate problems ahead of time.
- The Minister voiced his concern over the use of the term "caretaker" which he felt was not only a difficult word to pronounce but also did not engender much authority. He wondered if a new term could not be used.
- One delegate wanted to give a word of encouragement and urging towards the training of Water Point committee people and caretakers to begin soon.
- Mr. A Nehemiah wanted to know if the proposals will go to Cabinet without being considered at the 'grass roots' level by the people most affected?

- Mr. A Kapere also wanted to know what progress had been made in affecting the training programme on the level of the rural communities.

The Director of Rural Water Supply Mr. P Nghipandulwa answered a few of the questions/comments. He explained that traditional leaders had been invited to the workshop but had not been able to attend. In answering Mr. Nehemiah, he said that this process is only at the beginning and that at some point the proposals would have to go back to the grass roots at which time the traditional leaders can very much be involved. He agreed with the Minister that the term "caretaker" is not necessarily the best one, and since the level of Water Point Committee and Caretaker are the most important, it may be a good idea for a new name to be decided upon here.

The training questions were answered by Mr. H Koch, Acting Deputy Director, Rural Water Development and Planning. He explained that although there are many training programmes already in existence around the world, they cannot necessarily be utilised in Namibia. Programmes need to be developed which suit this country's needs. Since it is important to change the attitudes of management first so that attitudes will filter down, training began with top and middle management. Training of maintenance personnel has also been completed.

There are four courses being developed for the training of extension officers: T1 to T4. It is only the T4 course which must still be completed and about eighty candidates are at present in the other three courses. The Central Water Committees have already undergone awareness training, and within the next year a training package for committee members and caretakers will be finalised.

Mr. Koch further explained that human resource development is very important with an anticipated N\$3.5 million in the budget for training next year.

The Minister made the point that it is better for proposals to go from here to committee to Cabinet for approval so that they can then go to the grass roots level with the assurance that Government has already given its approval.

Mr. N Mukwiilongo emphasised that the points made by the Minister that construction of a water infrastructure and work on a strategy for a sustainable supply is very important.

## **5.0 INTRODUCTION TO GROUP WORK, INCLUDING DEFINITIONS**

Mr. John Kalbermatten is the consultant for GTZ who did the initial report for the workshop on "Financial Management for Rural Water Supply" and a Briefing Paper. He began by saying that when he first arrived in Namibia a year ago, he was impressed that a working strategy was already established. On the negative side, however, he explained that unfortunately, government statements must often be very general, and it is the follow up to the statements which is most important. He

felt the purpose of this workshop is to define how to implement into practice the statements made by Government.

He explained that there would initially be three working groups which the delegates must choose to work in depending upon their personal interests and where they feel they can make the most contribution. The groups are the following:

Group 1 - Coverage and Investment Needs

Group 2 - Social Equity, Government Support and External Aspects

Group 3 - Tariffs and their Implementation

Mr. Kalbermatten pointed out that this is the first step in a process which will ultimately result in an adequate water supply for rural areas. He also pointed out that Namibia is not unique in the fact that so few women are present at the workshop. Even though women are the main users of water on the grass roots level, they are often not represented satisfactorily. Providing a service means a partnership and the woman is the main consumer in that partnership.

He explained that the groups must first define the principles which they want to implement and not worry about details yet. When the groups come back together, there would be discussion and then the details would be worked out.

He has supplied a background report and sample draft policies which can be used to begin deliberations. He has also supplied a list of Definitions of terms which may mean different things to different people. He encouraged the use of terms throughout the process for consistency even if his terms are not used but new terms are agreed upon.

He felt that there was nothing else that he needed to communicate. The participants then moved into working groups which deliberated for the duration of the day.

## 6.0 OVERHEAD/SLIDE PRESENTATION BY THE DRWS

Mr. L Ebrecht presented a few overheads to give the workshop an idea of costs involved for various types of pumps, and then he showed some slides of water schemes around the country.

### COST FOR DIESEL DRIVEN WATER PUMPING INSTALLATION

*BOREHOLE DEPTH 160m  
WATER STORAGE 40m<sup>3</sup>*

Establishment	N\$ 8500
Siting, drilling and testing borehole	N\$ 105000
4 X 10m <sup>3</sup> tanks on stand & transport	N\$ 38500
Supply & installation of pump/engine	N\$ 29000
2 Domestic water points with concrete slab, pipework and drinking trough	N\$ 15000
<u>TOTAL:</u>	<u>N\$ 196000</u>

### COST FOR A SOLAR DRIVEN PUMP INSTALLATION

*BOREHOLE DEPTH 80 - 100m  
WATER STORAGE 40m<sup>3</sup>*

Establishment	N\$ 8000
Siting, drilling & testing of borehole	N\$ 66000
Supply and installation of solar pump	N\$ 51000
4 X 10m <sup>3</sup> tanks on stand and transport	N\$ 38500
2 Domestic water points with concrete slab, pipe work and drinking trough	N\$ 15000
<u>TOTAL:</u>	<u>N\$ 178500</u>

### COST OF A WIND DRIVEN PUMP INSTALLATION

**BOREHOLE DEPTH 100 - 120 m**  
**WATER STORAGE 40m<sup>3</sup>**

Establishment	N\$	8000
Siting, drilling and testing of borehole	N\$	66000
Supply and installation of windmill and pump	N\$	40000
4 X 10m <sup>3</sup> tanks and transport	N\$	38500
2 Domestic water points, pipe work, concrete slab and drinking trough	N\$	15000
<b><u>TOTAL:</u></b>	<b><u>N\$</u></b>	<b><u>167500</u></b>

---

### COST OF HANDPUMP INSTALLATION

**BOREHOLE DEPTH UP TO 60 m**  
**700mm x 200mm concrete block for mounting & splash**  
**slab sloping towards a discharge channel**  
**ZIMBABWE BUSH PUMP (N\$ 4200)**

Establishment	N\$	800
Siting, drilling and testing borehole	N\$	30000
Supply and installation of hand pump	N\$	4700
Concrete block and splash slab	N\$	2200
<b><u>TOTAL:</u></b>	<b><u>N\$</u></b>	<b><u>37700</u></b>

## EXCAVATION DAMS

*GENERAL DIMENSIONS: 80m X 60m X 6m  
(+/- 28800m<sup>3</sup>)*

ACCORDING TO THE LATEST TENDERS RECEIVED, THE COST TO  
REHABILITATE A DAM AMOUNTS TO:

N\$ 130000 PER UNIT

---

### SUMMARY

1. Diesel driven pump installation	N\$ 196000
2. Solar driven pump installation	N\$ 178500
3. Wind driven pump installation	N\$ 167500
4. Hand pump installation	N\$ 37700
5. Excavation Dam	N\$ 130000

---

### COST ESTIMATE IF 100 PUMP INSTALLATIONS (10 PER REGION) ARE ESTABLISHED

Diesel driven	N\$ 19,600,000
Solar driven	N\$ 17,800,000
Windmill	N\$ 16,750,000
Handpump	N\$ 3,770,000
Excavation Dams	N\$ 13,000,000



## DIESEL DRIVEN INSTALLATION

### OPERATING COST

Lister 6-1 engine uses at 50% load and if run for 10 hours per day = 10 litres per day.

For one year, the engine uses  $10 \times 365$  litres = 3650 litres per year.

Cost per year is  $\text{N\$ } 3650 \times 1.65 = \text{N\$ } 5940.00$ .

### MAINTENANCE COST

Oil consumption due to regular 250 hour oil changes.

$\frac{3650 \text{ hours per year}}{250} = 14.6$  changes at 2.6 litres

Per oil change =  $\text{N\$ } 14.6 \times 2.6 \times 6.5 = \text{N\$ } 250.00$

Topping up of oil is on average 0.15 l/day

For one year cost =  $\text{N\$ } 365 \times 0.15 \times 6.5 = \text{N\$ } 356.00$

Yearly costs for oil =  $\text{N\$ } 606.00$

### AIR FILTERS:

Changes of paper air filter elements after 400 hours of operation.

Number of filters needed =  $\frac{3650}{400}$   
= 9

Cost of air filters per year =  $\text{N\$ } 9 \times 16$   
=  $\text{N\$ } 144$

Fuel filters renewable after every 500 hours at a cost of  $\text{N\$ } 22$  each.

Cost per year =  $\text{N\$ } \frac{3650}{500} \times 22 = \text{N\$ } 161.00$

### DECARBONIZING:

Decarbonizing should be done on an engine every 2000 hours. This process is performed by a well qualified mechanic at a cost of approximately N\$ 500 each time the job is done.

Depending on how the machine is run and maintained, decarbonizing will have to be done 2 to 3 times per year.

Related costs are as follows:

Contractor call out N\$ 500 per visit	= N\$ 500
Gasket Set N\$45	= N\$ 45
Renew piston rings once N\$90	= N\$ 90
Pump gland packing N\$ 26 per roll	= N\$ 26
Lubricating oil for rocker & pushrod 5 l @ N\$ 7	= N\$ 35
Cleaning materials	= N\$ 25
Mono belts 2 X N\$ 47	= N\$ 94

On average each decarbonizing will cost N\$ 1115

Yearly decarbonizing will cost N\$ 2230.00 to N\$ 3345.00

---

### SUMMARY OF YEARLY OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE COSTS OF DIESEL DRIVEN PUMP:

#### OPERATING COSTS

Fuel :	N\$ 6022.00
Oil :	N\$ 606.00

#### MAINTENANCE COSTS

Air Filters :	N\$ 144.00
Fuel Filters :	N\$ 161.00
Decarbonizing :	N\$ 2230.00 to N\$ 33345.00

**TOTAL:** N\$ 9163.00 TO N\$ 10278.00

---

The slide show given by Mr. Ebrecht included scenes of installations which have been sorely neglected and some which have been well looked after.

A point which was made was that tanking water to places is very expensive running somewhere in the region of N\$1500/m<sup>3</sup>.

Q: Comparing the installation costs of diesel and solar pumps, which is a bit lower than the diesel, why do we use so much diesel instead of solar?

A: There are limitations with the solar pumps that they cannot be used to the same depths as diesel, and if consumption at an installation is large, the solar will not suffice.

A comment was made that these slides would be very useful tools for training extension officers to show how things should not be done.

Q: How convenient is it to supply spares for maintenance?

A: There are one or two depots for diesel (for free at present) in each region and at least one shop which carries the necessary spares. The locations are obviously more conveniently placed for some and not for others.

Mr. Kaulinge made the point that it is a hard fight to try and get rid of chronic dependence upon government. In the past, the help was often benevolent but caused dependence and it is now time to ask NGO's to begin to help make people independent in a gradual way with NGO's supplying services. The educational process must begin now.

Mr. Koch reiterated the point that community involvement is necessary and said that at some future time, diesel would have to be purchased from local filling stations and spares would be stocked at local shops so that the local economy would benefit.

Q: What is the cost of constructing a new dam?

A: The answer is shown on the overhead but obviously will depend upon the size and location of the dam.

Q: Is this cost the same for catchment dams?

A: The cost for a catchment dam is more varying between one half and one million dollars per dam.

Q: Did the costs shown include labour and transportation? A: Yes.

Q: Since wind pumps are less expensive, why are they not used more in the North?

A: Wind pumps must be used in areas where the wind is strong but this does not include the North.

## 7.0 GROUP III: TARIFFS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Kaulinge asked Group III to begin the presentation section. Mr. A Cashman shared the points discussed by his group:

1. Minimum lifeline block tariffs for communities must include an amount of water for human consumption and for economic purposes, i.e. livestock or irrigation. If livestock is included, a minimum amount per head must obviously be determined which will vary from region to region.
2. The abilities of the community to meet the cost must be considered because we obviously do not want to bankrupt a community.
3. It must be decided as to who and how the water should be sold. Should NAMWATER sell to DRWS who in turn sells to the community or should NAMWATER sell directly to the community. Where at all possible, the most direct line of communication must be followed, so communities should purchase the water directly and sell it to individuals. If tariffs are too high, the communities can negotiate through their Central Water Committees who communicate with the DRWS.
4. Subsidising has merit on a regional basis. Tariffs must also be on a regional basis to enable greater representation/participation and consider the specific characteristics of the regions in determining amounts.
5. What should cost recovery and tariffs cover? Initially, operation and maintenance costs must be covered and hopefully there will eventually be profits which communities can realise.
6. How to introduce the tariffs? Ultimately, at least the operation and maintenance costs should be recovered, but initially, there may be a backlash because the amounts may be high. There must be complete communication on the purposes of the tariff so the people will understand why they are now paying for a previously free commodity. The tariff must begin low and gradually rise to cover expenses.
7. The regional central water committee has a key role to play as an overseer. This body should help in deciding tariffs, subsidies and the phasing in and promotion of tariffs. They can only function properly by having the proper information and being able to share this information with their communities. There must be a transparency about from where the costs come. They must advise the Minister and be able to negotiate for the community with NAMWATER and DRWS. At the moment, the government members on the committee are in an advisory capacity, and it would be better if they are full members of the committee so that they can provide full support to the committee.
8. NAMWATER may need to be represented in areas where they provide a service.

9. Maybe the committees should decide specifics within their own areas covering such things as equity of use, i.e. should those who travel further have to pay the same as those who live closer to the water source?
10. The term sustainability means something different to government (term refers to having a source which is able to give continuous service) and to communities (the term refers more to long term affordability).
11. Should the implementation be at the water committee level looking at their own area?
12. Damage happens to water points by factors outside of the community such as in the case of elephants. How are repairs to be financed and undertaken? Possibly in the case of game, a tourist levy could be charged nationally which would be kept in a central fund for the purpose of paying for damage.
13. How will funds be administered? It should be done as close to the point of collection as possible. If eventually profits are made, will those profits go back into government to pay back its initial capital investment or will they remain with the community?
14. When bulk water is supplied by NAMWATER, the account must be sent directly to the community, and if it cannot be paid, the community would have to seek out subsidies.

The floor was then opened for questions or comments:

Q: How does one replace a water supply which has come to the end of its life?

A: This particular question was not debated by the group but giving an answer on a personal basis (Mr. Cashman) the community could possibly negotiate with government for a new installation.

Q: What if damage is caused by a member of the community. How will you recover the costs?

A: Again, this was a question not specifically looked at but the answer will probably depend upon the nature of the damage, i.e. whether there was criminal activity and the police must be involved, or the extent of the damage, i.e. must government now be brought in to help with costs because the community does not have the money?

Mr. Kaulinge interjected that this may be where the caretaker must be given stronger authority to oversee the water points not just for damage done but for neglect observation.

A further comment on the subject was made that many communities feel that there needs to be a law or some strong measure to guard against wastage, damage or negligence and to be able to hold the people responsible because the caretaker has

no power, and community members are becoming very frustrated with the state of installations.

Dr. McPherson commented on the topic of possible profits in the future and felt strongly that such profits should not go to a future government but should go to the individual communities for development activities or to lower tariffs. He also commented that he has a problem with people paying NAMWATER directly because then people will tend to give up their own responsibilities and expect the corporation to sort out their basic maintenance problems.

Mr. Cashman replied that he agreed with Dr. McPherson's first comment about profits but that it seemed Dr. McPherson was referring to individuals in his second comment and Group III's intention was for Central Water Committees to negotiate with NAMWATER and thus deal with individual problems.

Mr. R Fry pointed out that we do not want to go back to the old way of doing things with the DWA's involvement on supplying water, and Mr. H Koch felt that to expect the DRWS to act as middle man would only add cost to the tariff.

The suggestion of a Public Utilities Commission was raised by Mr. Kaulinge as a possibility for overlooking a variety of issues like water supply.

Mr. Fry just wanted to reiterate that the DWA is a bulk water supplier not a rural water supplier.

Governor Kapere pointed out that some communities in the future will gain the maturity to handle their water needs directly with NAMWATER, but at present, the Central Water Committees may not be able to do the job adequately and probably still needs a "middle man" to give assistance and training until the community can be left on its own.

A comment which was made was that the lifeline concept seems to imply a social security element. Mr. Cashman answered by saying that if a household receives a water bill and has to sell a goat to pay it, and the next month the same thing happens and again and again until there are no more goats, will that home be allowed to go thirsty if they have no more means available to pay for the water? The community must have sustainability of water without facing high tariffs which will cripple, and they must be able to continue an economic existence.

**Q:** How are tariffs to be set for boreholes, windmill pumps, hand pumps, etc.?

**A:** This point was not discussed in detail. The group looked at principles where initially the basic costs are met such as maintenance until the community can pay other operation costs. It would be a two tiered system.

**Q:** In some regions, individuals have approached the bulk water suppliers on their own behalf and some on behalf of their communities, and they have tapped into pipelines. They have good working relations and pay their bills. How will this change with NAMWATER supplying everyone?

Mr. Nghipandulwa replied that in situations with individuals or communities there is no reason to change a working arrangement.

Q: In the southern regions where there are many water schemes, will communities take over all the schemes?

A: Again, this was a topic not specifically covered but the general idea is that communities will receive training to be able to maintain and operate the schemes themselves.

Mr. H Koch made a point at this time that if it is decided that DRWS should act as the middle man between NAMWATER and communities, the directorate will have to be expanded because, at present, it does not have the manpower to handle the logistics involved. This, of course, goes against government's directive to cut down. We must empower communities to do the tasks.

Q: The DRWS is not in business to make profits but is service rendering. People say if it comes into the middle, it will raise tariffs, but if it is rendering service it should not add to the tariffs.

At this point, Mr. Cashman remembered that there was another point raised in his group's discussions:

- The Central Water Committees incur certain running costs which the members themselves must cover because they are serving at the moment in their private capacities. These are actual costs which, in all fairness, should be recovered through the sale of water.

Mr. Kalbermatten felt that at this stage, the participants were dealing too much with details which will arise in the far future and can be dealt with then. He also wanted to point out that NAMWATER is in the business of selling water and would cover its costs as set down by the government. In this workshop, participants need to be looking at policy which will specify how to deal with communities who cannot pay their bills.

Mr. Kaulinge answered by reminding Mr. Kalbermatten that although NAMWATER is a corporation set up for the purpose of selling water and paying for itself in that way, the sole shareholder is the government and the government works for the people; so it is not such a straight forward situation. Another comment was made that generally it is agreed that government should not subsidise NAMWATER, but rather DRWS which can then act as the middle man to help communities and thus subsidise the communities. The Chairman pointed out that, unfortunately, NAMWATER will not be able to survive for at least the next five years without subsidies from government. As it is, there is still debate on where assets such as dams should be allocated: to the DWA or to NAMWATER.

Mr. Kaulinge then went on to highlight the points which he felt Group III had made:

1. Block tariffs for lifeline uses and economic activities with consideration of sustainability.
2. Water to be sold to be sold directly to communities which would work with DWRS to set tariffs.
3. Regions would determine tariffs to cover costs.
4. Warned to handle issue of setting too high tariffs very carefully so will not have adverse reactions.
5. Phasing in of tariffs is necessary. The CWC must play a crucial role with maximum access to information.
6. Must consider restructuring of CWC in terms of membership and function. Government representatives must not just be advisors but must be full participants.
7. Use water tariffs equitably possibly using a differential scale depending upon individual circumstances.
8. Damage to installations from outside sources, specifically elephants, must be dealt with. The suggestion of a tourism levy was made to cover damages caused by game.
9. In terms of reinvestment of revenue, the government would not be reimbursed but the money would go back into communities.
10. The CWC's have their own specific costs which need to be fairly compensated.

The Chairman reiterated the point made by Mr. Kapere that initially communities may not be able to take sole responsibility for water management but would need help, but eventually, with maturity and training, they would be able to do so.

#### 8.0 GROUP II: SOCIAL EQUITY, GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND EXTERNAL ASPECTS

Mr. Uanivi reported for this group and used overheads to give the following points:

##### 1. Subsidies/Grants

- Grants - Yes
- Only "lifeline subsidies at local & W.P. committee levels.
- Only short term subsidies for settlers.



- Upper limits achieved through punitive tariffs except if sustainable limits exceeded then quotas.
- No subsidies to land or livestock rich populations (only exceptions)
- Need to determine 'lifeline'
- Incorporate gender equity into representative structures.

## 2. Resource Management

- Water can be used as a resource management tool.
- Sustainable limits need to be determined by regional planners.
- Need to involve communities in determination of supply limits & tariffs
- Water Point Committees should get ownership/use rights over water resource which they pay for
- Community development committees get control over all resources (where there is no existing control)
- Thorough training should be applied to water point committees at all levels.

## 3. Cross-subsidisation

- There should be cross-subsidisation - at water point committee level for 'lifeline' and at higher levels for economic reasons
- Tariffs need to be re-invested in the water sector.

## 4. Co-ordination and Planning

- Integrate water committees into development committees (eg. as subcommittees)
- Promote inter-sectoral co-ordination (ministries, donors, NGO's)
- Regional authorities should be at forefront of co-ordination
- should support planning capacity in regions (decentralising)
- Regional councils should develop their planning capacity
- Line ministries should support planning of regional authorities

A couple of points which did not fit into any of the above categories follow:

- Should communities pay bulk meters directly or through RWS?
- Revision of policies governing private boreholes/depletion or overuse of groundwater.

Mr. Kaulinge asked that the last two points be looked at first.

A comment was made that the issue of groundwater would be addressed in a new water act which is being reviewed at the moment. Another comment was that private boreholes need to be controlled as well as private dams. Apparently, the new water act will bring back the concept of the water resources boards. At this stage, very few of the private dams are legally applied for and there is not the manpower to enforce the necessary legalities.

Ms. Sealy commented that this group was also very aware of the need for transparency in terms of pricing and availability of water. She also wanted to point out that this group's idea of lifeline amount is different from the previous group because it only includes human consumption and not economic. They felt that there should be an integration of committees to look at the whole picture when deciding pricing and that DWA should not have that job exclusively.

A comment was made that if the Ministry supplies water to those who cannot afford it, why does it not also supply seeds to sustain life. Can we take away the community's responsibility for economic growth which in turn allows it to support government?

Q: What is the subsistence level of livestock per household?

A: This was a detail which would be looked at later.

On the subject of "Subsidies/Grants":

Q: Why was the word 'punitive' used with tariffs? Is that word not a bit harsh?

A: The term can be changed but the social equity concept must remain.

A comment was made that in a policy document specific conditions should be given for receiving grants and subsidies. Ms. Sealy, at this point, explained that the term grant was meant for a 'once off' capital expenditure and subsidy was for lifeline payments.

Another comment was made that it could be stipulated that certain preconditions would be given as negotiated, and the answer was that those are details which were not discussed.

On a different subject, a comment came up that farmers are encouraged to grow into commercial suppliers and yet their water supply was going to have to be limited.

How could the two concepts abide together? Mr. Kaulinge pointed out that farmers must move into the commercial sector and would be under a different consideration. Mr. Cashman suggested that maybe farmers should be given grants instead of trying to use water for regulation. Another participant stated that the crux of the matter is that lifeline water must be guaranteed and farmers could be suffocating other users.

Mr. Cashman felt that the term 'lifeline' may be overused and possibly should not be connected to subsidies. Those should be organised between communities and government. Dr. McPherson did not agree stating that all must be assured of the ability to receive water even if it has to be subsidised for individuals. No one should die of thirst due to a lack of water in Namibia.

A comment was made that the term "settlers" needs to be clarified. The answer given was people who move to another area for a specific time period such as folks who are being resettled by the government for five years.

A point made under "Resource Management" was from Mr. Koch who wanted to know if the use of water as a resource management tool was meant to be controlling through tariffs or through supply? The group had not elaborated on this but both could be considered.

The subject of "Cross-subsidisation" had a few points made:

Mr. Gibbs felt that there might be a discrepancy between the groups as to the future use of excess water tariffs. Mr. Cashman stated that his group felt tariffs were there for recovering costs not to be used as a tool for control. Ms. Sealy stated that her group would definitely reinvest profits in the community and not give the money back to government.

Mr. Gibbs then stated his concern that the communities may not always be the best judges of what sustainable levels are and that there may need to be an objective person/body involved. The Chairman felt that these were details which could be dealt with later. Mr. Kapere felt that if the committees did not have the skills to see danger then hopefully other committees in the region would be able to act as checks and balances for them.

On the subject of cross-subsidisation, Mr. Kalbermatten felt that local water committees could have cross-subsidisation and higher levels of subsidies from government could be for bringing in industry or tourism into a region. He explained that government could have a levy on something like tourism which could then be used in areas which were less affluent.

On co-ordination and planning, Mr. Kaulinge stressed that these points are important because empowerment must continue and those in power must do what their constituencies want. The needs of the grass roots must go from the bottom up and not the other way around. The group reiterated that the regional level must be the central point from which decisions are made not just being informed.

Mr. Kapere made a point that the ministries invite regional members to functions and the costs of attending or hosting are not covered in the MRLGH budget, but it is important for the regional members to be present.

**Q:** How do the Regional Councils move into the forefront? At this stage, they would have a difficult time doing so.

Mr. Kaulinge answer by saying the suggestions are the ideal, and we are still in the interim period. The comment back was that they would need to be given the authority to be in the forefront.

Mr. Kapere also made the point that to do planning, one needs expertise and consultants and how does one pay for such. He also noted that sometimes different ministries decide to build a centre, for example, and have not spoken to one another but are duplicating the work. When the regional council tries to step it, it is not very successful because each ministry wants to complete the task to show they have accomplished something. Ms. Basson commented that the regional councils have the legal authority to plan and co-ordinate, but they do not always have the wherewithall to use the various ministries.

Another participant pointed out that the ministries do have a good deal of expertise, and the regional councils can use the budget of the ministries by using that expertise. The ministries can implement what the regional councils say they would like to see happen. Mr. Kaulinge said that there are forums for this issue being discussed.

A further comment was that there needs to be legal recognition of regional and community development committees. A point of clarification was also made that water committees would become subcommittees of the development committee on the same level.

As there was no further discussion, Group I's presentation was made by Mr. Fitter.

## **9.0 GROUP I: COVERAGE AND INVESTMENT NEEDS**

1. Within the limits imposed by resource availability from GRN and users, and technical feasibility, the minimum acceptable water supply to all Namibians will be based upon:
  - 1.1 -a max. walking distance of 5km; to be reduced to an acceptable distance of 2.5km by the year . . . . . ; to be further reduced to the ideal of 1km by the year . . . . . ;
  - 1.2 -15 litres per person per day; which may be regionally adjusted following studies to determine actual and required daily needs; and
  - 1.3 -a maximum of 30 minutes waiting time at the water collection point.

2. Human domestic water supply needs will take priority over livestock requirements. Livestock needs will be based upon the natural carrying capacity of grazing lands.
3. A "Natural Resource User Fee" will be levied on owners of livestock in excess of subsistence levels to ensure:
  - 3.1 -the survival of less resource-endowed farmers;
  - 3.2 -sustainable natural resource use; and
  - 3.3 -funds generated by this charge will be kept by the community/region generating it for water supply maintenance, land improvement or other development projects.
4. Priority will be given to rehabilitation of existing water points before construction of new facilities; either of which shall be based on clearly defined demands by local communities channelled through their Central Water Committees. The Central Water Committees will be composed of elected members of Local Water Committees.
5. For both new installations and rehabilitation works, the principle of the most cost-effective technology shall be applied.
6. The lowest cost acceptable water supply technology [basic minimum] to be applied to an area will be negotiated between users [represented by their Central Water Committee] and providers [represented by DWA/NGOs]. The additional costs for technologies which are selected by communities in excess of this basic minimum, will be borne by the users.
7. DWA will develop a model to determine the investment needs for the sector under different scenarios to allow the Government to make informed decisions.[Strategy ?]

The point was made by the group that the investment money available will determine when these goals will be met. It was also noted that point 7 must happen so that government can take informed decisions.

Another point was raised that it may be a good idea to give some of the eventual profits back to government for their initial investment so that they can in turn plow that money back into less affluent areas.

Q: Who would administer the User fee and at what level?

A: That duty should be done on the community level so that communities can take responsibility, but the communities need legal status so, for instance, if the money gets used up, the communities could be sued for losses. There are obligations as well as rights which must be enforced.

Mr. Koch asked whether the community could decide not to put the user fee on to the tariff. Mr. Gibbs explained that his group had a strong feeling about deterring overuse of the water and the grazing, and since there would be two fees for overuse involved, they felt it was better to put them together as one. Mr. Koch said that possibly there could be a tariff on livestock which is in line with the carrying capacity of the land and one for livestock over that capacity in order to keep the basic tariff low. On the same topic, Mr. Fitter explained that large groups of livestock are generally in areas which have piped water, and so this is why point 2 was put in. They felt that boreholes, etc. should be designed to only be able to give an amount of water for sustainability in that area. Mr. Kalbermatten felt that since two different groups had given suggestions on this point, maybe the DWA should make a final decision based on research.

Mr. Gibbs pointed out that despite the expertise present in the room and his speaking to people in the veterinary services, etc., he could not get an answer to his question regarding water consumption by livestock. Mr. Kaulinge said that figures are available through a study done by the FAO.

Mr. Gibbs then explained that filling in the time periods will depend upon financial implications although one does not necessarily want finances to dictate the policies. Mr. Fitter still felt that participants should indicate approval or disapproval of the specifics of point 1. One of the ladies did indicate that five kilometres is much too far and the figure should rather be two kilometres.

In the discussion which followed, it was mentioned that there is not always "sweet" water available in an area and sometimes the technical feasibility limits where installations can be placed. Mr. Kalbermatten emphasised the need to do more research before proper minimum levels can be established. It was explained that the five kilometres was merely an interim step in order to get to the preferred distance, but another participant noted that it takes about three hours to walk five kilometres and that is a large chunk out of a person's day. We must make finances available to bring those distances down.

## **10.0 PRESENTATION OF MODIFIED POLICY STATEMENTS**

After lunch, the workshop continued with Working Group IV coming together and the other working groups meeting to modify their statements to be able to give final statements. Mr. Kaulinge began with Group I which presented its modified points.

A. Group I:**COVERAGE AND INVESTMENT NEEDS**

1. Within the limits imposed by resource availability from GRN and users, and technical feasibility, the minimum acceptable water supply to all Namibians will be based upon:

- 1.1 - a max. walking distance of 2.5km by the year . . . . . ; to be further reduced to 1km by the year . . . . . ;
- 1.2 - 15 litres per person per day; which may be regionally adjusted following studies to determine actual and required daily needs; and
- 1.3 - a maximum of 30 minutes waiting time at the water collection point.

2. Human domestic water supply needs will take priority over livestock requirements. Livestock needs will be based upon the natural carrying capacity of grazing lands.

3. Priority will be given to rehabilitation of existing water points before construction of new facilities; either of which shall be based on clearly defined demands by local communities channelled through their Central Water Committees. The Central Water Committees will be composed of elected members of Local Water Committees.

4. For both new installations and rehabilitation works, the principle of the most cost-effective technology shall be applied.

5. The lowest cost acceptable water supply technology [basic minimum] to be applied to an area will be negotiated between users [represented by their Central Water Committee] and providers [represented by DWA/NGOs]. The additional costs for technologies which are selected by communities in excess of this basic minimum, will be borne by the users.

6. A "Natural Resource User Fee" will be levied on owners of livestock in excess of subsistence levels to ensure:

- 6.1 - the survival of less resource-endowed farmers;
- 6.2 - sustainable natural resource use; and
- 6.3 - funds generated by this charge will be kept by the community/region generating it for water supply maintenance, land improvement or other development projects.

6.4 - the "User Fee" will consist of a basic fee for "lifeline" domestic and livestock purposes; and an excess for amounts above "lifeline".

**Strategies:**

1. DWA will develop figures to determine the investment needs for the sector under different scenarios to allow the Government to make informed decisions.
2. DWA will facilitate the formation of Local and Central Water Committees with elected members.
3. The setting of the "User Fee" will be performed on agreement between the MAWRD and the communities [Central/National Water Committees].

Mr. Fitter explained that the distance of 5 kilometres had been eliminated and a time period has not been added.

Mr. Kapere noted that he feels that members of the CWC are already elected officials. Mr. Gibbs expressed that this group feels the members of the CWC should be people who are specifically interested in water use not necessarily politicians from other committees. He feels the present committee described by Mr. Kapere is a development committee. It was suggested that the grass roots people elect the water committee members but that people from the regional development committees also be involved.

Dr. McPherson made the observation that the CWC makes administrative decisions and would it be possible for a committee made entirely of users to do that? Another participant suggested that a possible solution is to have the water committees as subcommittees of the development committees as suggested in another group. Mr. Kaulinge asked if the CWC was not meant to regulate the water usage whether the group was made of users or civil servants? An explanation of CWC's was then given.

Mr. Kaulinge emphasised that users cannot work in a vacuum but must work with government.

B. Group II:

**SOCIAL EQUITY, GOVERNMENT SUPPORT AND EXTERNAL ASPECTS**

**1. Subsidies/Grants**

- Grants which are conditional and negotiated
- Only 'lifeline' subsidies at local and Water Point Committee levels
- Short term subsidies for settlers is being handled by MLRR.



- Upper limits achieved through progressive tariffs except if sustainable limits exceeded then quotas.
- No subsidies to land or livestock rich populations (only exceptions)
- Need to determine 'lifeline'
- Incorporate gender equity into representative structure

## 2. Resource Management

- Water can be used as a resource management tool.
- Sustainable limits need to be determined by regional planners.
- Need to involve communities in determination of supply limits and tariffs.
- Water Point Committees should get ownership/use rights over water resource which they pay for.
- Community development committees get control over all resources (where there is no existing control).
- Thorough training should be applied to water point committees at all levels (flexible approach - must make use of available trained capacity at local, regional and national levels).

## 3. Cross-subsidisation

- There should be cross-subsidisation
  1. at Water Point Committee level at least for 'lifeline'
  2. and at higher decision making levels for economic reasons (decisions based on national economic values).
- Tariffs need to remain in the water sector, i.e. WPC, LWC, CWC and higher.

## 4. Co-ordination and Planning

- Integrate water committees into development committees (eg. as subcommittees)
- Promote inter-sectoral co-ordination (ministries, donors, NGO's)
- Regional authorities should be at forefront of co-ordination and provided with adequate resources.
- Should support planning capacity in regions (decentralise).

- Regional Councils should develop their planning capacity.
- Line ministries should support planning of Regional authorities.
- Donor and NGO activities should be compatible and integrated with policy and regional plans.

The presentation's wording has been changed from the original somewhat and the point made about short term subsidies to settlers was taken out because it was decided these settlers receive a subsidy from another Ministry so it would not be duplicated.

Q: What input was given on training?

A: The idea was to design a programme flexible enough that it could be handled by NGO's who would go around the country giving the training thus keeping away from a large training department used strictly for training WPC's.

Mr. Kapere wanted to know how payments for water would be moved from location to location now that the settler issue had been taken out of the statement. The answer was that the settlers still receive a subsidy but from another ministry, and they would still need to pay their tariffs. The question was asked how nomad communities who move constantly would be handled. It was suggested that by giving ownership of water points to the communities, they would then be able to do the regulation whether the settlers were moved there by government or chose to move to a new area. If a particular community is having problems with receiving payments in these situations, they could approach government for subsidies on merits given.

Q: What about the Angolans who are moving across the border to water their animals at Namibian water holes?

Mr. Kaulinge answered this question by reminding the group that Angola had sheltered many Namibians before Independence, and eventually, things will be sorted out.

### C. Group III:

#### TARIFFS AND THEIR IMPLEMENTATION

1. There should be a scale of tariffs to ensure the equitable recovery of costs by the service provider from those legal entities receiving such services. This should take into account the need and desirability for a minimum lifeline tariff, such that communities will be entitled to sufficient water to ensure the satisfying of basic human needs.

2. Central Water Committees have a key role to play in the determination and setting of tariffs and cost recovery guidelines for communities and water committees. Their duties and functions should include the following:
  - tariff setting
  - subsidies
  - phasing
  - information
- Composition of the committee should include representation from the water committees, advised and supported by government officials and, where appropriate, other service providers such as NAMWATER.
3. Implementation of cost recovery shall be gradual with due regard to the ability of communities to pay.
4. There should be established a Development Fund which would be administered by Central Government the purpose of which will be to encourage the development of rural communities and to make provision to compensate for natural disasters related to water infrastructure.
5. To enable communities to acquire user ownership of water infrastructure the transfer of such assets used to achieve this objective to legal entities must be accorded due status in law.
6. Cost recovery by the service provider from beneficiaries shall be achieved in such a manner that overheads and other charges are minimised.
7. Funds in excess of those required for full cost recovery should be utilised for the benefit of the sector with priority given to the needs of the communities from which they have been raised.

This group was generally happy with its original points, but it took note of suggestions which were made and did some wording changes to come up with the above seven points.

They reconsidered the definition of lifeline tariffs and gave it a broader definition, and they concurred on the sentiments that excess funds should be used in the water sectors.

**Q:** What about the question of free diesel?

**A:** That is a point of detail.

Mr. Kaulinge reiterated that everyone must pay and the workshop concurred.

## 11.0 WORKING GROUP IV:

This group included the Permanent Secretary, Deputy Permanent Secretary, Director of Rural Water Services, and the Regional Governors from Erongo, Oshikoto, Omusati, Ohangwena, and Karas.

Phase 1: The next 12 months.

The Road Forward.

WASCO - Step one - the presentation of the workshop recommendations on Thursday, 9 November, and then by the following Thursday, 16 November, we will, with or without WASCO's endorsement, proceed to the Regional Structures for grass root consultations via a questionnaire approach. The logistics will be detailed by DRWS, who will evaluate a time scale.

CWC's - To assist with the needs analysis survey, over a period of one month per region, whereupon requisite feedback via the Governors Office will be furnished to DWA HQ. RW Extension Officers will assist in the process in all Regions. The 4 Northern regions only have one CWC but it is perfectly possible to conduct a survey through this organisation.

Regions such as Hardap, the Governors propose that the elected councillors and traditional leaders must be involved to articulate the needs of their constituencies.

THEN: (following the questionnaire evaluation and fine tuning of the policy statements)

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS - Omusati - have an RDC with all line ministries participating. The agenda is dominated by WATER.

Oshikoto has REMC, meets regularly mostly focusing on WATER. Some of them have collected up to N\$20,000 for the provision of water but in most instances there is simply no water.

It was decided that consultation via the questionnaire should include Regional Development Committees, Regional Emergency Management Committees, as well as Regional Water Committees and the Central Water Committee representing the four Northern regions.

ACTION: DRWS: Takes and drives the programme of work for the regions present and not present.

The drafting of

- the "Manual of Practice for Rural Water Supply"
- The "Preliminary Long Term Rural Water Supply Investment Programme"

- The development of a national human resource development programme for Rural Water Supply
- The selecting of a Region or Sub-regions to pilot test the efficacy of prepared policies and guidelines

were accepted as activities which the DWA(DRWS) will pursue, on the basis of consultation with Regional structures prior to finalisation.

The design of cost recovery policies and tariff structure will be pursued in a transparent and justifiable manner. Similarly, a compatible Rural Water Supply financial management policy will be designed by DWA(DRWS).

Finally, the principle of evaluating a "Water Sector Development Fund" was greeted with enthusiasm and agreed upon as a principle.

## 12.0 WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Dr. McPherson asked the group to evaluate the workshop in a very simple way by indicating their level of satisfaction and whether their expectations were met. The results were as follows:

### LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

Very Satisfied  
7

Satisfied  
36

Not Satisfied  
3

### EXPECTATIONS

Fully Met  
8

Met  
35

Not Met  
3

## 13.0 CLOSURE OF WORKSHOP

Mr. A Kapere, as host of the workshop, gave a few words. "Here in the Erongo Region we can welcome you and chase you away." He thanked everyone for coming to work on this important issue. He felt that the importance of water could not be overemphasised. "Water is Life." He said that the participants had been gathered discussing life and he hoped it is just the beginning of shaping policies which would be implemented.

He wished everyone a good journey back and expressed thanks and satisfaction to the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Rural Development for the opportunity availed the people of the country to discuss this issue. "We are going away very happy and with the hope that the water issue will be handled with necessary care."

Mr. Kaulinge then officially closed the workshop.

#### 14. ANNEXES

1. List of Participants
2. Briefing Paper

## WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION/FUNCTION</u>	<u>ORGANISATION</u>
Ashipara, Engelbert	Vice-chairman	CCWC Oshakati
Awasmann, Joseph	Control RWE Officer	RWS - Karas Region
Barnes, Jonathan	Directorate of Environ. Affairs	Natural Resource Economics Programme
Basson, Theresia	Regional Officer (Chief Exec. Officer)	Hardap Regional Council
Cashman, Adrian	Consultant, Rural Water Supply	Parkman Namibia
Christelis, Greg	DRWS, Dep. Director: Rural Geohydrology	Water Affairs
Coetzee, Robert	Central Water Committee	Kunene South
Cownie, David	C.P. Consultant	Caprivi Rural Water Project
Drews, Hanjörg	Planning Engineer	DWA
Ebrecht, Lutz	DDRWS South	RWS H/Q
Esterhuizen, Coen	Regional Head - Karas.	Rural W/S
Fitter, Jörn	Planning Advisor (SARDEP)	Directorate of Planning Dep. of Agric. & Rural Dev.
Fry, Richard	Deputy Permanent Secretary	DWA
"Garoëb, Moses	Councillor	Hardap Regional Council
Gibbs, Ken	WATSAN Project Officer	UNICEF
Goliath, Stephanus	Governor	Karas Region
Greiner, Fred	Technical Advisor	GTZ/DWA
Haingura, Ambrosius	Governor	Kavango Region
Hayes, Michael	Regional Head	RWS, Hardap
Kalbermatten, John	Consultant	Kalbermatten Associates
Kandjii, SH	Chief Control Officer	MARR Projects Implementation
Kapere, AK	Governor	Erongo Regional Council
Karuuombe, J	Chief Community Liaison	Dir. of Community Dev. - Kunene Region
Katjivirue, Charles	Liaison Officer	DRWS
Kaulinge, I	Permanent Secretary	MAWRD

Kaulu, SM	Member	North Region
Kayama, T	RWS	Caprivi
Koch, Harald	Acting Deputy Dir.: Rural Water Development & Planning	MAWRD, DWA, DRWS
Mbai, Asser	Councillor/CWC Chairman	Otjozondjupa Regional Council
Mbuti, Alphonsine	RWS Officer	Omatjete
McPherson, Harry	r	GTZ
Mhone, Yambila	Project Co-ordinator (Africare)	Community Based Management Project RWS
Mukwilongo, N.	Omusati Regional Governor	
Mwaningange, Billy	Governor	Ohangwena Region
Nambimbi, Thomas	Councillor	Oshana Regional Council
Nampala, Hosea	Governor	Oshikoto Regional Council
Negumbo, Sikunawa	Planning Manager of Extension Works	MAWRD/DEES
Nehemia, Abraham	DRWS, Control RWEO (Oshakati)	DWA
Nghipandulwa, Pita	Director DWA	RWS
Nuineeko, Festus	Extension Officer	DRWS
Samupofu, Slysken	Regional Chief (RWS)	DRWS
Shihepo, Olivia	Community Development Officer	WSSPOR
Simubali, Lucas	Regional Councillor	Caprivi Regional Council
Sizimbo, Francis	Councillor	Caprivi Regional Council
Tjiramba, Godfried	Dev. Planner	DRWS
Truebody, Miriam	Consultant	Ogongo/Oshakati RWS Prog.
Tujendapi, KS	Private Secretary	KRC - Projects
Uanivi, Sebulon	Regional Head	Omahehe
Van der Leest, Henk	Project Co-ordinator	WSSPOR (Finnconsult)
Woehl, Helmut	Directorate of Environ. Affairs	National Progr. to Combat Desertification (NAPCOD)
Zijlma, Sjaak	DRWS, Planning Officer	DWA