

Coordinating twinning partnerships towards more adaptive governance in river basins

# Basin Report:

Questionnaire + Addendum To review case study basins with regard to their water governance regime contact and performance

# <u>Okavango Basin</u>

With focus on the Namibian part Case Study from the TWINBAS project





#### About this questionnaire

This questionnaire was developed within the scope of the Twin2Go project. It serves to record case study data about a river basin's water governance regime, its context and its performance. An explanation of the indicators, pre-defined scores and potential data sources is provided in the guidance on this questionnaire. (Twin2Go, Guidance on the Questionnaire of the Twin2Go - Case Study Review Workshops. 13/03/10).

Scores to each of the indicators are assigned according the suggested score scheme proposed in the guidance. In the case of numerical indicators like indices, the numerical values are added in brackets after the score, e.g. "B (0.178)" or "C (12,534)". For a better understanding of the recorded issue, additional information is added in the "comments" column.

- If not specified differently, the indicators refer to the national part of the basin of interest. The report only considers the national part of the basin.
- In general, you should check the GWP toolbox for papers, reports, etc. as data sources of your region, especially with regard to the water governance regime.

The questionnaire was completed by Twin2Go staff in collaboration with local experts previously involved in TwinBas.

Based on the preliminary synthesis results and discussion during the Twin2Go synthesis workshop (Stockholm, 01-02/09/10) an addendum was made with some additional parameters. This addendum has been filled by the same experts.

The resulting data will be post-processed and added to the Twin2Go database. Should you feel these scores do not reflect the situation of the basin accurately, or want to contest any of the information included, you may contact the project organisers. Contact information as well as additional information regarding the project and the results can be found on www.twin2go.eu.

Names of participating experts have been removed for confidentiality purposes.



### **Table of Contents**

| A) Water governance regime   | 4        |
|--|----------|
| <ul> <li>I) Characteristics of environmental governance regimes</li> <li>a) Water policy, institutional &amp; legal framework (formal and informal)</li> </ul>   | 4<br>4   |
| b) Formalisation of IWRM principles & Millennium Development Goals   | 6        |
| c) Decision making regarding uncertainties   | 6        |
| II) Actor networks with emphasis on the role and interactions of state and non-state actors and power relationships  | 6        |
| a) Cooperation and coordination structures   | 6        |
| b) Information sharing via formal rules, dependency relationships etc.   | 7        |
| <ul><li>III) Multi-level interactions across administrative boundaries and vertical integration across levels a horizontal integration across sectors</li></ul>  |          |
| B) Context   | 8        |
| <ul> <li>I) Societal dimension</li> <li>II) Good Governance Principles at the national level – legal basis at the national level</li> <li>III) Environmental dimension</li> </ul>                                    | 9        |
| C) Performance   |          |
| <ul> <li>I) Progress towards stated Goals</li> <li>II) Good governance principles as indicators for the process dimension</li> <li>III) Stakeholder participation</li> <li>IV) Response to climate change</li> </ul> | 12<br>13 |
| Context  | . 15     |
| I) Basin Characteristics   | .15      |
| Performance  | . 15     |
| I) Environmental sustainability  |          |
| a) State of the water resources and the environment  |          |
| b) Management practices  | .16      |



# A) Water governance regime

| No.   | Indicator  | Score | Comments  |  |  |
|-------|--|-------|---|--|--|
| I) Cł | Characteristics of environmental governance regimes  |       |   |  |  |
| a) Wa | a) Water policy, institutional & legal framework (formal and informal)                         |       |   |  |  |
|       | Domestic water legislation   | А     | Namibian Water Resources Management Act 2004, Act no 24. A new Water Resources  |  |  |
| 1.    | (laws, by-laws, etc.) in place?  |       | Management Bill has in principle been approved by the Parliament in 2010.   |  |  |
| 2.    | Domestic Water Law: Public<br>character of water and legal<br>status of water use rights       | A     | The 2004 and 2010 water resources act and bill recognises that the water belong to the people of Namibia. The previous act from 1995 had the same clause.   |  |  |
| 3.    | Domestic Water Law: Explicit<br>recognition of traditional and<br>indigenous water uses        | В     | Water for personal and domestic use is excempted from the requirement of having a license.  |  |  |
| 4.    | Domestic Water Law: On flow<br>availability, third party rights<br>and ecological requirements | A     | The 2004 act makes provisions to develop a national water managment plan and to establish a revision period every five years. The Integrated Water Resources Management Strategy and Action Plan was developed in 2006. |  |  |
| 5.    | Integration of domestic water legislation  | A     | The 2004 act regulates all types of water use.  |  |  |
| 6.    | Multilevel structure of domestic<br>water legislation and<br>subsidiarity                      | A     | The 2004 Act delegates functions to regional and basin level.   |  |  |
| 7.    | Existence of formal domestic<br>administrative structure for<br>water governance               | A     | A Water resources management agency and council exists as well as basin organisations and water user associations.  |  |  |
| 8.    | National basin organisation or comparable arrangement  | A     | The Water resources management agency is the overall planning agency. Basin organisations are planned but not in operation in all basins.   |  |  |
| 9.    | Formalised transboundary coordination organisation   | A     | Transboundary organisations exists for Okavango (OKACOM and ORANGE ORASECOM   |  |  |



| No. | Indicator   | Score | Comments   |
|-----|---|-------|--|
| 10. | Formal institution (legislation)<br>that prescribes the basin<br>management principle                               | В     | The Water Act 2004 prescribes the basin management principle.  |
| 11. | Water (basin) strategies, programmes and plans  | В     | Plans are in progress, and have been finalised for some basins like Orange.  |
| 12. | Financing mechanisms:<br>Degree of investment from<br>private sector/ public/ other<br>sources (e.g. international) | В     | Public sector in irrigation, private sector in some hydropower/reservoir schemes.  |
| 13. | Economic instruments<br>Is water for irrigation priced?   | С     | A water abstraction fee is levied, however below cost recovery.  |
| 14. | Economic instruments<br>Is water for households priced<br>in urban areas?   | В     | A water abstraction fee is levied, however below cost recovery. NamWater is the parastatal organisations which abstracts bulk water and distributes to consumers with a user charge. |
| 15. | Economic instruments<br>Is water for industry priced?   | В     | A water abstraction fee is levied, however below cost recovery.  |
| 16. | Tradable permits related to water abstraction/use   | С     | No   |
| 17. | Polluter pays principle (related to water)  | В     | Polluter Pays Principle is in the act however implementation weak.   |
| 18. | Environmental subsidies<br>(related to water )  | С     | No   |
| 19. | Payment for ecosystem<br>services (related to water)  | С     | No   |
| 20. | Tradable permits (related to water quality, maximum, allowable loads etc.)  | С     | No   |
| 21. | Environmental tax (related to water)  | С     | Environmental taxes exists however not related to water  |
| 22. | Presence of substituting<br>informal institutions for<br>management of water  | A     | Stakeholders are engaged however under formal institutions.  |
| 23. | Presence of complementary<br>informal institutions for water<br>management  | В     | Does not play a significant role.  |



| No.                             | Indicator  | Score        | Comments  |
|---------------------------------|--|--------------|---|
| 23.a                            | Case-specific indicator(s)   |              |   |
| b) Fo                           | ormalisation of IWRM principles  | & Millennium | Development Goals   |
| 24.                             | Formalised IWRM principles   | А            | The act and water management strategy is based on IWRM principles   |
| 25.                             | State of implementation of IWRM principles   | В            | Basin management plans exists for some basins implementation lagging behind for some basins.  |
| 26.                             | Capacity to implement IWRM   | В            | Capacity building activities are supported by government and international donors.  |
| 27.                             | Is universal and non-<br>discriminatory access to safe<br>drinking water and sanitation a<br>goal?   | A            | Yes, its even a criteria that the access should be affordable.  |
| 28.                             | Integration of wetlands in<br>IWRM and IRBM*   | В            | Yes for the Okavango basin  |
| 28.a                            | Case-specific indicator(s)   |              |   |
| c) De                           | ecision making regarding uncert  | ainties      |   |
| ~~                              | General practices for dealing  | В            | Not specifically mentioned in the act of management strategies.   |
| 29.                             | with uncertainties   |              |   |
|                                 | with uncertainties<br>Dealing with uncertainties:<br>Reversible and flexible options   | В            | Not specifically mentioned in the act of management strategies  |
| 30.                             | Dealing with uncertainties:  | B            | Not specifically mentioned in the act of management strategies         Not specifically mentioned in the act of management strategies |
| 30.<br>31.                      | Dealing with uncertainties:<br>Reversible and flexible options<br>Dealing with uncertainties:  |              |   |
| 29.<br>30.<br>31.<br>32.<br>33. | Dealing with uncertainties:<br>Reversible and flexible options<br>Dealing with uncertainties:<br>Safety margins<br>Are scenarios used for decision | В            | Not specifically mentioned in the act of management strategies  |

### II) Actor networks with emphasis on the role and interactions of state and non-state actors and power relationships

#### a) Cooperation and coordination structures



| No.    | Indicator   | Score | Comments  |  |  |
|--------|---|-------|---|--|--|
| 34.    | Vertical coordination<br>(governmental)   | A     | Vertical coordination is established and functional   |  |  |
| 35.    | Horizontal coordination<br>(governmental)   | С     | Horizontal coordination exists (WASCO) however this coordination body never meets.                  |  |  |
| 36.    | Role of local governments   | В     | Local governments participate as a stakeholder in basin management organisations where these exists |  |  |
| 36.a   | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |   |  |  |
| b) Inf | b) Information sharing via formal rules, dependency relationships etc.  |       |   |  |  |
| 37.    | Kinds of knowledge included<br>=> Role of experts/ science,<br>local/traditional knowledge  |       |   |  |  |
| 38.    | Access to information =><br>about expert knowledge and<br>management plans  | В     | Information is accessible   |  |  |
| 38.a   | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |   |  |  |
|        | III) Multi-level interactions across administrative boundaries and vertical integration across levels and horizontal integration across sectors |       |   |  |  |

#### a) Centralisation

| 39.  | One level one actor?                         | А | The ministry is the dominant partner                                       |
|------|--|---|--|
| 40.  | Degree of centralisation                     | В | Decentralisation has taken place, with the ministry being still in control |
| 41.  | Technical capacity and economies<br>of scale | В | There is limited capacity a lower levels.                                  |
| 42.  | Legal obligations and<br>responsibility      | A | Well defined in the act- not well implemented yet.                         |
| 42.a | Case-specific indicator(s)                   |   |  |



# B) Context

| No.   | Indicator  | Score     | Comments   |  |
|-------|--|-----------|--|--|
| I) Sc | ) Societal dimension                               |           |  |  |
| 43.   | Proportion of the population living in rural areas | 64.9      | Source: United Nations Population Division (2008): World Urbanization Prospects: The 2007<br>revision Population Database, http://esa.un.org/unup/<br>Values for 2005  |  |
| 44.   | State of societal development                      | C (0.686) | Human Development Index         Source: UNDP: Human Development Report         Values for 2009         http://hdrstats.undp.org/en/countries/country_fact_sheets/cty_fs_SWE.html   |  |
| 45.   | Social sustainability (Gini<br>Index)              | E (74.3)  | Gini Index<br>Source: UNDP: Human Development Report 2009,<br><u>http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf</u> - Values were calculated based on data<br>by World Bank (2009d)   |  |
| 46.   | Economic sustainability (e.g.<br>GDP)              | D (4,547) | GDP per capita (US-\$, PPP-corrected)<br>Source: World Bank, <u>http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/icp-final-tables.pdf</u><br>Values for 2005 Gini Index<br>Source: UNDP: Human Development Report 2009,<br><u>http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_2009_EN_Complete.pdf</u> - Values were calculated based on data<br>by World Bank (2009d) GDP per capita (US-\$, PPP-corrected)<br>Source: World Bank, <u>http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ICPINT/Resources/icp-final-tables.pdf</u><br>Values for 2005 |  |



| No.   | Indicator   | Score       | Comments  |
|-------|---|-------------|---|
|       |   | C (4.5)     | Corruption Perception Index   |
|       | Effectiveness of formal                                   |             | Source: Transparency International,   |
| 47.   | institutions  |             | http://www.transparency.org/policy research/surveys indices/cpi/2009/cpi 2009 table               |
|       |   |             | Values for 2009   |
|       |   | No data     | Rating by the rating agency "Standards & Poor   |
|       | Trustworthiness of economic                               |             | Source: The Guardian (article from 22.05.2009),   |
| 48.   | institutional setting - degree of risk for foreign direct |             | http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2009/may/22/recession-government-borrowing#zoomed-             |
|       | investment  |             | picture   |
|       |   |             |   |
|       | Presence of avenues of dissent                            | A (9.00)    | Press Freedom Index   |
| 49.   | – press freedom, freedom of                               |             | Source: Reporters without Borders, http://www.rsf.org/en-classement1003-2009.html                 |
|       | speech  |             | Values for 2009   |
| 49.a  | Case-specific indicator(s)                                |             |   |
| II) G | ood Governance Principles                                 | at the nati | onal level – legal basis at the national level  |
|       | Participatory regarding                                   | В           | There is no platform for stakeholder interaction at national level. Stakeholder interaction takes |
| 50.   | decision making in the water sector                       |             | place at lower levels – at basin and local level.   |
| 51.   | Transparency regarding water allocation                   | В           |   |
| 50    | Effectiveness and efficiency                              | В           |   |
| 52.   | regarding decision making in the water sector             |             |   |
| 53.   | Equitable and inclusive                                   | В           | Based on IWRM principles  |
| 54.   | Predictability – with regard to IWRM and climate change   | В           |   |
| 54.a  | Case-specific indicator(s)                                |             |   |



| No.    | Indicator  | Score      | Comments  |  |  |
|--------|--|------------|---|--|--|
| III) E | II) Environmental dimension  |            |   |  |  |
| 55.    | Köppen-Geiger climate<br>classification (river basin)                          | BWk<br>BWh | Source: Kottek, M., J. Grieser, C. Beck, B. Rudolf, and F. Rubel (2006), <u>http://koeppen-geiger.vu-</u><br>wien.ac.at/present.htm#maps  |  |  |
| 56.    | Climate Moisture Index   | A          | Source: GWSP Digital Water Atlas (2008), GWSP Digital Water Atlas (2008),<br><u>http://atlas.gwsp.org/index.php?option=com_wrapper&amp;Itemid=53</u><br><u>&amp;id_desc=98&amp;itemId_desc=63&amp;id_ds=146&amp;itemId_ds=52</u><br><u>&amp;header=Climate%20Moisture%20Index&amp;site=b1_cmi_anWSAG1_0</u> |  |  |
| 57.    | Climate Moisture Index<br>Coefficient of Variation                             | A          | Source: GWSP atlas (2008), <u>http://atlas.gwsp.org/index.php?option=com_wrapper&amp;Itemid=53</u><br><u>&amp;id_desc=126&amp;itemId_desc=63&amp;id_ds=171&amp;itemId_ds=52&amp;header=Coefficient%20of%20</u><br><u>Variation%20for%20Climate%20Moisture%20Index&amp;site=b2_cmi_annual_cv</u>             |  |  |
| 58.    | Per Capita Equivalent of TARWA   | C (8810)   | Source: UNESCO, UN World Water Development Report, <u>http://www.greenfacts.org/en/water-</u><br>resources/figtableboxes/3.htm<br>Values for 2005   |  |  |
| 59.    | Average water availability at the river basin level (1995)                     | E (1-5)    | Source: University of Kassel, WaterGAP 2.0, <u>http://www.env-</u><br>edu.gr/Documents/World%20Water%20in%202025.pdf  |  |  |
| 60.    | Annual renewable water supply per person by river basin (1995)                 | E          | Source: World Resources Institute, EarthTrends 2001,<br>http://earthtrends.wri.org/pdf_library/maps/2-4_m_WaterSupply1995.pdf   |  |  |
| 61.    | Projected annual renewable<br>water supply per person by<br>river basin (2025) | E          | Source: World Resources Institute, EarthTrends 2001, <u>http://earthtrends.wri.org/pdf_library/maps/2-</u><br><u>4_m_WaterSupply2025.pdf</u>  |  |  |
| 62.    | Relative Water Stress Index  | Е          | Source: UNESCO, World Water Development Report II, http://wwdrii.sr.unh.edu/download.html   |  |  |
| 63.    | Climate Vulnerability Index  | D          | Source: Oxford Centre for Water Research (OCWR), 2008-2010,<br>http://ocwr.ouce.ox.ac.uk/research/wmpg/cvi/   |  |  |



| No.  | Indicator   | Score | Comments   |
|------|---|-------|--|
| 64.  | Degree to which water quality<br>status restricts usability of<br>users' types                      | A     | WFD RBMP   |
| 65.  | Extent of flow and channel modification   | В     | Significant flow and channel modification                            |
| 66.  | Impact of land-use changes on<br>hydrological processes   | В     | Land use changes has a significant effect on hydrological processes. |
| 67.  | Uncertainty associated to<br>climate change predictions<br>regarding precipitation for the<br>basin | D     | Source: Illustration from MAGICC-SCENGEN                             |
| 67.a | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |  |



# C) Performance

| No.   | Indicator  | Score   | Comments  |  |
|-------|--|---------|---|--|
| l) Pr | ) Progress towards stated Goals  |         |   |  |
| 68.   | Progress towards sustainable<br>access to safe drinking water<br>(MDG drinking water target) | A       | Source: WHO & UNICEF (2008), Progress on Drinking Water and Sanitation: Special Focus on<br>Sanitation, <u>http://www.wssinfo.org/en/40_MDG2008.html</u><br>Values for 2006 |  |
| 69.   | Proportion of population with<br>access to improved drinking<br>water                        | C (92%) | Source: UN statistics of MDG progress, <u>http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx</u><br>Values for 2006  |  |
| 70.   | Proportion of rural population<br>with access to improved<br>drinking water                  | C (88%) | Source: UN statistics of MDG progress, <u>http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx</u><br>Values for 2006  |  |
| 71.   | Progress towards sustainable<br>access to basic sanitation<br>(MDG sanitation target)        | С       | Source: WHO & UNICEF (2008), Progress on Drinking Water and Sanitation: Special Focus on Sanitation, <u>http://www.wssinfo.org/en/40_MDG2008.html</u><br>Values for 2006    |  |
| 72.   | Proportion of population with access to improved sanitation facilities                       | E (33%) | Source: UN statistics of MDG progress, <u>http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx</u><br>Values for 2006  |  |
| 73.   | Proportion of rural population<br>with access to improved<br>sanitation facilities           | E (17%) | Source: UN statistics of MDG progress, <u>http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/Data.aspx</u><br>Values for 2006  |  |
| 73.a  | Case-specific indicator(s)   |         |   |  |
| II) G | I) Good governance principles as indicators for the process dimension                        |         |   |  |
| 74.   | Participatory regarding decision making in the water sector                                  | A       | Stakeholder participation practices in decision making.   |  |



| No.    | Indicator   | Score | Comments  |
|--------|---|-------|---|
| 75.    | Transparency regarding water allocation   | В     |   |
| 76.    | Effectiveness and efficiency<br>regarding decision making in<br>the water sector  | В     |   |
| 77.    | Equitable and inclusive   | В     |   |
| 78.    | Predictability – with regard to<br>IWRM and climate change  | С     |   |
| 78.a   | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |   |
| III) S | takeholder participation  |       |   |
| 79.    | Deliberative engagement<br>opportunities  | В     |   |
| 80.    | Inclusiveness of stakeholder<br>participation   | A     | All relevant stakeholder groups are included.   |
| 80.a   | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |   |
| IV) F  | Response to climate change  | Ð     |   |
| 81.    | Strategy for adaptation to<br>climate change in the water<br>sector   | С     | Namibia has not developed a NAPA. A second communication to UNFCCC (planned for 2011) is in progress. This communication will also address water resources. |
| 82.    | Availability of specific knowledge enabling adaptation  | В     | Knowledge on impacts on climate change impacts on water resources in Namibia is being established- primarily through internationally supported activities.  |
| 83.    | Awareness of water managers regarding adaptation to climate change  | В     | Awareness raising activities has been undertaken as parts of national and international activities.   |
| 84.    | Coordinated implementation<br>process regarding adaptation<br>to climate change: Program /<br>Plan of activities and measures | C     | No coordinated implementation.  |



| No.  | Indicator   | Score | Comments                 |
|------|---|-------|--------------------------|
| 85.  | Operational activities<br>(measures)                              | E     | No operational measures. |
| 86.  | Ways to deal with climate<br>variability (floods and<br>droughts) | В     |                          |
| 86.a | Case-specific indicator(s)  |       |                          |



## Context

| No.                      | Indicator      | Score       | Comments  |  |  |
|--------------------------|----------------|-------------|---|--|--|
| I) Basin Characteristics |                |             |   |  |  |
|                          |                | 153.783     |   |  |  |
| 67a                      | Sub-Basin Size | km2 (37% of |   |  |  |
|                          |                | the basin)  |   |  |  |
| 67b                      | Transboundary  | Yes         | Riparian countries Angola, Namibia and Botswana |  |  |

## Performance

| No.   | Indicator                       | Score | Comments   |  |  |  |
|---|---------------------------------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| I) En   | I) Environmental sustainability |       |  |  |  |  |
| a) State of the water resources and the environment |                                 |       |  |  |  |  |
| 87  | Aquatic biodiversity            | A     | EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment, fish study, 2009          |  |  |  |
| 88  | Invasive exotic species         | A     | EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment, fish study, 2009          |  |  |  |
| 89  | Surface and groundwater quality | A     | EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment, Water Quality study, 2009 |  |  |  |
| 90  | Groundwater use                 | В     | Groundwater use has intensified  |  |  |  |
| 91  | Water Exploitation Index (WEI)  |       |  |  |  |  |



| No.  | Indicator  | Score | Comments   |  |  |  |
|------|--|-------|--|--|--|--|
| b) M | b) Management practices                            |       |  |  |  |  |
| 92   | Water allocated for aquatic ecosystem              | В     | EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment Water resources and hydrology study, 2009  |  |  |  |
| 93   | Water pollution incidents                          | A     | Water Quality good with no specific pollution incidents, EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study,<br>Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment, Water Quality study, 2009   |  |  |  |
| 94   | Water quality monitoring                           | С     | No systematic water quality monitoring, only research level, EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment, fish study, 2009   |  |  |  |
| 95   | Hydrometeorological<br>monitoring – levels         | В     | Hydrological monitoring network exists, with time series, however network is not very dense.<br>EPSMO project, Technical Diagnostic study, Okavango Environmental Flow Assessment Water<br>resources and hydrology study, 2009 |  |  |  |
| 96   | Level of understanding of<br>groundwater resources | В     | Groundwater management committees have been established at least for two basins in Namibia   |  |  |  |