



PANGANI RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PROJECT

IUCN Management Response to the Mid-Term Review of Pangani River Basin Project

Date: 1st December 2008



PANGANI RIVER BASIN MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Management Response to the Mid-Term Review of Pangani River Basin Project

In September 2008, IUCN with project Partners, PBWO, SNV and PAMOJA Trust commissioned a Mid-Term Review of the Pangani River Basin Project. The review was carried out by a Consultant from Nordic Consulting Group Norway and an IWRM Expert from the Ministry of Water and Irrigation in Dar es Salaam. This document is a Management Response to the recommendation by the Reviewers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS.....	5
1.0 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE-MID TERM REVIEW.....	6
1.1 INTRODUCTION.....	6
2.0 ISSUES, RECOMMENDATIONS AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....	6
2.1 ORGANISATIONAL AND MANAGERIAL STRUCTURE	6
2.1.1 <i>Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report</i>	<i>6</i>
2.1.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>7</i>
2.1.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>7</i>
2.1.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2 KIKULETWA CATCHMENT FORUM (KCF)	7
2.2.1 <i>Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report</i>	<i>7</i>
2.2.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>8</i>
2.2.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>8</i>
2.2.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken.....</i>	<i>9</i>
2.3 IWRM PLANNING	9
2.3.1 <i>Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report</i>	<i>9</i>
2.3.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>10</i>
2.3.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>10</i>
2.3.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>11</i>
2.4 PILOT ACTIVITIES ON CLIMATE CHANGE ADAPTATION.....	11
2.4.1 <i>Summary of Issues.....</i>	<i>11</i>
2.4.2 <i>Recommendation.....</i>	<i>11</i>
2.4.3 <i>Management Response.....</i>	<i>12</i>
2.4.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>12</i>
2.5 PROJECT DURATION AND EXTENSION.....	12
2.5.1 <i>Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report</i>	<i>12</i>
2.5.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>12</i>
2.5.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>12</i>
2.5.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>12</i>
2.6 CONSOLIDATED PROJECT DOCUMENTS.....	13
2.6.1 <i>Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report</i>	<i>13</i>
2.6.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>13</i>
2.6.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>13</i>
2.6.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>13</i>
2.7 OTHER RECOMMENDATIONS.....	13
2.7.1 <i>Summary of Issues.....</i>	<i>13</i>
2.7.2 <i>Recommendation</i>	<i>14</i>
2.7.3 <i>Management Response</i>	<i>14</i>
2.7.4 <i>Management Actions to be undertaken</i>	<i>14</i>
3.0 LESSON LEARNING	15
3.1 SUMMARY OF LESSONS LEANT	15
3.2 MANAGEMENT RESPONSE.....	15
3.3 MANAGEMENT ACTIONS TO BE UNDERTAKEN	15
ANNEX 1: PANGANI BASIN IWRM PLANNING REFERENCE GROUP (RG).....	16
1. MANDATE	16
2. MEMBERS.....	16
3. ACCOUNTABILITY AND APPOINTMENT	16

4.	MEETINGS OF THE RG	16
5.	SECRETARIAT.....	17
6.	TENURE.....	17
7.	TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR RG.....	17



ACRONYMS

BWO	Basin Water Officer
CDO	Community Development officer
EU	European Union
IUCN	International Union for Conservation and Nature
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
KCF	Kikuletwa Catchment Forum
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PBWO	Pangani Basin Water Office
PC	Project Coordinator
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRBMP	Pangani River Basin Management Project
PU	Project Unit
RG	Reference Group
RT	Review Team
SCFT	Sub-Catchment Facilitation Team
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
WSDP	Water Sector Development Program
WUA	Water User Association

1.0 Management Response-Mid Term Review

1.1 Introduction

In September 2008, IUCN with project Partners; PBWO, SNV and PAMOJA Trust, commissioned a Mid-Term Review of the Pangani River Basin Project. The review was carried out by a Consultant from Nordic Consulting Group Norway and an IWRM Expert from the Ministry of Water and Irrigation in Dar es Salaam. This document is a Management Response to the recommendations by the Reviewers.

The aim of the Mid-Term Review was to assess if the Project was “on track” and come up with recommendations for further implementation and advice on improvements of the Project, if required.

The scope of the review included assessment of the appropriateness of the project design, including the LFA elements, progress review of planned activities, review of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and impact. The institutional and technical sustainability of the project was also reviewed.

On 14th November 2008, project Partners PBWO, IUCN, SNV and PAMOJA Trust, met at PBWO to review the findings and recommendations of the Review Team. All Partners appreciated the contributions of the Review Team (RT) and noted that the review report highlighted a number of issues, observations and analyses that Partners agreed with. The Partners discussed the recommendations and jointly developed the main elements of the Management Response to the recommendations.

2.0 Issues, Recommendations and Management Response

2.1 Organisational and Managerial Structure

2.1.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

The sustainability of the project is at risk as the project is perceived as an IUCN project amongst the PBWO staff rather than the PBWO's project. There is lack of proper ownership of the project interventions. The PRBM Project should organisationally and institutionally be placed under the Basin Water Officer (BWO). The Project Management Unit (PMU) should only be a “project unit” in the PBWO's organisation on equal terms with other similar units coming onboard later. Further, matters pertaining to the daily implementation of the project activities, the project planning and internal monitoring, the use of human and other resources to the benefit of the Project, etc. should to a larger extent take place *within* the PBWO. There should be increased active communication between the Project Coordinator and the BWO on “professional” project aspects, while communication between IUCN and the Project (Management) Unit on “internal IUCN administrative matters” (staffing, accounting, etc.) must continue as before. One CDO should be seconded full-time to the Project from the BWO, and a letter in this respect should be issued to avoid misunderstandings.

2.1.2 Recommendation

The PMU should be more integrated into the PBWO in order to create ownership to the project activities and secure sustainability. More technical communication should go between IUCN Nairobi and the Basin Water Officer. The CDO should be fulltime seconded to the Project.

2.1.3 Management Response

The PBWO and IUCN feel that it is NOT true that the PMU is not integrated in the PBWO and is perceived as an IUCN project rather than the PBWO's project. The Basin Water Officer (BWO) emphasises that the PMU has dual reporting lines and is answerable to both PBWO and IUCN-Nairobi. In addition, the PMU is dual appraised by both the PBWO and IUCN-Nairobi. Further, the project activities under PRBMP are delegated to PMU Project Coordinator by PBWO. The Project Coordinator acts on behalf and at the direction of the PBWO. Correspondences from Nairobi to PMU on technical guidance and administrative issues are copied to PBWO. Further, all important decisions regarding the project are taken in consultation with Partners. However, the PBWO highlighted that there is scope for improvement on certain aspects of programme management such as clarifying the details regarding the MOU between IUCN and SNV.

The Partners nevertheless acknowledge that there is scope for continuous improvement in strengthening integration and agree with the need to second the Community Development Officer (CDO) from the PBWO to the Project. The Partners further agree to explore the possibility of involving more staff from the PBWO in project activities.

The PBWO wishes to highlight that the organisational structure of the PBWO is yet to be finalised and there are plans to create a unit to deal with projects within the PBWO. Once this has been done, the PMU will be 'physically' integrated within the unit.

2.1.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. The Partners will pursue efforts to involve more staff from PBWO in the project to further strengthen ownership*
- ii. The PBWO CDO will be seconded full time to project and a letter will be issued*
- iii. Once the PBWO has set up a unit for projects in its organisational structure, the PRMP PMU will be integrated physically into the unit*

2.2 Kikuletwa Catchment Forum (KCF)

2.2.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

The Kikuletwa Catchment Forum (KCF) establishment has slowed down and seems to have come into some "backwaters". Grips must be taken to get the process back on track. The Kikuletwa has four identified sub-catchments and this should be reflected in the approach of the Project. In order to gain some momentum and re-

vitalise the forum establishment process, the interaction and awareness raising activities amongst stakeholders should be instigated in all four sub-catchments. A Core Team should be established to push and run the process, and be responsible for the outputs. This Core Team should comprise full-time seconded staff, one CDO from the PBWO and one SNV representative.

2.2.2 Recommendation

The design and establishment of the Kikuletwa Catchment Forum (KCF) must be significantly boosted and approached as follows:

- i. A Core Team of SNV and the CDO should be formed, with increased exposure and support from external advisors with extensive experience (e.g. from the Rufiji Basin)*
- ii. Set up facilitation Teams (FTs) comprising staff from various institutions*
- iii. The project activities should start in the four Sub-Catchments of Kikuletwa, where Sub-Catchment Forums (SCFs) should be established (starting with one to try the methodology out first), later forming the larger KCF*
- iv. The NGOs PAMOJA and TIP will coach, and participate in, the SCFTs*
- v. Low-cost Sub-Catchment Committees should be selected by the SCFs, acting as forum secretariats*
- vi. The Reference Group (RG) should comprise a maximum of six handpicked individual experts, covering various professional topics (district policies; institutional development; stakeholder participation; IWRM processes; irrigation efficiency; and the BWO from Rufiji). The RG should work as a "Steering Committee" to the Core Team*
- vii. In practical terms the Project should not start in all four simultaneously from Day 1, but rather start in one sub-catchment and gain some experience there before embarking on the other three, say after some few months.*
- viii. Once the Sub-Catchment Forums (SCFs) are established and operational, the larger Kikuletwa Catchment Forum (KCF) should be formed in the future.*

2.2.3 Management Response

The Partners agree with the observation that the Kikuletwa Catchment Forum establishment process has slowed down and lost momentum. The Partners also appreciate efforts by the review team to redesign the approach to make it more practical.

The PBWO will second a CDO full time to be part of the Core Team. However, as a matter of institutional global policy, SNV can not second staff to other projects on a full time basis, as the institution moved away from this approach due to problems associated with sustainability of results. SNV nevertheless agrees to explore measures to ensure that the KCF focal person, recruited already in SNV for this process, is fully dedicated and available to the KCF establishment process. No other assignments from within SNV will be given to the KCF focal person to ensure that he fully focuses on the project.

The Reference Group will be established but expanded to cater for the entire Pangani Basin project with broader mandate. This is to avoid creating Reference Groups each time the PBWO wants to establish sub-catchment forums. The mandate of the Reference Group will also be expanded to provide additional advisory services on the IWRM planning process (Annex 1). The composition will be a mixture of individual experts and sector institutional representation to ensure sustainability and institutionalisation of the process and also to benefit from individual technical expertise. Sector representation will enhance integration sector plans in the IWRM Plan and enhance ownership.

Engagement of TIP will be explored but will be preceded by a capacity assessment to ensure that TIP and any other potential partner have the capacity to carry out the required assignment.

Overall, the Partners accept the 'new' design of the Road Map by the RT and adopt the road map with some modifications as described above.

2.2.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. Work to start in all four sub-catchments instead of one to fast track process*
- ii. Action plan to be developed based on new road Map*
- iii. Reference Group to be established to cater for the whole basin and expanded to help with other project result areas, see Annex 1 for draft TORs developed*
- iv. Engagement of TIP (and other potential Partners) to be explored and possibly engaged as need arises*

2.3 IWRM Planning

2.3.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

IWRM Planning is a very resource-demanding, time-consuming and comprehensive exercise, where experts having that experience from elsewhere must be taken on-board. The RT is not convinced that there are sufficient resources under the Project to pull the plan preparation through; and neither is the RT comforted as to the available human resources in the PWBO/Project to undertake this exercise. The activity plan presented in the Project does not give enough details to highlight the elements of such planning and does not reflect the required knowledge of such processes. Ground water assessment has not been included and it is necessary that the IWRM planning process incorporates this in the planning process. The RT believes that there are not enough funds to undertake the IWRM plan to the required level of detail and standard. The Project might therefore be in an awkward position where some activities have to be given priority before others. The opinion of the RT is that the IWRM plan preparations could be taken on board through the Water Sector Development Programme (WSDP) later on.

2.3.2 Recommendation

The IWRM planning process requires comprehensive expertise to be involved at the required level, and e.g. groundwater assessment is lacking today. In case additional funds will not be available, the RT recommends that funds are reallocated from Result 4 (IWRM Planning) to the KCF development. The IWRM planning could be incorporated later in the Water Sector Development Programme, where funds for such activities will be available.

2.3.3 Management Response

The Partners agree with the Review Team's observation that IWRM Planning is a very resource demanding and time consuming exercise. Viewed in isolation, the Partners agree that the budget for Result 4 (as specified) is not enough on its own to undertake a comprehensive IWRM planning process. However, Sub-result 4 is not a stand alone activity and is linked to the other Result Areas. Most of the background information required for IWRM planning has already been undertaken and reports are available. Result 1 on flow assessment for instance has generated information on surface water resources assessment, water quality and river health, socio economics, etc. Further, information on policy and institutional analysis is also available and this would easily be updated with less financial resources.

Overall, the IWRM Planning process would not be starting from scratch (under Result 4) but rather build on earlier water resources studies undertaken in the basin and also on information generated from other Result Areas.

The recommendation that funds are reallocated from Result 4 on IWRM Planning to the Kikuletwa Forum development in Result 2 is not substantiated with costing or budget analysis. About USD 700,000 is allocated to supporting the training of Water User Associations (WUA) and development of the KCF. We are concerned that the KCF is a relatively small area and if we develop a very cost and labor intensive process there, it will not be replicable or serve as a demonstration model.

The recommendation to source additional funds from the WSDP to support IWRM Planning in the Pangani Basin is noted and appreciated. However, Partners feel that this should not be at the expense of on-going planned activities for the development of an IWRM Plan for the Pangani River Basin. The PBWO will source WSDP funds to support the development of an IWRM Plan for the entire Pangani Basin including three other sub-basins outside the Pangani River Basin. The Partners feel that in addition to an IWRM Plan for the entire Basin, IWRM Sub-Basin implementation Plans will have to be prepared for each sub-basin (Umba, Zigi, Msangazi and Pangani River)

The Partners thus decided that the IWRM Planning for the Pangani River Basin should proceed as planned and this will constitute the IWRM sub-basin implementation Plan for the Pangani River Basin. The Pangani River Basin Plan will be developed for a shorter time frame (5 years), as a rolling implementation Plan to be updated every five years.

When development of an IWRM Plan commences, with WSDP support, a comprehensive IWRM Plan will be developed for the entire basin with a planning horizon coinciding with the national long term vision. At the same time, 5 year rolling implementation IWRM Sub-basin Plans will be developed for the other 3 sub-basins outside the Pangani River Basin.

The Partners feel that this approach will accord the PBWO with a medium term IWRM planning instrument to provide a framework for dealing with immediate challenges in the Basin. No planning instrument currently exists.

It is also recognized that prioritization is a key aspect of an IWRM plan and as such, any relevant studies that are urgent will be prioritized in the Pangani River Basin IWRM Plan and carried out as part of the IWRM Plan development process for the entire Pangani Basin.

The Partners do recognize that this approach needs to be carefully managed and coordinated to avoid duplication and as such have agreed to set up one process management structure for the whole basin that will manage development of the entire Basin IWRM plan and the sub-basin IWRM Implementation Plan.

2.3.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. Result 4 on IWRM planning to continue as planned since there is already background information that has been generated on the Pangani River Basin earlier studies
- ii. *The Partners will undertake a detailed budget analysis for the Kikuletwa Catchment Forum establishment process, though an estimated USD 700,000 is already allocated to KCF from various result areas. Preliminary budget estimates so far indicate that it is not expected that the KCF will need any more additional funds above USD 700,000*

2.4 Pilot Activities on Climate Change Adaptation

2.4.1 Summary of Issues

At present, the practical interventions at grassroots level are ongoing in three sites: Soko, Ruvu and Hingilili, being far outside and away from the Kikuletwa Catchment. Whereas the RT appreciates that the history of Partners' interventions led to these areas being chosen, it is now suggested to concentrate all efforts in the Kikuletwa Catchment, at the same time as completing the mentioned ongoing activities. All new practical grassroots interventions should clearly be concentrated within the Kikuletwa Catchment, in order to gain a synergy from various activities under the Project.

2.4.2 Recommendation

The pilot interventions on climate adaptation measures should be undertaken in the Kikuletwa Catchment in order to gain synergy of the efforts in the area and show tangible results

2.4.3 Management Response

The Partners agree that there should be activities in the Kikuletwa Catchment in order to create synergies in the SCF establishment. However we feel it is inappropriate not to cooperate in future with good Partners in other catchments with whom we have created and fostered good working relations. This would tarnish the projects reputation as a reliable partner.

2.4.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. Synergy to be pursued in interventions on climate adaptation in KSC but not only limited to the KCF.*

2.5 Project Duration and Extension

2.5.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

Formally, the support from UNDP is projected to end in August 2010, and support from EU should end in October 2009. In addition, IUCN has granted an additional operational support of the PMU for an additional 6 months as compared to the initial plan.

Assuming that these project activities can start fully in January 2009 the RT estimates that realistically, it would take between two and three years (establishment and operation of the SCFs and SCCs, and maybe designing the KCF and its mandate) to complete the process. This is up to two years beyond the end of the EU funds and up to 0.5 years extension of the UNDP/GEF funding.

2.5.2 Recommendation

The Project should be extended by 1-2 years, depending on the available funds, to gain momentum of the forum establishment in the Kikuletwa Sub-Catchment.

2.5.3 Management Response

The Partners agree with the RT's observation that the project activities are delayed and additional time is required. The Partners subscribe to the recommendation and will convene a re-planning workshop to reschedule the current work plan and incorporate activities for the establishment of the KCF. Based on the revised work plan, the Partners will submit a request for a No-Cost Extension to the EU and UNDP/GEF.

2.5.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. Convene planning workshop to re-plan the project activities for all results areas*
- ii. Based on the new work plan, the Partners will determine the exact time frame required for extension and additional financial resources*
- iii. A request for No-Cost Extension will be submitted to funding agencies once the exact time-frames required to implement rescheduled activities have been established*

2.6 Consolidated Project Documents

2.6.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

The Project has evolved from simple studies funded by IUCN WANI into a larger programme where other funding institutions came onboard. The steering documents today comprise mainly the project documents of the EU and UNDP/GEF. In addition to the MOU between IUCN and PBWO, and the RT has raised a need for the steering documents to be merged into one, giving the present road map of the Project. There is need to prepare a consolidated Project Document (PD), taking the changes onboard. Without such a document, it will be almost impossible for outsiders (auditors, reviewers, evaluators) to get an overview of the Project and its activities and it will be very difficult for the project staff to use any single document as the reference for their work.

2.6.2 Recommendation

A single aggregated and merged Project Document should be prepared to ease project overview and internal project monitoring

2.6.3 Management Response

The Partners agree with the RT's observation that the project has evolved from simple studies to a larger programme where other funding institutions came onboard. The need to have a consolidated document is therefore imperative. However, the Partners feel that the merged log-frame should be the basis for developing such a document. The Project Implementation Manual (PIM) though in draft form provides most of the information but has proved to be too detailed and the Partners would want to avoid this. The merged log-frame will be the basis for developing the Project Document and associated agreements and contracts appended.

2.6.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

Narrative text will be developed based on the current merged log-frame. The final document will form the Project Document

2.7 Other Recommendations

2.7.1 Summary of Issues Excerpted from the Review Report

a. Annual Planning

The Annual Plans are merely EXCEL sheets that can only be read on the PC screen without the reader being disoriented. It is recommended that the EXCEL format is simplified so that the printouts can be read easily with explanatory notes explaining

the details under the tables and an accompanying narrative text to elaborate on the next year's activities.

b. Project Reporting

The Annual Progress Reports should follow the same set-up as the Annual Plans, so it is easy to follow the activities and expenditures through.

c. Document Handling and Filing

Lack of reference information (date, author, institution, name of document, etc.) in the documents. There is need to make sure that every document has, either in the header or footer, information on every document page, which can identify who prepared the document and when it was submitted.

2.7.2 Recommendation

- i. Annual plans should be more elaborate and comply with the reporting formats.*
- ii. All pages in all documents must have date, author, institution and document name in header/footer*

2.7.3 Management Response

The Partners agree with the RT's observations on the need for Annual plans to be more elaborate and comply with the reporting formats. The need for all pages in all documents to have date, author, institution and document name in header/footer is also appreciated and acceptable. On the annual plans and reporting formats, attempts will be made to harmonise the planning documents and reporting formats. The Partners are discussed the possibility of recruiting someone to sort and archive documentation related to the project in the Pangani Basin.

2.7.4 Management Actions to be undertaken

- i. Future documents will have date, author, institution and document name in header/footer*
- ii. Standard Annual and progress reporting formats to be developed*
- iii. Old project documents and reports to be archived and stored in a systematic and chronological order for ease of reference*

3.0 Lesson Learning

3.1 Summary of Lessons Leant Excerpted from the Review Report

- *The managerial structure must be revisited (and if required – revised) when projects are becoming more comprehensive with time.*
- *Project management must be integrated into the local administrative structure, to secure ownership and sustainability. Project management should be delegated and decentralised to the extent possible.*
- *Document codes (“keys”) for easy reference should be established at the start-up of any project.*
- *Project annual planning and reporting must follow identical templates and set-ups (tables and narrative text).*
- *Important lessons learned from the Project will have to be internalized and mainstreamed into the basin management system.*
- *Sustainable financing of activities post- project should be instigated early, as this is critical for database updating, review of EFA and scenarios, and hence contribute to the basin IWRM plans.*

3.2 Management Response

The Partners agree with the lessons learned as outlined by the RT. The managerial structure is constantly being updated to respond to new project requirements, e.g. the establishment of the Project Steering Committee and the planned Reference Group for the project. The Partners recognise the importance of documenting and sharing lessons. This is an on-going process. The Partners also acknowledge the need to internalize and mainstream important lessons learned from the Project. To ensure continuous learning and cultivation of lessons, a Monitoring and Evaluation (M & E) system is being finalised and will be implemented for the project.

3.3 Management Actions to be undertaken

- Finalise and implement M & E system*

Annex 1: PANGANI BASIN IWRM PLANNING REFERENCE GROUP (RG)

Draft Version1 developed during Partners meeting on 14/11/2008

1. Mandate

The RG will be established by the Pangani Basin Water Board, a body established through the National Water Policy. The RG thus draws its mandate from the National Water Policy through the Pangani Basin Water Board.

The mandate of the RG is to provide guidance on the IWRM Planning process, facilitate the integration of sector plans in the IWRM plan and guide the establishment of water user basin forums in the Pangani basin.

2. Members

13-person multi stakeholder group representing the following interest and community based groups:

1. *Pangani Basin Water Board representative (Chair person)*
2. *Local govt (DED)*
3. *Agriculture & Land use (agriculture expert)*
4. *Irrigation*
5. *Energy*
6. *Water utilities at district level*
7. *Water utilities at urban level*
8. *Natural resources & environment*
9. *Cooperatives*
10. *Community development- Tengeru-social work institution (ministry of social work) (stakeholder participatory process)*
11. *Livestock*
12. *Institutional design, development with experience of national water strategies*
13. *PBWO-Secretary*

3. Accountability and Appointment

Members of the RG shall be appointed by the Pangani Basin Water Board. Membership shall be based in institutional representation to ensure sustainability of the process. The Pangani Water Board shall also appoint individuals based on their expertise, experience and specific skills that will be identified as essential for the process.

The RG will be accountable to the Pangani Basin Water Board. The RG may appoint subcommittee from the stakeholders to tackle a number of issues to help meet its objectives.

4. Meetings of the RG

The RG shall meet on a quarterly basis in the first year. In subsequent years, the RG shall meet twice per year subject to availability of funds.

5. Secretariat¹

The Pangani Basin Water Office shall be the Secretariat to the RG.

6. Tenure

The RG tenure shall be 2 years renewable based on relevance as determined by the Pangani Basin Water Board

7. Terms of Reference for RG

Facilitate

1. *Facilitate the integration of regional and sector development plans in the IWRM Plan and IWRM sub-basin plans*
2. *Facilitate the institutionalization of the IWRM planning process in their respective institutions*

Advise

3. *Advise the secretariat on process for engagement of stakeholders and government agencies*
4. *Provide advice on the process of establishing water user associations at basin and sub-basin level such as the Kikuletwa sub-catchment forum*
5. *Provide advice on the proposed work-plans, schedule of activities and budgets of the different components of the IWRM planning process*

Guidance

6. *To provide guidance on the development of IWRM plan for the Pangani Basin and Sub-basin plans for Zigi River, Uмба River, Pangani River, Msangazi River*

Communication

7. *Receive and consider reports from secretariat and ensure that the Basin Water Board is kept informed and aware of the process*

In fulfilling its objectives, the RG may (with facilitation from the secretariat) establish sub-committees, and/or task forces to assist in meeting specific objectives as may be necessary.

¹*With support from IUCN and other partners as may be necessary*