



Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Hybrid Public Meeting Venue: Dolphin's Leap Conference Centre, Gqeberha and Zoom (Online) 21 April 2022

Chairperson(s): Ms. Ndileka Mohapi (DWS)

Agenda: Annexure I

Attendance List: Annexure II

Powerpoint Presentations: Provided with meeting minutes

Abbreviations:

BHN - Basic Human Needs

COGTA - Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs

DWS - Department of Water and Sanitation

DFFE - Department of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment

EWR - Ecological Water Requirements

GW - Ground Water

NMBMM - Nelson Mandela Bay Metropolitan Municipality
NMMU - Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

RQOs - Resource Quality Objectives

RU - Resource Units

SDF - Spatial Development Framework

UFH - University of Fort Hare
WRC - Water Research Commission

WSU - Walter Sisulu University

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
Welcome and introduction	The Chair, Ms. Ndileka Mohapi (DWS) welcomed all attendees and opened The Keiskamma and Fish To Tsitsikamma Catchment Water Resource Classes, Reserve And RQOs Determination Public Meeting. All participants introduced themselves.	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
Attendance and apologies	Apologies were noted for the following: - Mr. Ferreirs Cobus (DWS) - Ms. Jackie Jay (DFFE) - Dr. Bonani Madikizela (WRC) - Mr. Martin Labuschagne (DWS) - Mr. Matthew Hill (NMBMM)	
Approval and additions to the agenda	The move for the adoption agenda was by Ms Yolokazi Galada (DFFE) and this was seconded by Ms Ncamile Dweni (DWS)	
Purpose of the meeting and stakeholder involvement	The purpose of the meeting and the importance of the stakeholder involvement was outlined by the Chair, Ms. Mohapi. She noted that involving stakeholders in this particular study will assist in getting valuable insight and updated information and inputs. Ms. Mohapi further requested that the stakeholders participate in the meeting and provide inputs in any reports and documents that are released for comment in the study. This is to ensure that the study's output correctly reflect the situation on the ground.	
Presentation by the Department of Water and Sanitation Mr. Lawrence Mulangaphuma (DWS) presented on background of the study. [Power point presentation is available online https://www.dws.gov.za/RDM/WRCS/default.aspx provided with the meeting minutes]. In his presentation, Mr. Mulangaphuma highlighted catchments that will be included in the study as well as steps that would be followed and outcomes that are experienced in the study.		
	Comments and Questions:	Responses:

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	A representative from the Gamtoos Irrigation Board asked if the aspect of groundwater will have the same amount of attention given to it in the classification as will be given to the surface water component.	It was noted that the question posed may be answered at a later stage during the presentation from GroundTruth.
Presentation by Groundtruth: study introduction and approach, study deliverables/ results to date and next steps	Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) presented on the study introduction and approach, study deliverables/ results to date and the next steps. [Power point presentation is available online at https://www.dws.gov.za/RDM/WRCS/default.aspx and provided with the meeting minutes].	
	Comments and Questions:	Responses:
	Ms_Farrell (GroundTruth) thanked the stakeholders for their engagement and questions raised. She highlighted that many of the issues and questions raised are addressed in the study reports to date, and that it was not possible to go into all this issues in this level of detail in the presentations due to the time constraints. She therefore encouraged stakeholders to also review and comment on the reports available online on the DWS website. Specific responses were also provided to the following issues and questions raised at the meeting:	
Surface Water:	A representative from the Gamtoos Irrigation Board asked what impacts are being considered for surface water. He further questioned if alien clearing (particularly the invasive black wattle) is included in the impacts that are being considered along with other impacts such as agricultural, social etc. He noted that the clearing of alien invasives can have a big and positive impact on the water table in the catchment (e.g. in the Kouga River).	Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) confirmed that the impacts of clearing of invasive alien species will be taken into consideration during the study. It was further noted that the impacts of the invasive species have been stated in the Inception Report.

D	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED	
	Mr. Kunene (DWS) noted that the presentation did not include industrial uses and impacts	Ms. Stassen (GroundTruth) confirmed that that the report gives, in more detail, the different types of impacts which also includes the industrial uses and impacts, agriculture uses, domestic uses etc.	
is m kr al pl ar pr gc ar in). Dr. Williams (former ECCOGTA) noted that the catchment is under the governance and management of the nunicipalities and the departments and so it is important to now what the Spatial Development Frameworks (SDFs) say bout the future use of water and forms of development lanned in the areas as the SDFs guide what is being done not how it links to what is being planned for the areas. He roposed that it is also critical that the municipalities, other overnment departments and the political actors are involved and considered in the process of the study and that the information in the SDFs is taken into consideration. O Mr. Coetzer (Conservation Outcomes) noted that: O Unregulated and unlawful use of the water resources also has a major negative impact (he made an example of the Kabeljous Catchment) especially on catchments that are not fully understood. O Alignment with other development plans and resource-use plans (provincial, municipal, management plans etc.) is important to ensure that resource use, planning and management is optimal.	Ms Mohapi (DWS) noted and agreed that it is important that the other departments and municipalities are involved in the study and contribute to the study. It was further noted that municipalities were invited to the meeting, however, there will be a follow up on the non-attendance by the municipalities.	
M	As. Galada (DFFE) noted the following: The biodiversity management plan outlines the pressures placed on the systems and should be included in the study Action: Ms Farrell to request the biodiversity management plan from Ms Galada (DFFE) She also requested clarification on how the key findings of the conservation strategy and	Ms. Mohapi (DWS) noted that other plans and water use management plans are being taken into consideration by the study. She further noted that the reconciliation studies reflect and reconcile the changes in the water use and water availability in a particular area as it is understood that changes and key stakeholders and development plans of an area change often.	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	reconciliation studies would be incorporated into this current study O A key stakeholder is the department of mining and mineral resources and a representative is needed in this study.	Mrs Farrell further noted that the biological perspective of the study (protection of the ecology of the catchment) is also dependent on the reconciliation studies.
Wetlands, Groundwater and Estuaries:	Dr. Lemley (NMMU) noted that it is important for the study to include surveys of estuaries as they are some of the province's most pristine systems.	a). Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that estuaries will be included in the study and that there is a system to prioritise these systems (e.g. particular estuaries) and identify the level of detail (i.e. intermediate) whereby those will be assessed and have RQOs set for them. b) Ms Forbes (Marine & Estuarine Research) responded and agreed with the response above. She noted that estuarine surveys will be done and certain systems will be prioritised for more detailed studies.
	A comment was posted by Mr. Kunene (DWS) that encouraged the study to consider the Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Study: Mzimvubu Tsitsikamma WMA 7 completed in 2019. It takes into cognisance climate change impact which will have dire consequences for ecological infrastructure. Therefore, that component is quite important. This speaks to all components of the hydrological cycle and responses as well or even receiving environment	Ms Stassen (GroundTruth) responded to the comment on the Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment Study and noted that the project team members working on the planning and water resource models are looking into the climate change aspect and have considered the latest climate change information. She further noted that the study will ensure to continue to take climate change into consideration and include all relevant studies.
	Dr. Williams noted that one other important stakeholder that needs to be engaged is the house of traditional leaders.	Ms Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the traditional authorities were being represented at the meeting by Mr. Fumani Khoza (DWS) who would relay the information discussed at the meeting to the traditional authorities and revert back to the project team with any questions/queries from the traditional leaders.

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	Ms. Galada (DFFE) requested clarity on a statement that she understood to be that some systems will not be prioritized based on biodiversity importance. She requested clarity on the criteria that will be used for the prioritization of the systems. Ms. Galada further added that there may be other stakeholders in pressurised systems that would be important in participating in the study e.g. the mining sector and the public/society.	Ms. Forbes (Marine & Estuarine Research) responded by clarifying that there are a number of estuaries in very good condition and noted that biodiversity is one of the considerations in the prioritization process and pressure is the other criteria that will be used to prioritize. She further elaborated on the prioritization and classification criteria that will be used in the study citing biodiversity as the first consideration of the criteria along with the functional significance of the estuary, Marine Protected Areas (MPA) linkages, protected area status and pressures of the system as other factors considered when prioritising.
	Mr. Nomquphu (WRC) posed a question on the groundwater issue and noted that this issue varies widely but the presentation did not mention to what extent it varies. He also requested clarity on whether there has been an indication of the extent and manner in which major groundwater aquifers in the study area interact with the surface water.	Mr. Rose (JG Afrika) responded and noted that aquifer systems are currently being identified. Areas are still being identified and assessments have not as yet being done or initiated. More detail on the interactions can be shared once the systems have been identified and assessments have been conducted.
Information Review and Gaps:	Ms. Mohapi (DWS) noted that monitoring data is necessary and needed for the study (recordings, gauging stations etc.) in order to have correct reports and robust studies as well as to close any information gaps.	
	Dr Williams commented and noted that it is critical for a data and information bank or observatory to be developed. This bank will allow other agencies and multiple organisations to access information and collaborate on information. Dr. Williams also asked if the historic studies that were done bring about the value that they are set out to bring to the current study i.e. were the studies useful or not.	Ms. Forbes (Marine & Estuarine Research) responded to Dr. Williams and noted there is a lot of information and data that the project team and project specialists engaged and noted even though much of the information was valuable, some of it was outdated, thus bringing about the need to conduct surveys when prioritising the systems.

DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	Ms Farrell (GroundTruth) supported the statement and noted that the public meetings and engagements with stakeholders are important for the data collection and verification processes.
Mr. Maneli (DWS) commented and noted that a lot of data is available through the relevant offices and departments. This data dates back a few years. Mr. Maneli also noted that capacity issues may have hindered some data collection processes in the past but more recently, more data has become available. Mr. Maneli further encouraged to expand the study to NMMU, UFH and WSU who may have relevant data sources along with DEDEA who has done work on wetlands on the coastal side.	Ms. Mohapi (DWS) responded and added to the comment by Mr. Maneli and noted that all who apply for water use licences are required to report on a regular basis and this allows for information to be collected, stored and used for studies such as the current study.
Dr. Lemley (NMMU) posed a question on the river components issues and asked on how these issues will be compensated for from a hydrology point of view.	Ms Farrell (GroundTruth) noted that the project team includes hydrology specialists. Ms Stassen added to the comment and noted that modelled data will be used where observed data is not available.
Ms. Galada (DFFE) asked that in terms of the new emerging issues and parameters that are not included in monitoring programmes of departments e.g. DWS, will there be an opportunity to investigate these (e.g. pharmaceuticals).	Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded to Ms Galada's question and noted that water use licences would come into play at this point as industries would need to apply for these licenses and include the relevant parameters. There is a gap with certain parameters but where this gap exists then the study can target and focus on those gaps in its monitoring processes.
A request was received from a representative of the Gamtoos Irrigation Board on the general outputs, deliverables and outcomes from this study which will give valuable information with indicator outputs etc. He noted that it may be valuable to have a table that summarizes the outputs, indicators and results.	Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the deliverables and reports (Inception, Gap Analysis) provide that information.

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	Ms. Galoshe (DWS) commented on the DWS River Health Monitoring programme and emphasised that there is River Health Monitoring data available through the Department and that it is mostly macro-invertebrates reports and geomorphology surveys that are available.	Reports will be published on the DWS website and an overall summary Report will also be published on the website at the end of the project.
	There was a request for clarification on the training and capacity development component and the implementation plans of the RDM.	 a) Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the capacity development would be between DWS and the consultants. During workshops, members of DWS that are interested in the different water systems or the approaches will be invited for learning and knowledge and experience exchanges and also allowing the project team to gain valuable knowledge and share their catchment knowledge and experiences, thus building capacity. A report will be put together on the capacity development with inputs from the department on lessons learned etc. at the end of the project. b) Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded to the second part of the question on the implementation plans for the RDM and noted that once the RQOs for each prioritised RU are set, an implementation plan will be compiled to support the Department.
Final comments.	Man Mark and (DMC) and a patient of the second of the seco	
Final comments:	Ms. Mohapi (DWS) urged participants to communicate with the project management team should they wish to be a part of the different workshops conducted for the various components of the project.	
	It was proposed that perhaps in the 2nd phase of the project, additional areas be added as part of the study area (e.g. former	Ms. Mohapi noted that consideration must be made to have some of the meetings in inland areas.

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
	Transkei and central karoo - Queenstown, Middleburg etcareas) especially when making decisions on where to host the public meeting due to the vastness and size of the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma catchment areas. This is to ensure that no stakeholders are left out of the stakeholder engagement process due to logistical difficulties in getting to the meeting venues.	
	Furthermore, it was noted that considerations must be made for the language used in the different areas in which the stakeholder engagement and public meetings are conducted i.e. take into account the stakeholders who may not have English as their primary language and may require some form of interpretation during the meetings.	Ms. Mohapi responded and noted that the stakeholders in attendance are to play an important role in relaying information (in the appropriate language) to those stakeholders who are not in attendance and may not be English-speaking stakeholders. Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) also noted that the stakeholder specialist team are able to assist in translating and interpreting in the native language to the non-English speaking stakeholders.
Way forward	 Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) noted the following on the way forward: There are opportunities for stakeholders to comment on the Integrated Units of Analysis (IUA) Report. This will be distributed, and stakeholders will have 2 weeks to comment and return comments— deadline for this is 6 May 2022. A form to nominate PSC members will be circulated via email to the stakeholders. Regional stakeholders must relay information on the study at their forums and if presentations are needed to relay the information and provide progress of the study, the project team must be informed and these presentations will be given at the forums. The outcome of the study will be communicated at the second round of stakeholder engagement meetings. 	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES TO ISSUES DISCUSSED
Closure	The Chair, Ms. Mohapi thanked all attendees and closed the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Water Resource	
	Classes, Reserve And RQOs Determination Public Meeting	

Annexure I: AGENDA



Determination of water resource Classes, Reserve and Resource Quality Objectives (RQOs) for the water resources in the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma catchment (WP11354)

PUBLIC MEETING

Date	20 a	and 21 April 2022	
Venue	Neptune's Cove (Kei Mouth) and Dolphines Leap (Gqeberha)		
Virtual Zoom Meeting			
Time 09h00 for 9h30 to 13h00			
Chairperson Ms Ndileka Mohapi			
		AGENDA	
09h00	Registration		
09h30	1. WELCOME	AND INTRODUCTION	
09h40	2. ATTENDAN	NCE AND APOLOGIES	Ohi-
09h50	3. APPROVAL	AND ADDITIONS TO THE AGENDA	Chair
10h00	4. PURPOSE	OF THE MEETING AND STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	
10h10	5. PRESENTA	ATION BY THE DEPARTMENT	Mr Lawrence Mulangaphuma
10h30	6. PRESENTA	ATION BY GROUNDTRUTH: Study introduction and approach	GroundTruth
	Project backgi	round and objectives	
	Study area an	d impacts	
	General approach and methodology for the water resource Classes, Reserve and Resource Quality Objectives study		
11h00	Tea break		
11h15 7. PRESENTAT		ATION BY GROUNDTRUTH: Study deliverables/ results to date	GroundTruth
	Information re	view and gap analysis (rivers, wetlands, groundwater, estuaries)	
	Delineated Into	egrated Units of Analysis and prioritisation of Resource Units and level termination	
	Stakeholder d	iscussions, input, agreement	
12h15	8. PRESENTATION BY GROUNDTRUTH: Next steps Groundstate Groundst		GroundTruth
	In-field surveys (rivers, estuaries, wetlands and groundwater)		
		tuaries: Eco-classification, Ecological Water Requirements (EWR) and identify and evaluate ecological consequences of scenarios	
12h15	8. PRESENTA	TION BY GROUNDTRUTH: Next steps continued	GroundTruth
	Wetlands: Ass	ressments and conditions	
	Groundwater:	Assessments, quantification and requirements	
	Socio-econom	ics	
	Determine was scenarios	ter resource classes based on catchment configuration for the identified	
	Determine RQ	Os and provide implementation information	
	Continued state	keholder involvement	
	Second round	of stakeholder engagement meetings (Kei Mouth and Gqeberha)	
12h30	9. DISCUSSIO	ons	All
12h45			Ms Lebogang Matlala
13h00	11. CLOSURE Chair		

Background Information Document (BID): https://www.dws.gov.za/rdm/WRCS/default.aspx

Annexure II: ATTENDANCE LIST

PLEASE NOTE – personal information has been redacted from the attendance list below in line with the Protection of Personal Information Act No 4 of 2013, (POPIA), which came into effect on 1 July 2021.

Organisations in Attendance		
In Person	Virtual	
DWS	Nelson Mandela Bay Metro	
DWS	DWS	
DWS	Great Fish River Water Users Association	
Gamtoos Irrigation Board	DWS	
Gamtoos Irrigation Board	Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Gamtoos Irrigation Board	SANParks	
Retired (Former COGTA)	DWS	
DWS-Gqeberha	DWS	
DWS-Gqeberha	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environmental Affairs	
	Department of Agriculture, Land Reform and Rural	
DWS-Gqeberha	Development	
Conservation Outcomes	Natures Valley Trust	
DWS-Gqeberha	Amatole Water, East London	
ECSESS	DWS: National Water Resource Infrastructure	
DFFE	Da Gama Textiles in King Williams Town	
NMMU	Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme-Transkinira Trust	
DWS	DWS	
DWS	DWS:EC	
DWS	DWS	
DWS	JG Afrika	
DWS	DWS	
DWS-Gqeberha	DWS	
DWS-Gqeberha	Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality	
GroundTruth	DWS	
GroundTruth	DWS: Surface and Groundwater Information	
GroundTruth	Water Research Commission (WRC)	
GroundTruth	GroundTruth	
	Marine & Estuarine Research	