water & sanitation
Department:
Water and Sanitation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

GroundTruth
environment & engineering

WP11354
DETERMINATION OF WATER RESOURCE CLASSES, RESERVE AND RESOURCE QUALITY OBJECTIVES (RQOS) FOR THE WATER RESOURCES IN THE KEISKAMMA AND FISH TO TSITSIKAMMA CATCHMENT

TECHNICAL TASK GROUP MEETING: PROPOSED RESOURCE QUALITY OBJECTIVES

ORGANISATIONS FOR THE T CATCHMENT (Mthatha, Mbhashe and Pondoland)
Venue: Blue Lagoon Hotel and Conference Centre (East London)

02 June 2025

Chairperson(s): Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS)
Agenda: Annexure I
Attendance List: Annexure II
PowerPoint Presentations: Provided with meeting minutes and provided in link: https://www.dws.gov.za/wem/WRCS/kft.aspx

Abbreviations:

BAS	**-Best Attainable State**
DEDEAT	**- Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism**
DFFE	**- Department of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment**
DWS	**- Department of Water and Sanitation**
ECPTA	**- Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency**
EIA	**- Environmental Impact Assessment**
EMP	**- Estuarine management plans**
EWR	**- Ecological Water Requirements**
IUA	**- Integrated Unit of Analysis**
PES	**- Present Ecological State**
PMC	**- Project Management Committee**
PSC	**- Project Steering Committee**
REC	**-Recommended Ecological Category**
RQOs	**- Resource Quality Objectives**
SALGA	**-South African Local Government Association**
TEC	**- Target Ecological Category**
TPC	**- Thresholds of Potential Concern**

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
1. Welcome	The Chair, Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) welcomed all attendees and opened the first Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Catchment Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Technical Task Group Meeting.		
2. Attendance/Apologies	Attendees' details were noted in the attendance register. Apologies received for the meeting: - Pieter Viljoen (DWS) - Andrew Lucas (DWS) - Onesimo Notobela (Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment) - Mr Pieter Kruger (Baviaanskloof Western Farmers Association) - Monique Kuhn (Kempston Agri) - Duncan Shaw (GIBB Engineering and Architecture) - Dr. Mark Graham (GroundTruth) - Bulelwa Leni (Amatola Water)	The apologies were noted.	
3. Acceptance of Agenda/ Additions to Agenda	A request was made by the project team to amend the agenda to include the RQOs for the Q01 to Q03 IUAs	The amendment was accepted and the agenda was adopted with the requested additions.	
4. Purpose of the Technical Task Group Meeting	Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) outlined the purpose of the Technical Task Group Meeting. She highlighted that the project is now at the RQO determination phase for the RQOs that will eventually be gazetted. The RQOs are determined from the water resource classes that have been set in the catchment. She noted that the RQOs need to be monitored and complied by to ensure equitable access to resources and that the resources are used and managed sustainably. Ms. Matlala highlighted that the purpose of the technical task group meetings is to consult with the stakeholders as the users of the resources to ensure that the RQOs are determined, defined and		

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	gazetted correctly. Ms. Matlala further noted that the sustainable management and use of the water resource is the responsibility of all stakeholders. All stakeholders (government, municipality, farmers etc.) need to work together to ensure that all water resources are protected and used in a way that will ensure that future generations have access to it, and that all people have access to good quality, clean water.		
5. Technical presentation	Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth), Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika), Dr. Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) and Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth, presented on the results (draft RQOs) of the study in the Q, R and S catchments. [Power point presentation is available online at https://www.dws.gov.za/RDM/WRCS/kft.aspx and provided with the meeting minutes].		
5.1 Background, scope of study and study area	**Comments and Questions:** N/A	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** N/A	
5.2 Overview of Reserve, Classification and RQOs	**Comments and Questions:** 1. Mr Andrew Lucas (DWS) commented and noted that in setting a Reserve that is to meet basic human needs and ecological requirements, there are components such as the groundwater that have natural contaminants. He asked on how to address elevated salt/sulphates/metals levels in the groundwater in the case that those levels would deem the groundwater unsafe for consumption and would, therefore, not meet the basic human needs.	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** 1. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that groundwater can be variable as the geological conditions could elevate compounds such as chlorine, metals etc. He noted that this issue may be addressed through the monitoring process in the RQO development.	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	2. Ms Neliswa Piliso (DEDEAT) asked if the gazetting process is done for public comment or if it is done only to present the finalised RQOs and Reserve.	2. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the first round of gazetting is done to allow public comments for 60 working days. Thereafter, based on the comments received, revisions are made where possible and, where not possible, reasons are stated for no revisions being made. The final RQOs and Reserve are then gazetted.	
	3. Ms Neliswa Piliso (DEDEAT) asked how the local communities in the rural areas are reached to ensure that their comments on the water resources are taken into consideration for the gazetting process or if it would be a matter of presenting the final RQOs and Reserves once the gazetting process has been concluded. She further asked how to address issues of flows in areas that would experience drought.	3. Ms. Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that there is a comprehensive stakeholder engagement plan that the project employs. The study includes stakeholder/public meetings in the beginning with the regional stakeholder liaison being tasked with reaching out to the communities and ensuring the presence of community representatives. The stakeholders were informed of the process of appointing a project steering committee (PSC) that includes representatives of different stakeholder groups. The PSC members representing the communities are expected to communicate the study proceedings back to the communities. Further to this, there are forum meetings at the regional level which also assist with communicating the proceedings of the study back to the communities. The final product is then presented back to the stakeholders/communities in another public meeting at the end of the project.	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
		Ms Matlala also noted that it is not only climate change that causes reduced flows into the estuaries, however, water that is being used or taken upstream would also contribute to the low flows. It is through monitoring that such trends and issues can be picked up, hence, compliance is important. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that flows would be set in areas that will experience drought. A climate change assessment was done as part of the study, and those systems that would be affected by the droughts were identified. Ms Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) also commented and noted that the climate change assessments focused on the Algoa system and detailed modelling was done for the area to see if the EWR and human needs would be met should climate change be experienced.	
	4. Mr Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) Asked how often the RQOs review process is expected to take place. He expressed that with monitoring, there may arise a need to revise the RQOs before the 10 year period is reached and asked if revisions to the RQOs could be made before the 10-year mark.	4. Ms. Matlala (DWS) noted that the 10 year period is proposed in the National Water Act and provisions are made for the review of protection measures. The revisions of the RQOs must be informed by sufficient evidence. She also noted that there are reconciliation studies currently being done by the Department to address such concerns (e.g. water stress, current allocations etc.).	
	5. Mr Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) commented and noted that alien invasives such as wattle are also an issue for water quantity and asked if the study can influence other programmes to address this issue.	5. Ms. Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that there are mitigation measures put in place when setting the RQOs to ensure compliance. In areas where alien invasives exist, there	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
		needs to be removal of these alien invasive plants. The mitigation measures and requirements will be formally communicated with the relevant departments to ensure compliance and prioritisation of issues.	
5.3 What are RQOs and their importance?	**Comments and Questions:** N/A	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** N/A	
5.4 Methodology to establish RQOs	**Comments and Questions:** 1. Mr Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) commented and noted that the decision to not gazette a system in a low category (E or F) must be accompanied by notes explaining the decision to not gazette it at its present category but rather in its recommended ecological category (REC) as it may seem as though the study is hiding the true state of the resource. 2. Mr. Andrew Lucas (DWS) asked if the gazetting is done for a long term period or a limited period and if there is a commitment to better the resources over the 10-year period. 3. Mr Bheki Kunene (DWS) commented and noted that there may be challenges faced with trying to determine a Target Ecological Category (TEC)	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** 1. Ms Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the study is not hiding the true state of the resource. The report will detail both the present ecological state and the REC of the resource. The mitigation measures to be applied for improving the category/classification will also be detailed. The target ecological condition takes into consideration the implications on the socio-economics. 2. Ms. Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that there is the recognition that a need for the revisions of RQOs may arise within the 10-year period, thus, provisions have been made within the amendments in the National Water and Sanitation Bill to allow for a review period. 3. Ms. Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the gazette will detail the PES, the REC and the TEC of a resource as well as the short term, mid-	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	for a resource that has not been classified as its true state.	term and long-term mitigation measures for improving the resource's category	
6. Presentation of RQO results			
6.1 IUA_T01 (All water resources – rivers, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)			
6.2 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs	**Comments and Questions:** 1. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) commented on the indicators of nutrients not appearing in the data presented. She noted that it is important to consider the land use in the catchment especially if it leads to the pollution/nutrification of systems. She also asked if the frequency of monitoring is specified in the study and what would be considered to be a minimum sample size to determine if the objectives are being met or not.	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** 1. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that nutrients are included in the RQOs, however, it was not necessary to include for this reach as the evaluation tool used did not indicate that nutrients are an issue in the reach. However, with that said, Ms Kylie Farrell confirmed that she will bring the nutrient indicator into all RQOs as Ms Muller's comment is valid. She further stated that stakeholders are welcome to make recommendations such as the inclusion of nutrients and those recommendations will be considered. Ms. Farrell further noted that the next deliverable for the study is the monitoring and implementation plan that will provide the mitigation and management measures with frequencies. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) recommended that the Department's regional team should provide input when the monitoring frequencies are being determined.	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	2. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) commented and asked if the upper catchment riverine system and the lower catchment/estuary should not be separated when determining RQOs as the upper catchment riverine system would have lower levels of contaminants (e.g. salt) and therefore lower electrical conductivity and likewise turbidity when compared to the estuary and it would not be feasible to blanket the different systems with the same RQOs. 3. Ms Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) asked why the groundwater IUA_T01 was determined as a priority area if there is a shortage of data which could assist in setting the RQOs for this area. She noted that aspects of the criteria used may limit what needs RQOs set for. The focus needs to be on what stands out. She noted that there may not be a need for setting RQOs for quantity, quality etc., however, they can be set for what is considered to be a priority. 4. Ms Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) asked for clarification on the difference of the 95th percentile being used for surface water and the 75th percentile being used for groundwater. She also commented that if there is a strong connection between the ground and surface water, elevated fluoride and nitrogen levels would be observed in the surface water, the nitrogen is the nutrient and becomes important for setting the RQOs and this may warrant more investigation.	2. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) noted that the different resources are separated. The resources prioritised for each IUA are specified. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) also responded and noted that in cases where rivers that are just beyond the estuary functional zone are prioritised, the estuaries flow and quality may be relied on and this would be noted. 3. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that the quaternary catchments were scored using the specified criteria (with a number of characteristics) on a percentage scale. Sometimes the known circumstances in a resource unit (e.g. high groundwater use) allowed for its score to be upgraded. 4. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that there isn't enough data to accurately set the RQOs and align the river and groundwater water resources. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) also responded and noted that the elevated compound may be on a localised scale which may be highly variable. With monitoring the resource, there would be a baseline relating to a naturally occurring contaminant versus an anthropogenically introduced contaminant to be measured against. He further elaborated on the percentile	3.Ms Adaora and Mr. Schapers to engage on this further offline

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
		and noted that other studies have used the same percentile and that it can be adjusted if needed. With long-term monitoring of resources, groundwater is cyclic seasonally (yearly) and over long term events such as El Nino in which the groundwater level decreases.	
	5. Ms Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) commented and noted that there needs to be a standardisation of terminology used in the study. She also noted that with the narrative, if applications for basic assessments or Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs) there are buffer zones that need to be considered when an RQO is set for no additional water reducing activities in the wetland.	5. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the BAS is the Best Attainable State and it is a term used in the Department's guidelines. For rivers, the terms PES, REC and TEC are used but for wetlands and estuaries the BAS is used. The study must comply with this terminology as it is presented in the Department's manuals. This clarification will be given in the report. Ms. Farrell suggested that the buffer zones be added as Thresholds of Potential Concern (TPC) which is something used in river systems and groundwater systems. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded in agreement with adding a TPC. He further noted that some numerical criteria provide blanket protection for both the catchment and the wetland specifically.	
	6. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) commented and noted that the information under the narrative criteria could rather be mitigation measures rather than RQOs as RQOs need to have an aspect that can be monitored and reported on.	6. The comment was noted.	
	7. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if it is correct to assume that the river RQOs will apply	7. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that there are linkages between the Khowa/Elliot	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	for wetland and if this would be supported by data to say that there is equivalence in the ranges being used by rivers. 8. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) commented and noted that it becomes critical to include nutrients because there are sewage discharge issues observed.	wetland and the priority river IUA in this area and that is why the water quality for the river is used for the wetland. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) also responded in agreement to note that a similar observation can be made with the rivers and estuaries as they may be linked from a flow perspective. 8. The comment was noted	
6.3 IUA_T02 – T04 (All water resources – rivers, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)			
6.4 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs	**Comments and Questions:** ***T02*** 1. Ms Neliswa Piliso (DEDEAT) commented and noted that the estuary information presented assists in prioritising estuaries and estuarine management plans (EMPs). She also noted the comment made on the lack of bathymetric information and asked who would be responsible for conducting these studies. Ms Piliso also asked if the Mbashe estuary system also experiences cattle feeding on the mangroves.	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** 1. Dr. Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that the provision of the bathymetric information in systems where there has been a change of flow, would be the responsibility of DWS. She noted the bilateral functioning between the Department of Environment Affairs and DWS and perhaps the bathymetry could be a point of focus for both. Dr. Van Niekerk further noted that the Mbashe estuary does experience cattle grazing on the mangroves and trampling of seeds. She further noted	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
		that there may be an opportunity for a regional estuary management plan rather than individual management plans.	
	2. Mr. Andrew Lucas (DWS) commented and noted that there may be an opportunity for broad classification of different categories of estuaries as this would have an impact on the behaviour of the estuary (e.g. urbanised versus natural estuaries). He further asked if the use of urban estuaries for major recreational activities can be used for the classification process.	2. Ms Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that this classification was done. She further responded that the legal limit is applied. She noted that fish gills may be added as a generic limit.	
	3. Mr. Vusi Mthombeni (DEDEAT) commented and commended the work that has been done.	3. The comment was noted.	
	4. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if the RQOs and indicators can be easily mainstreamed into the estuary management plan. He also asked if the ranges come from the Mbashe estuary.	4. Ms Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that the Mbashe estuary recommendations are achievable through an estuary management plan.	
	5. Ms. Neliswa Piliso (DEDEAT) commented on the linkage between the RQOs and the EMPs and noted that the RQOs form the basis of the EMPs i.e. the RQOs give a foundation of what is to be included in the EMP.	5. The comment was noted.	
6.5 IUA_Q01 to IUA_Q03 (all water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)			

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
6.6 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs	**Comments and Questions:** ***Q02*** 1. Mr. Andrew Lucas (DWS) asked if a river site lower down just below where the diversion to Glen Melville Dam occur had been considered as it would be a site below all the manipulation (diversion etc.) and would provide the remaining status of the Great Fish river system. 2. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) asked that since there is more water in the system now, are black fly not problematic and should there not be consideration given to dropping the flow to get rid of the insects. 3. Mr. Andrew Lucas (DWS) asked if this study had found evidence of flow manipulations. He also noted that there are periods in a week when flow for irrigation is stopped and, therefore, flow manipulation could be a possible solution to the black fly infestation. 4. Ms. Muller (Amatola Water) asked if the annual Fish canoe race had been considered for the flow manipulations and water quality aspects. 5. Mr. Andrew Lucas (DWS) asked if grazing where there is a nature reserve is less severe than	**Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:** 1. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that a site lower down was considered and was found to not be suitable for hydraulics and the biological surveys. The diversion to Glen Melville Dam is small compared to irrigation downstream of the selected site. 2. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) noted that this had been proposed in the Great Kei system. In the Great Fish, there are major limits in changing the system's operations and there are already periods of drop in flows e.g. during the annual maintenance period. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) also responded and noted that there are many studies indicating the issue of the black fly on the Great Fish system as the black flies like high turbid water. 3. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the weekly manipulations get lost in the monthly modelling and would, therefore not get picked up but the annual shutdown. 4. Comment was noted. An additional RU was added within this IUA to take cognisance of the Fish River canoe race, with water quality RQOs included for recreational use for the reach. 5. Ms Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that the	4. PSP to include RQOs for water quality for recreation

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	where there is cattle raising and cattle access to estuaries i.e. is there a difference between indigenous animals and cattle with grazing on the estuarine system. 6. Mr Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked how the RQOs align with the resource management plans developed for the dams. 7. Mr Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if there are limits that guide the extraction of water from dams (dam level limits).	vegetation in nature reserves is more lush. In some other areas, the issue may have been overstocking of livestock and thus, localised impacts (such as trampling) was observed. Overall the biomass was more lush and higher and thicker in the nature reserve. 6. Ms Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the RQOs will impact the management plans as the RQOs provide the limits applicable for managing the water resource. The activities of the water resource must comply with the limits so there may be a need for a revision of the management plans to ensure compliance with the RQOs. 7. Ms Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that there are such limits. A unit within the Department looking at operational rules of dams would determine these levels and the actions to be taken should the levels be reached and, thus, restrictions on extraction would then be imposed.	
7. Next steps for the study: Classification, RQO and Reserve Draft Gazette	The Next steps were discussed in the meeting on Tuesday, 03 June 2025.		
8. Closure and thank you	Ms. Matlala thanked all attendees for attending and closed the first day (day 1) of the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Technical Task Group Meeting in East London.		

Signed: _____ _____

Professional Service Provider: Dr Mark Graham (GroundTruth)

Chairperson: Ms Lebogang Betty Matlala (Department of Water and Sanitation)

Annexure I: AGENDA

water & sanitation

Department:
Water and Sanitation
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

WP11354

DETERMINATION OF WATER RESOURCE CLASSES, RESERVE AND RESOURCE QUALITY OBJECTIVES (RQOS) FOR THE WATER RESOURCES IN THE KEISKAMMA AND FISH TO TSITSIKAMMA CATCHMENT

TECHNICAL TASK GROUP MEETING: PROPOSED RESOURCE QUALITY OBJECTIVES

ORGANISATIONS FOR THE Q, R and S CATCHMENTS

(Great Kei, Buffalo/ Nahoon, Keiskamma and Great Fish)

Date:	3 June 2025
Time:	09h00 – 13h00
Meeting venue:	Blue Lagoon Hotel and Conference Centre Blue Bend Place Beacon Bay East London 5241
Chairperson	Ms Lebogang Matlala

Purpose of the Technical Task Group Meeting

The purpose of this focused technical task group meeting with key stakeholders on the project is as follows:

- *Guide Stakeholders Through the RQO Determination Process*
  - Provide a detailed walkthrough of the methodology for establishing Resource Quality Objectives (RQOs), in alignment with Step 6 of the Integrated Framework. This includes defining RQOs with narrative and numerical limits and outlining implementation strategies.
  - Review the steps previously undertaken for the establishment of RQOs (Steps 1 to 5) as per the gazetted process for RQO determination.

- *Evaluate RQOs for Selected Indicators*
  - Summarise and discuss the proposed RQOs for each prioritised Resource Unit (RU) for rivers, wetlands, estuaries, groundwater and major dams within the respective catchment areas. This will involve analysing specific indicators and their relevance to the water resources under consideration.

- *Address Stakeholder Feedback*
  - Provide a platform for stakeholders to raise pressing concerns, ask questions, and seek clarifications regarding the proposed RQOs before they are finalised for gazetting.

Your participation in these discussions is vital to ensuring the comprehensive and effective management of the water resources in these catchments.

AGENDA			
1.	**Welcome**	09h00 – 09h05	Ms Lebogang Betty Matlala
2.	**Attendance/Apologies**	09h05 09h10	Ms Lebogang Betty Matlala
3.	**Acceptance of Agenda**	09h10 – 09h15	All
4.	**Purpose of the Technical Task Group Meeting**	09h15 – 09h30	Ms Lebogang Betty Matlala
5.	**Technical presentation**	09h30 – 10h00	Ms Kylie Farrell
5.1	*Background, scope of study and study area*		
5.2	*Overview of Reserve, Classification and **RQOs***		
5.3	*What are RQOs and their importance?*		
5.4	*Methodology to establish RQOs*		
6.	**Presentation of RQO results**	10h00 – 11h30	PSP Team
6.1	*IUA_Q01 to IUA_Q03 (all water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)*		
6.2	*Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs*		
Tea/coffee break (11H30 – 11H45)			
6.3	*IUA_R01 to IUA_R02 (All water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)*	11h45 - 12h30	PSP Team
6.4	*IUA_S01 to IUA_S03 (All water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands*		
6.5	*Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs*		
7.	**Next steps for the study: Classification, RQO and Reserve Draft Gazette**	12h30 – 12h50	Ms Adaora Okonkwo
8	**Closure and thank you**	12h50 – 13h00	Ms Lebogang Betty Matlala
Light lunch break and close			

Website for Reports and Document : https://www.dws.gov.za/RDM/WRCS/kft.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	
DEPARTMENT OF WATER AND SANITATION ATTENDANCE	
15	Virtual
7	In-person
STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE	
In-person	
Amatola Water	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency	
Virtual	
Agri Eastern Cape	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality	
Buffalo City Metropolitan Municipality	
Amathole District Municipality	
OR Tambo District Municipality	
Municipal Infrastructure Support Agency (MISA)	
AGES OMEGA	
PROJECT TEAM ATTENDANCE	
GroundTruth	In-person
GroundTruth	In-person
GroundTruth	Virtual
GroundTruth	Virtual
CSIR	Virtual
JG Afrika	Virtual