



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 ORGANISATIONS FOR THE Q, R and S CATCHMENTS (Great Kei, Buffalo/ Nahoon, Keiskamma and Great Fish)
Venue: Blue Lagoon Hotel and Conference Centre (East London)**

03 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:

COGTA	- Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs in South Africa
CSIR	- Council for Scientific and Industrial Research
DEDEAT	- Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism
DWS	- Department of Water and Sanitation
ECPTA	- Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency
EWR	- Ecological Water Requirements
IUA	- Integrated Unit of Analysis
PES	- Present Ecological State
PSC	- Project Steering Committee
RQOs	- Resource Quality Objectives
SALGA	-South African Local Government Association

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
1. Welcome	The Chair, Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) welcomed all attendees and opened the second 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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	The meeting's agenda was accepted without any changes.		
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		

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	ensure that the RQOs are determined, defined and 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	<p>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.</p> <p>[Power point presentation is available online at https://www.dws.gov.za/RDM/WRCS/kft.aspx and provided with the meeting minutes].</p>		
5.1 Background, scope of study and study area	<p>Comments and Questions:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:</p> <p>N/A</p>	
5.2 Overview of Reserve, Classification and RQOs	<p>Comments and Questions:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:</p> <p>N/A</p>	
5.3 What are RQOs and their importance?	<p>Comments and Questions:</p> <p>N/A</p>	<p>Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:</p> <p>N/A</p>	
5.4 Methodology to establish RQOs	<p>Comments and Questions:</p>	<p>Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	N/A	N/A	
6. Presentation of RQO results			
6.1 IUA_Q01 to IUA_Q03 (all water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)	Discussed in meeting on 02/06		
6.2 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs	Comments and Questions: N/A	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders: N/A	
6.3 IUA_R01 to IUA_R02 (All water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)	Comments and Questions: <i>IUA_R01</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms Lebogang Matlala (DWS) commented and noted that in cases were rivers have been prioritised even though there is no data available, the study's assessments have deemed it a priority resource. The Department will be guided in terms of where data collection must be focused and prioritised. The RQOs will not be gazetted but will be reported on. 2. Ms. Neliswa Piliso asked how the status of the Keiskamma estuary's would be maintained with the incoming proposed harbour development in the Keiskamma mouth. She asked if the RQOs would need to be changed as and when needed 	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) noted the comment. 2. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) noted that if RQOs need to be changed, the change would have to be informed by sufficient evidence. The RQOs gazetted now are set for the next 10 years. Dr. Lara Van Niekerk also responded and noted that if the mouth 	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>3. Mr. Bhekokwakhe Kunene asked for further clarification and guidance on the process of maintaining the low flow status quo. Irrigation and the resulting nutrification of water resources are major challenges. He further asked if the dams are equipped and suited for the required releases. He highlighted complexities that arise from the misalignment of the public's needs and the operationalisation of the dams.</p> <p>4. Mr. Xolani Nikelo (DEDEAT) commented and noted that the small harbour development on the Keiskamma estuary is going ahead and that has been officially announced by the premier. A spatial economic development framework is being developed for the 3 proposed small harbours (including on the Keiskamma estuary). The harbour will be small and will be focused on tourism-related activities within the estuary. He highlighted that concerns were raised regarding the impact of the tourism activities on the estuary. DEDEAT is still reviewing reports on the projected activities and projected impacts – once</p>	<p>is changed on the marine side there will only be a localised impact on the estuary. If a permanent structure is placed on the estuary, the mouth will be stabilised, the salinity changed and the mangroves impacted and, ultimately the income generating opportunities of the small scale local fishers will be impacted. The system's condition will, therefore, decline and so will its productivity.</p> <p>3. Ms Lebogang Matlala responded and noted that the comments raised will need to be raised and discussed at the project management committee meetings (PMCs) in which the specialists are present and would be able to offer the required guidance.</p> <p>4. Ms Lara van Niekerk responded and noted that the small harbour activities proposed (slipway and jetty) will only have localised impacts. It may be important to add a restoration RQO (offset) and bring forward the boat-control issue (boat zonation etc.).</p>	<p>4.Mr. Nikelo to connect project team to the service providers (Zutari) specialists who are drawing up reports for this small harbour development.</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>these are available, they will be made available to the project team.</p> <p>5. Ms. Neliswa Piliso asked if the RQOs would or could be revised in light of the information received regarding the small harbour development</p> <p>IUA_R02</p> <p>6. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amathola Water) commented and noted that the KwaNkwebu Dam's release is capped to maintain the functionality and protect the habitat. She suggested that perhaps the limit imposed on the dam could be set as an RQO to ensure it is not exceeded.</p> <p>7. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if remote sensing cannot be used to monitor aspects such as turbidity as a cost effective way of monitoring and to assist especially as there might not be sufficient resources on the ground to carry out the monitoring. He also noted that there is potential for remote sensing equipment to be loaded onto the vessels to assist with the monitoring.</p>	<p>5. Ms Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the RQOs must be complied with. The management of developments such as the harbour is the responsibility of all relevant role players and users. A scenario evaluation was done as part of this study to evaluate the consequences of certain developments in the short, medium and long term. The draft RQOs being proposed support the classification of the resources and, therefore, the management of the development must allow for the resource and Integrated Unit of Analysis (IUA) to maintain its status.</p> <p>6. The comment was noted by the project and the relevant amendments will be made.</p> <p>7. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that new and cost effective ways of monitoring will be considered as part of the monitoring programme e.g. sonar equipment attached to boats. Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) also noted that the clarity tube or Secchi disc are convenient tools to carry on surveys to assess turbidity. Ms. Matlala further</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>Furthermore, remote sensing could assist in providing a holistic assessment of a dam as opposed to a sample which provides an understanding of the condition of the resource at the point at which the sample is taken.</p> <p>8. Mr Bhekokwakhe Kunene asked on the optimisation of the dams to supply ecological requirements and water users</p> <p>9. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked that with the link between the Bridledrift Dam and the Buffalo estuary, would it be ideal to consider both the user needs and the ecology/biota.</p> <p>10. Mr. Bhekokwakhe Kunene (DWS) raised a concern regarding the lack of presence of</p>	<p>elaborated and noted that these suggestions would be considered as non-binding proposals.</p> <p>8. Ms. Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that for Bridledrift Dam, the management for user requirements is more important than the management for ecological requirements. She further noted that the system is currently optimised for the users' needs and not including the Ecological Water Requirements (EWR). Considerations need to be made for how to optimise the system to allow for release for both the user needs and the environment.</p> <p>9. Ms Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the study does not suggest that the ecology is not important but that the dam is a very important source of water for the users, thus the focus is on water supply for the users. Dr. Van Niekerk (CSIR) also responded and noted that the estuary is in very poor condition due to the port, the stormwater runoff, the transformation and localised poor water quality. She noted that the Buffalo estuary RQOs' focus was on stormwater management and water quality management.</p> <p>10. Ms. Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the discussions and findings of such studies need to also be</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>stakeholders from organisations such as the South African Local Government Association (SALGA) or the Department of Cooperative Governance and Traditional Affairs (COGTA) who are able to assist authorities when implementing the RQOs.</p> <p>11. Mr. Mlondolozzi Mbikwana (AGES OMEGA) commented and noted that the Buffalo City Metropolitan (BCM) Municipality has forums especially for spatial development activities. He noted that interest would decrease overtime due to the municipality's restriction in service delivery caused by political interference. He suggested that a representative from the Department could perhaps join the meetings in future.</p> <p>12. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) commented and noted that there are various platforms (like environmental education days) and events hosted by the different stakeholders that can be used to engage stakeholders and relay information. The Department could also partake in such events to share the message of issues observed on the ground with the local communities. The community representatives present at such engagements will then relay the message back to the broader communities.</p> <p>13. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if the KwaMasela wetland complex could be proposed as a RAMSAR site</p>	<p>discussed in forum meetings and special stakeholder meetings hosted by the Department at regional level. She further noted that there needs to be effective ways to manage the issues raised (e.g. land invasion, etc.).</p> <p>11. The comment was noted.</p> <p>12. The comment was noted.</p> <p>13. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and noted that designation of RAMSAR sites can only occur in formally protected areas. Unless the KwaMasela wetland is formally protected through a protected area or environment, it will not pass the screening to be declared as a RAMSAR site. He further noted that this wetland</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
		in combination with a few key other wetlands should be considered as RAMSAR sites as they are rare and endangered. Ms van Niekerk (CSIR) also responded and noted through an increased protection movement, specialists have the power to push for the declaration of RAMSAR sites on areas that are seen as being key to the ecology.	
6.4 IUA_S01 to IUA_S03 (All water resources – rives, groundwater, estuaries, wetlands)			
6.5 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs	<p>Comments and Questions:</p> <p><i>IUA_S01</i></p> <p>1. Ms. Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) asked if the yellowfish can still be referred to as being non-native if it has existed and adapted to the environment in the system for 40 years.</p>	<p>Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:</p> <p>1. Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that they are still classified as non-native as they should not be in our systems. The yellowfish, like the bass and carp, are predators and they cause a lot of damage and devastation to other species in the systems. Ms Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) also responded and agreed with the classification of the Yellowfish. She noted that translocated fish species such as bass and catfish, end up as barriers for inland migration of indigenous fish species. Systems with the non-native fish are treated the same as a dam wall or a low oxygen reach. The type of invasive and its predatory nature are major considerations.</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>2. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) disagreed with having to manipulate the classification of systems with low ratings to give them higher ratings. He queried on whether the IUA status is reported correctly and not manipulated or changed to reflect a different and incorrect narrative. He highlighted that this may cause conflict and confusion during monitoring. He asked if it would be achievable to recommend an improved status for this particular system and ensure it is managed (through certain measures) to reach a D status.</p> <p>3. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if it would not be possible to determine the minimum operational level using the data that exists for the downstream rivers, thus, classifying the RQO as a numeric RQO.</p>	<p>2. Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the Yellowfish species not being indigenous to the system results in the IUA's status of E-F. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) also responded and highlighted that the correct results are not being hidden, however, the Recommended Ecological Category (REC) of D is being used and highlighted as the ideal status for gazetting this particular system as opposed to the Present Ecological State (PES). She noted that the Department's guidelines do not allow for the gazetting of a system with an E-F status, however, the improved ecological category can be gazetted. She noted that there will be measures included in the report that speak to how the system's status can be improved. She further highlighted that the feasibility of the recommended status is dependent on the mitigation measures suggested. Ms. Matlala noted that stakeholders are welcome to review the mitigation measures in the report and comment on their feasibility. Ms. Farrell responded in agreement and noted that the REC is important to ensure that the system is given a chance to survive and thrive.</p> <p>3. Ms. Retha Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that at certain levels dams can release certain volumes. If dam levels are below certain thresholds, there won't be</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>4. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) also asked for clarification on the statement that there should not be a change >2% annually. He suggested using less than or equal to 2% (i.e. the change should not exceed 2%) rather than just >2%.</p> <p>5. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) asked if the setting of the RQOs aligns with the DWS National Siltation Management Strategy in that this process will not conflict with anything that has been created within this strategy in the Department.</p> <p>6. Mr. Kagiso Mangwale (ECPTA) asked if the narrative presented by Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) on the Cala Wetland Complex could be converted into the numeric criteria as the information cannot be directly monitored in the current state it is presented.</p>	<p>enough pressure to release the required volumes. This must be considered for the ecological requirements release from the dam.</p> <p>4. Ms. Stassen (GroundTruth) responded and noted that this was in reference to the sedimentation and that the volume of the dam does not change by more than 2%. If it does change then that suggests sedimentation in the dam. Mr. Mangwale's suggestion would be taken into consideration.</p> <p>5. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) noted the question and noted that a cross check will be done with the relevant department within DWS.</p> <p>6. Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the information in the numeric/narrative criteria is the mitigation measures that will be included in the next report. The criteria are more narrative than numeric for these RQOs. Mr. Ellery (GroundTruth) highlighted the difficulty in generating numeric RQOs with the data availability. The numerical values are the PES values and how those translate into the landcover maps that are produced per wetland. For example, an increase in invasive alien plants above 5% in the landcover mapping, this will have a direct effect on the vegetation component of the</p>	<p>4. PSP to check percentage of change in sedimentation of dams</p> <p>5. PSP to cross check RQO setting process with DWS National Siltation Management Strategy and relevant directorate</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>7. Ms. Matlala (DWS) commented and noted that if a wetland is connected to a river, the river RQOs would be considered for the wetland connected to it. She further noted that it is difficult to put numeric values to the wetland RQOs. However, where possible, numeric values will be put in for the RQOs.</p> <p>8. Ms. Nikite Muller (Amatola Water) commented and noted that RQOs should be set in terms of maintaining the wetland rather than trying to control land use patterns in the catchment. Perhaps the RQO could be rephrased to focus it on the wetland rather than the catchment e.g. the extent of the wetland should not be reduced.</p> <p>IUA_S03</p> <p>9. Ms. Leigh-Ann Kretzmann (DEDEAT) commented and noted that there is monitoring occurring at the Great Kei estuary and noted that the monitoring must be aligned with what is recommended in the current study. There is monitoring data available on potential discharge hotspots, management of pollution, and indigenous versus alien species. Environmental education and awareness and citizen science activities also occur here. She noted that this data could be useful in bridging any gaps in the study.</p>	<p>wetland health and thus, the RQO (the PES). Although there are some numerical values in the RQOs, the narrative would make more sense for these wetland cases.</p> <p>7. The comment was noted.</p> <p>8. Ms. Farrell (GroundTruth) responded and noted that the land use affects the wetland upstream. The comment was noted.</p> <p>9. Dr. Lara Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that the micro algae and vegetation information is being collected by the Nelson Mandela University. SCIAAB and SAEON also collect relevant fish data. She recommended an overarching regional programme (between the different departments, cities and organisations with bilateral agreements) to coordinate and prioritise the monitoring efforts.</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>10. Ms. Leigh-Ann Kretzmann (DEDEAT) commented on the impacts on the riparian vegetation and noted that on the eastern bank of the Kei there is a major issue with vehicles. She also asked if there is monitoring in place to address the siltation of the mouth as there have been siltation deposition observations at the mouth of the estuary.</p>	<p>10. Ms Van Niekerk (CSIR) responded and noted that control of vehicle access on the bank and mudbanks would be added as an intervention. She also noted that estuaries are highly variable and that mudbanks and sandbanks often change their shape. A constricted mouth may develop due to low flows and this would be a point of concern as this would mean that too much flow is being taken from the system. The change of banks is not considered a concern.</p>	<p>10. Dr. Van Niekerk to add an RQO in the hydrodynamics (tidal limitations) stating that the average water level in the system should not go below a certain limit</p>
<p>7. Next steps for the study: Classification, RQO and Reserve Draft Gazette</p>	<p>Ms. Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) presented the way forward.</p> <p>The next steps of the project included the release of the report for comment by stakeholders who are urged to make comments within two (2) weeks of the report being released. Ms. Okonkwo urged stakeholders to focus on the resource area relevant to their work or operations.</p> <p>She noted the date of the next Project Steering Committee (PSC) meeting which is on 24 June 2025.</p> <p>Ms. Okonkwo lastly noted what the next steps of the gazetting process will be.</p>		
<p>8. Closure and thank you</p>	<p>Ms. Matlala thanked all attendees for attending and closed the second day (day 2) of the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Technical Task Group Meeting in East London.</p>		

Signed:

**Professional Service Provider: Dr Mark Graham
(GroundTruth)**

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



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	
14	Virtual
8	In-person
STAKEHOLDER ATTENDANCE	
<i>In-person</i>	
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	
AGES OMEGA	
<i>Virtual</i>	
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	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
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