



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 K, L, M, N and P CATCHMENTS (Kouga, Groot, Gamtoos, coastal, Swartkops, Sundays, Bushmans, Kariega, Kowie)

- GROUNDWATER AND WETLANDS ONLY

**Venue: Dolphins Leap Conference Centre (Gqeberha)
05 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:

DEDEAT	- Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism
DWS	- Department of Water and Sanitation
EIA	-Environmental Impact Assessment
EWR	- Ecological Water Requirements
GWRU	-Ground Water Resource Unit
IUA	- Integrated Units of Analysis
NGA	-National Groundwater Archive
PES	- Present Ecological State
PSP	-Professional Service Provider
RQOs	- Resource Quality Objectives
SDG	- Sustainable Development Goal
WARMS	- Water use Authorisation and Registration Management System
WMS	- Water Management System
WUA	- Water Users Association
WWF	- World Wide Fund for Nature

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
1. Welcome	The Chair, Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) welcomed all attendees and opened the third Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Catchment Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Technical Task Group Meeting.		
2. Attendance/Apologies	<p>Attendees' details were noted in the attendance register.</p> <p>Apologies received for the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pieter Viljoen (DWS) - Andrew Lucas (DWS) - Cebisa Goboza (DWS) - Onesimo Notobela (Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment) - Cindy Bailey (Nelson Mandela Bay Metro Municipality) - Johan Kotze (Dutoit Agri) - Professor Janine Adams (Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University) - Wentzel Coetzer (Conservation Outcomes) - Bonani Madikizela (Water Research Commission) - Nicky McLeod (Umzimvubu Catchment Partnership Programme) - Dr. Mark Graham (GroundTruth) 	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		

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>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 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.</p>		
5. Technical presentation	<p>Ms. Kylie Farrell (GroundTruth), Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) and Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) gave a presentation that briefly outlined the classification and RQOs determination process. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) and Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) presented on the groundwater and wetlands results (draft RQOs) for the study in the K, L, M, N and P 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	Comments and Questions:	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
5.2 Overview of Reserve, Classification and RQOs	Comments and Questions:	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:	
5.3 What are RQOs and their importance?			
5.4 Methodology to establish RQOs			
6. Presentation of RQO results	Comments and Questions:	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:	
6.1 IUA_P01 and IUA_M01 (Groundwater and Wetlands only)	<p>P01 and M01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ms Barbara Weston (DWS) asked if the overall wetlands assessment considered the strategic water source areas in which the wetlands overlap. Ms. Weston also commented on the terminology used i.e. the importance and sensitivity is not classed as an A, B, C, etc. but it is just a description. The classes are to keep the consistency with the rivers and estuaries classification. The sensitivity is described as being very high, high, moderate and low rather than using categories. Mr. Ncamile Dweni (DWS) requested clarity on inferring RQOs between water resources. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) noted the comments from Ms. Weston. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and noted that what applies to the wetland from the estuary is what has been set as the estuary's RQO. For example if the RQO specifies that bacteria and nutrients in an estuary 	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>3. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) asked if the RQOs specified in the estuaries component could be included in the wetlands component.</p> <p>4. Ms. Barbara Weston (DWS) asked if the settlement around the Chatty Wetland is legal or illegal? This settlement may present town planning issues and that the settlement needs to be conveyed to the town planner so that when the gazette comes out, there are areas where no further developed should be considered.</p> <p>5. Ms. Ilse Chilton (DWS) commented and noted that it is important that the study reports that there is overflowing sewage, old manholes etc. in these areas. It is important that the pollution points are reported through this study.</p> <p>6. Ms Nokulunga Ngcibi (DEDEAT) commented and noted that the presentations have enlightened her work in EIAs especially where developments</p>	<p>cannot reach certain levels, then the same should apply to the wetland etc. Therefore, the RQO has nothing to do with the PES but rather the actual water quality and constituents in the estuary (the receiving environment). Whatever flows from the Chatty river goes into the river. If the estuary is in bad condition, it is likely because the wetland is in bad condition. There is always a knock on effect between the water resources.</p> <p>3. The comment was noted and the relevant additions will be made.</p> <p>4. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) noted the comment.</p> <p>5. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted the presence of the DWS regional stakeholders who are responsible for conveying the discussions of the meeting back to the relevant stakeholders and undertake the necessary engagements in order to flag and address the issues found.</p> <p>6. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that the Department should provide</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>are concerned. She further noted that the language used in this study not the language used in Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) reviews. The study has, therefore, highlighted what is happening in the department (DWS, DEDEAT etc.) and it also shows that the different departments and units within the different government departments work in isolation to each and asked that the silos be broken down and that collaboration is enhanced between the different departments. She noted that there are current EIA applications that may change due to the information gained during the presentations. She asked if the Department would not work in silos but would rather work together and offer capacitation opportunities and collaboration opportunities.</p> <p>7. Ms. Sibulele Gaulana (DEDEAT) commented and noted that there were borehole applications that were rejected for the development of student units and this development would use boreholes for water consumption and supply. She asked, how this situation could be addressed by the Department</p> <p>8. Ms. Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) asked why the groundwater resource unit was prioritised even though the study has claimed that there is not enough data at the site – was it the activity or the water use that has allowed for it to be prioritised. A narrative RQO could be developed/implemented for this water resource</p>	<p>information and comments to other departments highlighting the results of the Department's studies such as the current study. She also agreed that the silos in government departments must be broken down and collaboration must rather be enhanced.</p> <p>7. Ms. Charon Russell (DWS) responded and noted that a WULA would have to be applied for online. If the borehole has been drilled then they online system can be used to apply, however, if the borehole has not been drilled then the Department (DWS) can be contacted to give guidance on how they should proceed, where to stay away from and the water quality and pump testing to get a water user authorisation.</p> <p>8. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that the high use and high stress on the resource is what has pushed for this resource unit to be classified as a priority. He agreed with Ms. Okonkwo's recommendation to rather include a narrative RQO rather than a numeric RQO</p>	<p>7.DWS (Ms. Charon Russell) and DEDEAT to engage further on the matter of WULA applications for borehole drilling</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>unit as there is not enough data for it instead of a numeric RQO.</p> <p>9. Ms. Charon Russell (DWS) asked on why there were gaps in the data – she asked if it was because there were no (additional) hydro census surveys during the study . She asked why there were not more samples taken, perhaps through a hydro census, as there are gaps in the data. She further asked why M30B not included or classified as a priority area. She noted that there are a lot of municipal and private boreholes in the areas especially in the catchment of focus and, therefore, a hydro census survey could have revealed more water quality data within the catchment.</p> <p>10. Ms. Charon Russell (DWS) further commented that hydrosensus is not only for water quantity (prospecting new target zones) it is also for water quality and identify possible impacts from users or on existing users. Even if it is done on a desktop level. It speaks to all three aspects for the delineation criteria that was used (quantity, quality and ecological requirements) on identifying the Ground Water Resource Units (GWRU's). In certain areas the underlying geology will have a different result on quality or there will be areas where impact will have a different range of quality.</p> <p>11. Mr. Fanus Fourie (DWS) commented and noted that, regarding limited data, all WULs require</p>	<p>9. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that the M30B would be reviewed again as the prioritisation process was based off of a scoring system. He further noted that the hydro census would be of value to understand groundwater use and the current status quo also with identifying future monitoring points.</p>	<p>9.PSP to review inclusion of M30B catchment as a priority.</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>users to submit data (water quality, volumes, water levels, etc) to the Department. Unfortunately, this data is not captured on the Department's information systems/databases - National Groundwater Archive (NGA), Water Management System (WMS), HYDSTRA, Water use Authorisation and Registration Management System (WARMS) - as the data is presented in a hardcopy format (report) to the Department. Thus, this data is not available for use in the assessments or to see if water resource is in stress. The user needs to upload their data electronically onto the system for evaluation.</p> <p>12. Ms Ilse Chilton (DWS) commented and further addressed Ms Nokulunga Ngcibi (DEDEAT) comment on applications for EIAs and noted that from the integrated water source management perspective, when a request for a borehole is received it is important to also consider the ecological component that the groundwater is going to affect. The groundwater dependent water ecosystems must be considered i.e. the impacts on these ecosystems and the acceptable or available level to drill to– it is both quality and quantity that needs to be considered.</p> <p>13. Ms. Nokulunga Ngcibi (DEDEAT) requested a session with DWS in addressing issues that are water related. This would also ensure understanding in the changes found due to mitigation strategies of the natural resource. She further noted that DEDEAT works with EIAs and</p>	<p>12. The comment was noted.</p> <p>13. The comment was noted and a special meeting will be arranged.</p>	<p>11. DWS to hold a special meeting with DEDEAT to EIA</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	reviewing with better understanding would make the work easier in fulfilling the mandate as public officials .		processes and the associated
6.2 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs			
6.3 IUA_ N01, LN01, L01, KL01 and K01 (Groundwater and Wetlands only)	<p>LN01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) asked why the manganese compound was recorded so high (121) 2. Mr. Kwazikwenkosi Kunene (DWS) commented and noted that in the wetlands RQOs it states that the groundwater inflow should not be reduced further and that further studies need to be conducted for groundwater to determine the interactions between the groundwater and the surface water. He noted that it may seem that there aren't many studies that can strictly confirm that the inflow be reduced further. He asked if the statement on inflows can be rephrased to rather say that studies should be done to determine the threshold below which the flow should not be reduced. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that a further investigation into the distribution and physiology would have to be done. He further noted that manganese is not usually a compound that is observed in groundwater quality assessments. 2. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and clarified that for the Krakeel Wetland, further investigation was warranted for the catchment as it is not properly understood if the wetland is groundwater driven. For this particular wetland resource unit, the suggestion is to reduce or eliminate surface water extraction but for groundwater, further studies would be warranted. For the Sneeuberg wetland resource unit, it is known that the wetland is groundwater dependent and, therefore, there should be a buffer zone where groundwater extraction should be limited but groundwater extraction should not be completely eliminated in this catchment. This will be better stated in the RQO. 	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>3. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) commented in response to Mr. Steven Ellery's comment in presentation and noted that there needs to be protection zones around the wetlands. Protection zones and a detailed study may mitigate impacts on the wetland, however, the social aspect of the extraction must be considered – i.e. stopping the groundwater extraction may affect people. He noted that further away from the water resources there may be scope to protect groundwater resources but water protection zones are needed for wetlands.</p> <p>4. Mr. Kunene further commented on the groundwater level data presented (the minimum, maximum and the difference) and noted that some of the differences are big which may suggest some deep groundwater levels. He asked if the boreholes are tapping in the same aquifers (are some shallow and some deeper) and would it matter if the boreholes are tapping the deep or shallow aquifers when setting the RQOs?</p> <p>L01</p> <p>5. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) responded and noted that there should be an exception of the restoration purposes as the study and the Department are aligning with the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 6. She noted that the extent of wetlands is being measured and these speak to the extent as the protection of wetlands through the implementation of the mitigation measures works toward the improvement of the wetland.</p> <p>6. Ms. Ilse Chilton (DWS) commented and noted that the removal of alien invasives has been a</p>	<p>3. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and noted that his comment referred to further investigation being warranted for groundwater but that there should be no further extraction from dams.</p> <p>4. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that the water level stats that have extreme differentials on water levels, are ignored in determining the 75th percentile as there may be some sort of anomaly with the particular resources – it may be geological factors or the fact that it is close to extraction points. There are obvious outliers that can be observed in these assessments.</p> <p>5. The comment was noted.</p> <p>6. Ms. Barbara Weston (DWS) responded and noted that there is a</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>challenge in the catchment for a long time. She asked if there could not be an incentive that could be provided to the private water users for the clearing of alien invasive plants on their properties. Perhaps licence applications for water use may be considered as incentives for the successful clearing of alien invasive plants on the properties. This may encourage the water users to clear the invasive plants on their properties.</p> <p>7. Ms. Rienette Colesky (Gamtoos Water User Association) commented and noted that in the Gamtoos there are approximately 16 boreholes that have been monitored for levels over the past 2 years.</p> <p>8. Ms. Ilse Chilton (DWS) asked if the scope of the study include potential sites for future monitoring for groundwater specifically so that the DWS national and regional offices can use that information to expand existing monitoring networks.</p> <p>9. Mr. Henry Maluleke (DWS) commented and noted that in terms of the physicochemical water quality assessment which is done as part of this study is well described. He asked which microbiological indicator organisms were considered as part of the microbial groundwater quality assessment</p>	<p>programme through the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) that provided water use incentives based on the successful clearing of alien invasive plants and the restoration of parts of the wetland. She noted her support of the suggestion. Ms. Lebogang Matlala (DWS) also responded and noted that the suggestion was support but that further discussions would be needed to plan on how to sustain the idea of donor funding for these incentives.</p> <p>7. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) acknowledged the comment and requested the data.</p> <p>8. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that the monitoring points will be included in the report but the individual monitoring points will not be included (as that is beyond the scope of the study) only a statement around the need for the monitoring points.</p> <p>9. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) responded and noted that microbiological organisms indicators are not included.</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>KL01</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Barbara Weston (DWS) asked if there really isn't a priority wetland in this system/catchment that would be worth assessing. She noted that if there is a resource with a recommendation of no further significant changes on it then it must be presented. 2. Ms Rienette Colesky (Gamtoos Water User Association) asked if there is a drought and a water user has a water use authorisation for a particular volume but is not using the authorised volume in the current season and will exceed the maximum drawdown set for the area, what would the Department do and how will it change decision making and what it will mean for the water user. She noted that there might be future issues if there is unlawful use in certain areas the unlawful users may not be held accountable. If there is extensive drawdown in a particular area and unlawful use then there may be issues with catchment management. <p>K01</p> <p>Wetlands</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ms. Barbara Weston (DWS) noted that there are some legislative aspects to consider under the National Veld and Forest Fire Act for the burning. She also noted that the statement on the alien invasive threshold should specify that whatever measures are put in place must be done according to specific specifications. She noted that measures put in place for alien vegetation needs to be according to certain regulations and Standard Operational Procedures. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and noted that he would check that of the 80 priority wetlands determined by the study in the beginning if none fell into the system. 2. Ms Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) responded and noted that the drawdown is linked to active monitoring stations which the Department monitors. Each borehole is treated differently due to the dynamics between the individual boreholes. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) noted the comments 	<p>PSP (Steven Ellery) to confirm if there is no priority wetland in the KL catchment.</p>

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>2. Mr. Ncamile Dweni noted that there needs to be further assessments for the deteriorating water quality and asked for the PSP's recommendation</p> <p>3. There is a lot of unauthorised water usage or improper alien plant removal and disposal. More measures to combat thus must be considered e.g. public awareness campaigns.</p> <p>4. Ms Rienette Colesky (Gamtoos Water User Association) commented and noted the unprotected burning is a critical issue and there have been challenges identified by the water users i.e. the lack of control over the burning due to fear of financial and legal liability. To get organised burning would be challenging. She also noted that the irrigators, foresters etc. at the Garden Route Biosphere Reserve highlighted the need for agricultural support offices that would provide factsheets on how to conduct certain activities such as the process of alien invasive removal etc. She emphasized the need for a</p>	<p>2. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) responded and noted that it has been specified that no agricultural activities or impeding land uses so this does not include urban residential developments in the catchment and any further activities in the catchment. It allows for wastewater treatment works to be built in the catchment which could still have a water quality impact on the wetland down the stream. If there is a deterioration of the water quality and the RQO has been followed, perhaps there may be another activity that has been authorised that may not be compliant or functioning well. It is, important to consider other activities that could be causing the water quality deterioration.</p> <p>3. The comment was noted.</p> <p>4. Mr. Steven Ellery (GroundTruth) noted that in efforts have been made to mobilise the community to burn more frequently but this has been challenging. Working on Fire and their burning functions may be outsourced to the landowners especially for an important wetland area.</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>brochure or fact sheet specifying how to conduct such activities.</p> <p>5. Ms. Rienette Colesky (Gamtoos Water User Association) asked if a specific groundwater level is reached, a restriction will have to be placed on groundwater until the groundwater level has improved. She asked if this would be a temporary or a permanent measure. She also noted that the study reflects a generalisation that everyone contributes equally to baseflow which is not the case. Ms. Colesky asked how flexible or fixed the groundwater RQOs are if there is a drought. She noted that from an economic point of view, the limitations on the surface and groundwater impact the economy.</p> <p>6. Ms. Rienette Colesky (Gamtoos Water User Association) commented and noted that as the study indicates that there is not enough data, there should be an indicator of where the important monitoring points are. The restriction on water use may not be necessary if there is better information. She further noted that fixing the anthropogenic activities will assist with putting water back into the system without having to impose the restrictions e.g. proper alien invasive plant species removal, proper agricultural practices (e.g. planting the correct crops at the right time, irrigating at the right time). She noted that people need to be more aware of their water use i.e. the responsibility to use the water allocated as conservatively as possible. Compliance is important and it is everyone's responsibility.</p>	<p>5. Ms. Adaora Okonkwo (DWS) responded and noted that the rules set for RQOs must be adhered to. However, there needs to be a threshold that is set to assist the Department with monitoring the boreholes. Mr. Robert Schapers (JG Afrika) further responded and noted that the long-term trends (e.g. droughts) will be observable in the modelling. For climate resilience, groundwater extractions should not occur if certain thresholds are reached until the groundwater levels have returned to acceptable levels.</p> <p>6. Ms. Ilse Chilton (DWS) commented in response and noted that farmers have indicated that they manage and conserve their water resources very well as the water use is costly (e.g. diesel or petrol costs when connecting irrigation pumps). She also noted that getting water users to collectively work together to reach the same goal is a catchment management strategy issue as the catchment has unlawful and lawful users, users that are overly reliant on the water resources and those that do not have access to water.</p>	

	DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS	RESPONSES	ACTIONS / MATTERS ARISING
	<p>7. Ms Lebogang Matlala (DWS) noted that although there will be some resistance from water users, it should not present a barrier to stop the efforts to protect water resources. The Catchment Management Strategy will highlight the measures determined in this study as these measures and subsequent resources will benefit the users. She also noted that the Department must push for the strengthening of compliance and enforcement efforts to limit the illegal use and ensure the authorised users can be encouraged to comply with the authorisation. The push to the encourage compliance will also be attributable to the auditing of the Department on RQOs compliance. She lastly noted the need for the correct placement of resources from the Department to ensure sustainable water resources for all water uses.</p>		
6.4 Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs			
7. Next steps for the study: Classification, RQO and Reserve Draft Gazette	Comments and Questions:	Responses to corresponding issues raised by stakeholders:	
8. Closure and thank you	Ms. Matlala thanked all attendees for attending and closed the fourth day (Day 4) of the Keiskamma and Fish to Tsitsikamma Water Resource Classes, Reserve and RQOs Determination Technical Task Group Meeting in Gqeberha.		

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 K, L, M, N and P CATCHMENTS (Kouga, Groot, Gamtoos, coastal,
Swartkops, Sundays, Bushmans, Kariega, Kowie)**

Groundwater and Wetlands ONLY

Date:	5 June 2025
Time:	09h00 – 13h00
Meeting venue:	Dolphins Leap Conference Centre 35 Humewood Road Gqeberha 6013
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_P01 and IUA_M01 (Groundwater and Wetlands only)		
6.2	Discussions and consensus on the proposed RQOs		
Tea/coffee break (11H30 – 11H45)			
6.3	IUA_N01, LN01, L01, KL01 and K01 (Groundwater and Wetlands only)	11h45 - 12h30	PSP Team
6.4	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	
13	Virtual
8	In-person
Stakeholder attendance	
<i>In-person</i>	
Gamtoos Water Users Association	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Municipal Infrastructure Support Agency (MISA)	
<i>Virtual</i>	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Department of Economic Development, Environmental Affairs and Tourism	
Kouga Local Municipality	
Kouga Local Municipality	
JG Afrika	
AGES OMEGA	
University of Cape Town	
Project team attendance	
GroundTruth	In-person
GroundTruth	In-person
GroundTruth	In-person
GroundTruth	Virtual
JG Afrika	In-person