

MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND WATER RESOURCES, EGYPT

**WATER RESOURCES, IRRIGATION OPERATIONS,
AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES: AN ANALYSIS OF
THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS
AND WATER RESOURCES**

Report on a Workshop

19 - 22 April, 1995

Port Said, Egypt

**The Second Workshop of the Study,
"Strengthening Irrigation Management in Egypt,"**

Organized and facilitated by:

***International Irrigation Management Institute
Sri Lanka***

Supported by:

United States Agency for International Development

Cooperative Agreement Number: 263-0132-A-00-5036-00

IIMI
631.7.4
G232
IIM

16955

16955

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
A. BACKGROUND	2
B. OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP	3
C. PLANNING OF THE WORKSHOP	3
D. THE WORKSHOP LOCATION, PARTICIPANTS AND PROCESS	4
E. RESULTS OF THE WORKSHOP	5
1. Water Resources Planning and Policy-Making	5
2. Water Allocation, Distribution and Quality	6
3. Maintenance of the System, and Irrigation Improvement Project (IIP)	7
4. Decision-Making and Organizational Structure	8
5. Human Resources and Personnel Management	8
6. Research	9
F. EVALUATION	9
G. CONCLUSION: THE NEXT STEPS	10
 APPENDICES	
1. List of Workshop Participants	12
2. Workshop Agenda	14
3. Results of Small Group Discussions	16

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Workshop reported in this document was the second of five planned under the Study entitled *Strengthening Irrigation Management in Egypt*. The Study is being carried out jointly by the Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources (MPWWR), Government of Egypt, and the International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI). It is supported by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). A major objective of the Study is to develop plans whose implementation would enable the Ministry to make more effective use of the investments made under the Irrigation Management Systems (IMS) Project.

The purpose of this Workshop was to review a draft report prepared by IIMI with assistance from the Ministry. The specific objective was to agree on gaps and issues described in the report and identify the next steps to finalize it. The draft report summarized the results of over 130 interviews with MPWWR staff at all levels and in a number of locations. The interviews were designed to identify institutional issues that may be affecting the Ministry's ability to make best use of recent hardware and software investments by USAID and the Ministry under the IMS Project. On the basis of the results of the survey, possible means to address these constraints were identified. The Workshop participants included the senior officials who are members of the Study's Steering Committee, younger professionals who are working as members of the Study's Irrigation Objectives Task Force, other invited Ministry officials, USAID officials, and IIMI team members. The Workshop made use of participatory small groups to discuss, correct, modify, and rank in order of priority the large number of issues identified in the draft report.

Many of the issues discussed were sensitive and controversial, but by the conclusion of the workshop an initial agenda of some 114 issues was reduced to a prioritized total of 20 topics, most with associated recommendations for action. With one important exception, the issues identified were accepted by a large majority of participants. The priority given by some to re-examining the overall structure of the Ministry remained controversial.

The first workshop was designed to achieve a common, positive vision of the future of water resource development in Egypt, and was successful in meeting this objective. This second workshop addressed current issues, from a variety of quite different perspectives: field staff and headquarters staff; providers of services and users of services; senior and junior officers; and various Departments of the MPWWR. Achieving a consensus was thus far more difficult. But it was judged important, having given many staff the opportunity to comment on the issues, that they and MPWWR face, to ensure that these views were represented and discussed.

The workshop was ambitious in its scope and objectives. The focus on existing issues at the expense of examining future opportunities for change proved frustrating to some participants. Nevertheless, the Workshop was a useful exercise both for the Ministry and IIMI. The organized discussion and debate on important issues affecting the Ministry's capacity to meet future challenges led to improved understanding of present issues, and greater clarity in identifying the next steps.

REPORT ON A WORKSHOP ON WATER RESOURCES, IRRIGATION OPERATIONS, AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES: AN ANALYSIS OF THE MINISTRY OF PUBLIC WORKS AND WATER RESOURCES

A. BACKGROUND

With the support of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), the International Irrigation Management Institute (IIMI) is assisting the Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources (MPWWR), Government of Egypt, to analyze how it can make optimum use of past investments to improve the efficiency and productivity of water use. Over the past 14 years, USAID has been supporting the Irrigation Management Systems (IMS) Project to introduce new hardware and software into the Ministry. While the Project has had many successes, USAID and the Ministry wish to identify whether there are policy, institutional or human resource constraints affecting full integration of IMS investments into the working of the MPWWR, and if so, how can these be overcome.

IIMI and the Ministry are working together to carry out the Study one of whose main objectives is:

to develop a long range plan that would enable the MPWWR to make effective use of IMS outputs¹.

The Study is being implemented over a six-month period. Its methodology includes data collection through analysis of reports and documents, extensive interviews with Ministry staff at all levels, direct observations, and considerable interaction with Ministry officials, both formally and informally. A Steering Committee of senior officials is guiding the overall Study, while two task forces consisting of Ministry professionals are working closely with the IIMI team. In addition, five workshops are being held to try to maximize the involvement of Ministry officials in shaping the outputs of the Study.

The first Workshop was held in March in Alexandria, Egypt. That Workshop used a highly participatory process involving small group exercises to create a vision of the future of the Nile Basin in the year 2010. An ambitious and positive vision was created and adopted which provides overall direction to the remainder of the Study².

In parallel with the first workshop, the first phase of the Study involved the preparation of a report analyzing the institutional framework of the Ministry, with special but not exclusive attention to the experience in implementing the IMS Project. This phase was designed to be

¹. *Work Plan: Strengthening Irrigation Management in Egypt: A Program for the Future*. IIMI, MPWWR, USAID. March, 1995.

². *Nile Water Resources Management in 2010: Achieving a Common Vision*. Report on a Workshop, 9-11 March 1995. IIMI, MPWWR, USAID. May 1995.

comprehensive both in the breadth of topics considered, and in the sources of views and experiences assembled from within the Ministry. This approach was necessary to ensure a firm basis for selecting those issues to be studied further in the preparation of long term action plans. The draft report³ resulting from this exercise was the basis of the Workshop reported in this document.

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE WORKSHOP

The broad purpose of the Workshop was to review the draft report which had been circulated several days before, to try to reach agreement on its basic contents. By the end of the Workshop, it was expected that the participants would have:

- * agreed on gaps and issues identified in the draft report;
- * identified next steps in terms of finalizing the report; and
- * generated conclusions and recommendations for future development.

The original title of the second workshop (Irrigation Operations: Objectives, Strengths and Opportunities), as given in the *Work Plan*, suggested a focus on the technical aspects of irrigation and the scope for future improvements and investments. The actual agenda, based on the contents of the draft report, included considerable attention to broader institutional questions, existing constraints, and problems. While this agenda reflected the results of work to date, the mis-match between title and content led to some confusion and frustration among participants.

C. PLANNING OF THE WORKSHOP

Planning for this Workshop began in March following the first workshop. A logical progression would have been to move from the "vision" created at the first workshop, to a similar participatory workshop to identify goals and objectives that must be achieved to move toward making the vision a reality. On the other hand, the agreed Work Plan committed the IIMI team to carrying out a broad institutional analysis as the subject of the second Workshop. The combination of two objectives led to both misunderstandings by some participants (who expressed in the final evaluations their expectation of dealing with objectives), and with hindsight, an over-ambitious workshop design.

During March and April, the IIMI team and the Irrigation Operations Task Force collected data during two weeks of field visits to Upper Egypt and the Delta, and over 130 interviews with Ministry officials. Thereafter, the data were analyzed, and a draft report prepared. Ideally, this draft should have been circulated and discussed informally with the Steering

³. *Water Resources, Irrigation Operations and Institutional Issues: An Analysis of the Ministry of Public Works and Water Resources, Government of Egypt*. Draft report for discussion and not quotation. IIMI, MPWWR, USAID. April 1995.

Committee members and Task Force members before the Workshop. Early drafts of most (but not all) sections were reviewed by the Task Force, but the time available for drafting and revising the report was extremely limited. In consequence, while effectively incorporating the vast majority of comments received during the data collection process, the initial draft of the report proved too large and unwieldy to be dealt with effectively in a Workshop.

Recognizing this problem, the IIMI Team decided to focus the Workshop primarily on achieving a broad agreement on the issues identified in the Report, with secondary attention to the opportunities for addressing these. This was based on a belief (largely corroborated by the experience at the workshop) that achieving agreement on what are the key issues would itself be time consuming, but that this process was essential to providing the required basis for further work. (Some members of the Steering Committee have stated they regret this decision, and would have preferred more discussion of the opportunities.)

D. THE WORKSHOP LOCATION, PARTICIPANTS AND PROCESS

The Workshop was held at the Helnan-Port Said Hotel, Port Said, on 19-22 April 1995. The participants included the members of the Steering Committee, the members of the Irrigation Operations Task Force, the Chairman of the Cost Recovery Task Force, and a number of other Ministry officials who, because of their current responsibilities, were expected to make an important contribution to the proceedings. Most members of the IIMI team and three USAID officials also participated (Appendix 1).

On the first evening, there was an introduction to the Workshop objectives and process, and a brief review of the vision created at the first Workshop, followed by a reception. On the next two days, the pattern followed was brief presentations on a block of key issues, followed by small group discussions to modify, improve and rank the issues and if there was time to discuss opportunities for change; presentations to the plenary; and discussion of the results (see Appendix 2 for the Workshop agenda).

The blocks of issues discussed were as follows:

1. Water Resources Planning and Policy-Making
2. Operation and Maintenance of the Water Delivery and Drainage System (including Water Quality Issues and the Irrigation Improvement Project)
3.
 - a. Decision-Making and Organizational Structure
 - b. Human Resources and Personnel Management
 - c. Research

Within each block, small groups were generally asked to address specific subareas. For each block of issues the composition of small groups was different. For example, the groups dealing with water resources policy-making and planning, and water distribution and disposal were randomized, while the IIMI team selected the composition of the groups addressing research, organizational structure, decision-making, and human resource issues. On the last day, the groups were again randomly selected by counting around the table.

In the small group discussions, the groups sometimes endorsed the proposed issues, or added additional ones; in some cases the groups significantly modified what was presented, and rejected a few of them completely. At the last session, an attempt was made to use small group processes to prioritize synthesized lists of issues that had emerged from the previous two days' discussions. The IIMI team had synthesized the issues emerging from the previous two days of small group discussions, to reduce the number and make them more coherent and manageable. Small groups commented on and prioritized these synthesized issues, and in some cases, discussed opportunities for dealing with them as well. The results were presented to and discussed at the final plenary session.

The Workshop did not reach -- or even attempt to reach -- a full consensus on the issues and their priorities. On some there was complete agreement, on others only partial agreement. What follows is a brief discussion of the issues as presented and accepted by the Workshop on the last day. A complete record of the small groups' reports is provided in Appendix 3. The next section summarizes the results of the final session of the Workshop.

E. RESULTS OF THE WORKSHOP

1. Water Resources Planning and Policy-Making

One group worked on the separate lists of synthesized issues for planning and for policy-making. The group prioritized the three planning issues as follows:

- a. A clear definition and improvement of the water resources long range planning function and processes. This would provide effective inputs to water resource policy-making, other Ministry activities, and to the development of the Ministry's total program.
- b. Water resources planning activities are done in more than one unit of the ministry, perhaps creating a condition of overlap, duplication of effort, difficulty in setting program priorities, and coordination problems.
- c. The Project Planning Department (PPD)'s capacity to do economic and financial analysis as part of the project feasibility study process.

The group gave a very low priority to the issue raised in the draft report regarding the impact of heavy work loads on the quality and adequacy of supervision of planning.

The group ranked the policy-making issues as follows:

- a. There is a need to improve the process for developing water resources policy.
- b. There is a need to strengthen the process for coordinating donor programs.
- c. Development of a common water resource policy among Nile Basin countries.

Other issues were not addressed because of lack of time, or because the group expected they would be addressed separately. It was agreed that in developing the future plans, the IIMI team could cooperate with the Dutch team from Delft Hydraulics which is assisting the Planning Sector; this cooperation is to be coordinated by the Planning Sector.

The plenary session accepted these issues and the priorities proposed.

2. Water Allocation, Distribution and Quality

The small group addressing these issues proposed one overall priority issue on water allocation and distribution, with five supporting points. The issue was stated as follows:

- * Improve the basis and flow of information to and from the field for water distribution and disposal.

The five supporting points are:

Allocation

- a. Demand assessment is presently not very accurate.
- b. There is unaccounted use of drainage and ground water.

Distribution and disposal

- c. Clearer responsibilities to add accountability for improved operation and to counteract interference in operations.
- d. Integration of decision support tools.
- e. Sustainability of the telemetry system operation.

The group suggested four opportunities for obtaining and using information on water distribution and drainage to improve water distribution:

- a. Consider improving staffing, skills and facilities for efficient water distribution according to set-targets at different levels.
- b. Suggest more effective coordination mechanisms between water distribution units of the Ministry and relevant components of the National Water Research Center (NWRC) such as the Drainage Research Institute (DRI), and the Ground Water Research Institute (GWRI).
- c. Consider creating capacity for future sustainability of operations (and maintenance) of telemetry in the private sector.
- d. Need to develop a better mechanism for estimating seasonal shares for each directorate.

On water quality the group did not suggest issues or propose priorities, but suggested three opportunities:

- a. Need for better coordination of information among agencies.
- b. Need for better enforcement of laws on water quality.
- c. Need to improve public awareness regarding water quality problems, and lack of funds for water quality projects.

In presenting this group's proposals, both the General Manager for Water Distribution and the Director for Main System Management spoke about the importance of taking steps to improve water distribution, and to create the conditions which would encourage and enable better use of the telemetry system and other tools. There was broad agreement at the plenary session with these issues and opportunities.

3. Maintenance of the System, and the Irrigation Improvement Project (IIP)

The group dealing with maintenance and IIP proposed one priority issue for maintenance:

- * There is a need to review maintenance technology, organization, funding and specifications.

The group went on to identify five opportunities:

- a. Evaluate and do an inventory of facilities.
- b. Identify, categorize and evaluate current approaches to maintenance (public, private, Preventive Maintenance Program, beneficiaries).
- c. Investigate the potential of the private sector for maintenance of the telemetry and other high technology systems.
- d. Develop an integrated policy for maintenance, including human resources and funding.
- e. Develop technical specifications for how and when to do maintenance.

In its discussion of IIP, the group prioritized three issues as follows:

- a. Need to develop a long-range strategy for the National Irrigation Improvement Program (NIIP).
- b. Identify the future role and sustainability of the Irrigation Advisory Service (for example, integration into Directorate after WUAs established, need to recruit and train new staff continuously).
- c. Study the implications of continuous flow for the operation of the entire system (for example a modeling study).

The group did not discuss opportunities for IIP. Its presentation was not controversial; there seemed to be wide agreement with these issues and opportunities at the plenary session.

4. Decision-Making and Organizational Structure

One single group discussed decision-making and organizational structure, and human resources and personnel management issues.

For decision-making, highest priority was proposed for the following issue:

- * The need for more decentralization of decision-making.

The issue of modifying or broadening participation in the Ministry's committees was given second priority. The latter issue was especially contentious in the plenary session, with many senior officials defending limited participation in key committees by pointing out the participants are those with the most experience.

On organizational structure, the small group suggested the following priorities:

- a. The need for re-examining the overall structure of the Ministry.
- b. Communication and sharing of data among Ministry units.
- c. Re-examining the span of control or duties of senior officials.
- d. The relationship of special projects to regular MPWWR units.

This list does not reflect full agreement among the Workshop participants: many officials feel the current Ministry structure is quite adequate; similarly most senior officials do not see a problem with their wide span of control. Most people do agree that sharing of data among units of the Ministry is a serious problem.

5. Human Resources and Personnel Management

Issues under this heading were prioritized as follows:

- a. The low and sometimes inequitable compensation of Ministry officials.
- b. The problem of staffing numbers, distribution and composition; whether there is a match between Ministry needs, and the number of different types of staff and their distribution geographically and among units.
- c. The need to match training needs to long term career development.

There was general agreement that these issues are indeed important ones.

After ranking the decision-making, organizational structure and human resource issues separately, the small group concluded the overall organization of the MPWWR was the highest priority issue, which underlies the others.

The group then went on to discuss *opportunities* for change. These include:

- a. Review of the status of each Ministry unit.
- b. Converting departments to authorities or even conversion of some units into publicly owned companies.
- c. Privatization of activities.
- d. Training and re-orientation to encourage delegation of decision-making authority.
- e. Cost recovery to increase revenue.
- f. Flexibility in controlling revenues and setting salary scales (linked back to turning units into companies).
- g. Better enforcement of penalties.

6. Research

The small group discussing research gave the highest priority to one issue:

- * making the relationship of the National Water Research Center (NWRC) to other Ministry units more productive.

It gave lower priority, and did not really discuss, the issue of improving cooperation among NWRC units; this was perceived as an internal problem.

The group went on to identify specific opportunities for improvement. The group proposed that NWRC should develop its research plans jointly with the Ministry, linking them to the Ministry's plans and activities; that research outputs and other information should be defined and monitored; and that the budget from the Ministry to NWRC should be allocated on the basis of agreed research plans and budgets.

There was wide agreement at the Workshop on this issue and these possible solutions.

F. EVALUATION

Not surprisingly given both the topic and nature of this Workshop, and the participants being from different organizational units and levels, there was considerable variation in the participants' evaluations compared to the near-universal praise for the first workshop. According to the written anonymous evaluations by participants, the overall level of satisfaction with the content of the workshop scored 3.5 out of five, with a range from one to five. Fifty percent were very satisfied while 35% were moderately satisfied. People liked

the schedule, location and facilities (scores of 4 or more), but were only moderately or somewhat satisfied with the number of days (most wanted more), and participatory facilitation methods (3.75 average, but 70% were very satisfied and 10% moderately so).

Some parts of the draft report generated strong reactions at the workshop, both in the formal sessions and outside. This is also not surprising given the controversial nature of the material and the differences in views among Ministry officials. To a considerable degree, the views of some senior officials differed from those of many of the junior professionals on some important issues (this has been confirmed by informal reactions expressed in meetings after the workshop); and important tensions between some units of the Ministry also surfaced.

Many participants were frustrated by the lack of time to discuss "opportunities for change" (solutions). In his closing remarks the Chairman of the High Coordinating Committee for IMS reiterated this point, suggesting the Workshop should have focused on fewer issues, and given more time for discussing opportunities for improvement. The Workshop organizers had felt that it was more important to come to agreement on what the issues were, and how they should be prioritized as a pre-requisite to discussing solutions. But discussing problems without getting to solutions is naturally unsatisfying and this was expressed clearly.

Finally, several participants noted problems arising from a lack of common understanding and clarity among Ministry officials regarding basic concepts and terms, such as the differences among "research," "planning," and "consulting;" the difference between "policy" and "strategy," the term "institution," and the proper relationship of research, planning and policy-making.

G. CONCLUSION: THE NEXT STEPS

Based on the Workshop results, the IIMI team will completely re-write the draft report and make the revised version available to the Steering Committee for comment and final correction. The final version of the report will be more complete in that it will include more information on Ministry strengths and achievements as well as issues needing attention. It will form an important foundation for the next phase of the Study.

The next phase will involve selecting a number of specific problem areas or topics, and developing detailed action plans for addressing these. Drawing on the results of this Workshop, the IIMI team will make proposals and the Steering Committee will be requested to advise on these and approve them. These plans will specifically focus on how the Ministry can best achieve integration, and make effective use of IMS investments in the future.

The Workshop was a useful exercise both for the MPWWR (as noted by the Chairman of the High Coordinating Committee for IMS in his closing remarks) and for the IIMI team.

APPENDICES

LIST OF WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

Name	Position

MINISTRY -- MEMBERS OF THE <i>STEERING COMMITTEE</i>	
1.Eng. Gamil Mahmoud	Chairman, IMS High Coordinating Committee
2.Dr. Mahmoud Abu Zeid*	Chairman, National Water Research Center
3.Eng. Ali Abu El-Seoud	Senior Undersecretary of the Ministry, & Head of Planning Sector
4.Eng. Ahmed El Sawaf	Head, Irrigation Department
5.Eng. Ahmed Maher	Head, Irrigation Sector
6.Eng. Sarwat Fahmy	Monitoring Office Chief for IMS
7.Eng. Abdel Rahman Shalaby	Head of Central Management for Minister's Office
8.Eng. Yehia Abd El Aziz	Director, Irrigation Improvement Project
9.Eng. Soliman Abu Zeid	Director, Main System Management
MEMBERS OF THE <i>TASK FORCE ON IRRIGATION OPERATIONS</i>	
10.Eng. Hessein Elwan	General Manager of Water Distribution in the Irrigation Sector (Coordinator)
11.Eng. Khaled Bekheit	Irrigation Improvement Project
12.Eng. Mahmoud El-Sayes	Irrigation Department
13.Eng. Tarek Hanafy Selim Kotb	Irrigation Department
14.Eng. Fayek Amin Fareg	Planning Sector
15.Eng. Kamal M. Amer	National Water Research Center
16.Eng. Ragab Abd El Azim	Central Directorate for Water Distribution
17.Eng. Ahmed Abu El Seoud	Main System Management [new member]
OTHER MINISTRY INVITEES	
18.Eng. Kamal Anani	General Manager Project Preparation Department (Coordinator) (Coordinator, Cost Recovery Task Force)
19.Dr. Mohamed Gasser	Professor, NWRC
20.Dr. Bayumi Attia	Chief, Resources & Water Usage Unit, Planning Sector
21.Eng. Zeinab El Garabhy	Director, Preventive Maintenance Project
22.Eng. Refaat Saad Zakher	Deputy Director Water Distribution, Assiut, Irrigation Department
23.Eng. Mosaad El Kakah	Undersecretary, Khafr El Sheikh, Irrigation Department
24.Eng. Abdel Hafeez Shalaby	General Director for Water Distribution, Delta Barrage
25.Eng. Fayza Abu El Magd	General Director for Water Distribution, Lower Egypt

* Dr Abu-Zeid sent his regrets as he had another engagement.

IIMI TEAM

26.Dr. Doug Merrey	Team Leader
27.Dr. Chris Perry	Economist
28.Dr. M S Shafique	Irrigation Engineer
29.Mr. Rodney Vissia	Water Resources Specialist
30.Dr. Jeffrey Brewer	Institutional Specialist
31.Ms. Dian Svendsen	Workshop Facilitator
32.Dr. Khaled M. Abu-Zeid	Workshop Co-Facilitator
33.Dr. A F Metawie	Irrigation Engineer
34.Dr. Fouad El Shibini	Co-Team Leader
35.Dr. Farid A.M. Shosha	Management and Organizational Design Consultant
36.Dr Mohamed M Mohieddin	Sociological-Institutional Analyst
37. Ms Arwa Ali Beshara	Secretary

USAID

38.Dr. Wadie Fahim	Project Officer, IIMI Project, AGR/ILD
39.Mr. Russ Backus	Agricultural Development Officer, AGR/ILD
40.Mr Ray Waldron	Project Officer, AGR/ILD

WORKSHOP AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 19

Evening

7:00-8:30

Introduction

Workshop overview

Purpose

Outcomes

Explanation of the process

Agenda

8:30-10:00

Reception

THURSDAY, APRIL 20

8:30-9:30

Relationship of this Workshop to Vision

9:30-9:45

Overview of Draft Report

PART I TECHNICAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES IN WATER MANAGEMENT

BLOCK 1: Water Resources Planning and Policy-Making

9:45-10:15

Presentation of key issues

10:15-10:30

Coffee break

10:30-11:30

Small group work

11:30-12:30

Small group presentations

12:30-2:00

Lunch

2:00-3:00

Discussion of small group presentations

BLOCK 2: Water Delivery and Drainage, and Control of Detrimental Environmental Impacts

3:00-3:30

Presentation of key issues

3:30-3:45

Coffee break

3:45-5:00

Small group work

FRIDAY, APRIL 21

8:30-8:45	Feedback
8:45-9:45	Small group presentations (five groups)
9:45-10:15	Discussion of small group presentations
10:15-10:30	Coffee break

PART II MANAGEMENT PROCESSES WITHIN THE MPWWR

BLOCK 3: Three parts --

- * *Decision-making and organizational structure*
- * *Human Resource and Personnel Management*
- * *Research*

10:30-11:30	Presentations of key issues
11:30-2:00	<i>Prayers and lunch</i>
2:00-3:00	Small group work
3:00-4:00	Small group presentations
4:00-4:15	Coffee break
4:15-5:30	Discussion of small group presentations

SATURDAY, APRIL 22

8:30-9:00	[Continuation of discussions from yesterday if necessary]
8:30-9:00	Instructions for small group work to give priorities to synthesized issues
9:0-9:30	Small group work
9:30-9:45	Coffee break
9:45-12:00	Small group presentations and discussion in plenary
12:00-12:30	Closing remarks: MPWWR USAID IIMI Evaluation
12:30	Lunch, then departure

OUTPUTS FROM SMALL GROUPS

NOTE: The following are recorded from the flip charts with only minimal editing.

BLOCK 1

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

GROUP 1

ISSUES

1. SHARING DATA WITHIN/BETWEEN MINISTRIES.
2. PLANNING SECTOR ACTIVITIES TO SUPPORT FIELD OPERATIONS MUST BE COLLABORATIVE.
3. PLANNING TOOLS NOT USED FOR LONG-RANGE PLANNING.
4. WATER MASTER PLANNING SHOULD BE UPDATED.
5. RESPONSIBILITIES OF P.S. CHIEF ARE EXCESSIVE.

GROUP 2

PRIORITY

ISSUE

1. CONTINUOUS ACTIVITY OF REVIEWING AND UPDATING DATA, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS AND SCENARIOS OF LONG RANGE PLANS ARE NOT BEING ADEQUATELY DONE, AND PLANNING TOOLS ARE NOT BEING USED EFFECTIVELY FOR WATER RESOURCES PLANNING.
2. SHARING OF DATA AND INFORMATION BETWEEN MINISTRY UNITS AND BETWEEN MINISTRIES FOR WATER RESOURCES PLANNING IS POOR.
3. NO ORGANIZED COORDINATION PROCESS TO INVOLVE OTHER MINISTRIES IN LONG RANGE WATER RESOURCE PLANNING SEEMS TO EXIST.
4. LACK OF AWARENESS WITHIN MPWWR AND OUTSIDE MPWWR CONCERNING THE ACTIVITIES, OUTPUT, AND BENEFITS OF WATER RESOURCES PLANNING EXISTS.
5. WATER RESOURCE PLANNING IS SOMETIMES DONE IN OTHER UNITS OF THE MINISTRY. FOR EXAMPLE, SOME ACTIVITIES OF SRP SUCH AS THE WATER BALANCE STUDIES CAN BE CONSIDERED PLANNING ACTIVITIES, NOT RESEARCH.

GROUP 3

ISSUES

WATER MASTER PLANNING

1. UPDATE PERIODICALLY OR ACCORDING TO CHANGES, CRISIS, ETC.

- MORE INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER MINISTRIES, ORG. AND USERS.
- BETTER USE OF PLANNING TOOLS.
- BETTER SHARING AND FLOW OF DATA AND INFORMATION.

"ABOVE POINTS TO BE INSTITUTIONALIZED".

2. MORE CAPACITY FOR ECONOMIC AND FINANCIAL ANALYSIS IN PPD.

3. PROGRAM PLANNING

- MORE DECENTRALIZATION OF AUTHORITY TO MAKE PLANNING MORE EFFICIENT.

Points from Plenary Session on Water Resources Planning

COMMONALITIES AMONG GROUPS' EFFORTS

- UPDATING MASTER PLAN (NOT IN PRIORITY).
- INVOLVEMENT OF OTHER MINISTRIES.
- SHARING INFORMATION (TOP PRIORITY TOO).
- BETTER USE OF PLANNING TOOLS.
- INVOLVEMENT OF USERS.

OTHER ISSUES

HOW TO IMPROVE DATA QUALITY.

HOW TO IDENTIFY KEY TYPES AND SOURCES OF DATA.

-AGREE ON DATA SOURCES

PLANNING AS A CONTINUOUS PROCESS - CONTINGENCIES.

GROUP 4 - POLICY MAKING

ISSUES

1. AGREEMENT BETWEEN MINISTRIES ON POLICY IS POSSIBLE, BUT IMPLEMENTATION OF THE POLICIES DOESN'T ALWAYS HAPPEN.
2. NEED FOR RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT WATER QUALITY CONTROL PROGRAM.
3. ROLE OF BENEFICIARIES (USERS) IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PROPOSED POLICIES. (AWARENESS AND PARTICIPATION)
4. DEVELOPMENT OF A COMMON POLICY AMONG NILE BASIN COUNTRIES.
5. HOW TO APPLY COST SHARING PROGRAM UNDER THE CURRENT POLITICAL/AND SOCIAL CIRCUMSTANCES.

GROUP 5 - POLICY MAKING

ISSUES

1. WATER RESOURCES POLICIES AND LONG RANGE PLANNING (DEFINITION?!).
2. NO EFFECTIVE PROCESS FOR INVOLVING OTHER MINISTRIES.
3. NO PROCESS FOR PERIODIC REVIEW.
4. NO CLEAR BOUNDARIES BETWEEN PLANNING, RESEARCH AND DECISION-MAKING.
5. POLICY FOR COORDINATING DONOR PROGRAMS.

Points from plenary session on policy-making

ADDITIONAL POLICY ISSUES

IS LONG-RANGE PLANNING SUFFICIENT FOR POLICY-MAKING?

-CLARIFY DEFINITIONS.

NO COMMON TECH. LANGUAGE?

-INVOLVEMENT OF USERS (ALL KINDS) IN POLICY-MAKING.

POLICY ISSUES

COMMONALITIES

-AGREEMENT AMONG + INVOLVEMENT OF MINISTRIES.

DIFFERENCES

-KEY ISSUES BY ONE NOT SEEN AS ISSUES BY OTHER.

BLOCK 2

GROUP 1 - WATER ALLOCATION AND DELIVERY

ISSUES

1-A ALLOCATION

- DIFFICULTIES IN ACCURATE DEMAND ASSESSMENT.
- UNOFFICIAL USE OF DRAINAGE AND GROUNDWATER IS NOT ACCOUNTED FOR.

1-B DISTRIBUTION AND DISPOSAL

- MORE CLEAR RESPONSIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY ARE PREREQUISITES FOR IMPROVED OPERATIONS AND REDUCTION INTERFERENCE.
- DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS INCLUDING TELEMETRY AS WELL AS FLOW MEASUREMENTS ARE NOT ADEQUATELY INTEGRATED INTO OPERATIONS.
- FUTURE SUSTAINABLE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF TELEMETRY SYSTEM.

GROUP 2 - WATER ALLOCATION AND DELIVERY

1-A ISSUES

- DEMAND ASSESSMENT IS INEFFECTIVE.
 - * INCORRECT CROPPING PATTERN.
 - * DATES OF PLANTING AND HARVESTING.
- UNOFFICIAL USE OF DRAINAGE AND GROUND WATER IS NOT ACCOUNTED FOR.
 - * AND ALSO UNOFFICIAL IRRIGATED LAND.

1-B ISSUES

1. INTERFERENCE IN THE DISTRIBUTION AND DISPOSAL (???) SYSTEMS.
- 2.(NEW) LACK OF CAPABLE STAFF TO CARRY OUT WATER DISTRIBUTION.
3. DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS ARE NOT EFFECTIVELY INTEGRATED INTO OPERATIONS. (MSM, MODELS, DISCHARGE).
4. SUSTAINABLE OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF TELEMETRY SYSTEM (RESOURCES).
5. INADEQUACY OF FLOW MEASUREMENTS FOR IRRIGATION AND DRAINAGE.

ALLOCATION AND DELIVERY - ISSUES FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

ACCOUNTABILITY TO WHOM?

- MINISTRY
- USERS

HOW TO ACCOMMODATE USERS' COMPLAINTS AND INTERFERENCE?

IS EGYPT MOVING FROM DEMAND - BASED SYSTEM TO A RATIONING SYSTEM?

ARE TELEMETRY SYSTEMS DATA BEING USED EFFECTIVELY?

- FUTURE COST OF SUSTAINABILITY.

GROUP 3 - WATER QUALITY

ISSUES

- TOO MANY AGENCIES FOR MONITORING WATER QUALITY WITH NO EFFECTIVE COOPERATION.
- NO EFFECTIVE ENFORCEMENT OF W.Q. LAWS.
- LACK OF PUBLIC AWARENESS. REALLOCATION OF GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SECTOR MONEY FOR WATER QUALITY PROJECTS.

WATER QUALITY - ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

HOW DO PROJECTS RELATE TO WATER QUALITY?

- SUGGESTIONS FOR METHODOLOGY FOR MEASURING WATER QUALITY.

CENTRAL POINT IN MINISTRY FOR WATER QUALITY DATA?

- COORDINATION WITHIN MINISTRY: WATER QUALITY DATA.

CONCERN FOR WATER QUALITY VERY BIG - BEYOND MINISTRY.

OPPORTUNITIES

- IMPROVEMENT AND COORDINATION OF WATER QUALITY INFORMATION FLOW WITH PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT AND FUNDING.
- 1. PARTICIPATING AND SHARING OF PUBLIC SECTOR AND NGOS AND ADDING A SUBJECT INTO CURRICULUM ABOUT THE DANGERS OF WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION.
- 2. CONSIDER USE OF DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS FOR A QUICK AND EFFECTIVE WATER QUALITY MANAGEMENT.
- 3. CONSIDER CONDUCTING DETAILED REVIEW OF MONITORING REPORTING AND ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES BY SECTOR UNDER PRESENT LAWS AND PROPOSE AMENDMENTS TO STRENGTHEN THE LAWS AND THEIR ENFORCEMENT.

GROUP 4 - MAINTENANCE

ISSUES

1. NEED FOR GLOBAL INTEGRATED POLICY FOR UPGRADING MAINTENANCE PERFORMANCE; I.E. ADDRESSING PRIVATE SECTOR ROLE, EXTENSION OF PMP, EEC PROJECT, SOCIAL FUND, ETC.
2. NEED FOR TECHNICAL STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR:
 - A) HOW MAINTENANCE IS TO BE DONE, AND
 - B) WHEN MAINTENANCE IS TO BE DONE (TIED TO IRRIGATION PERFORMANCE).
3. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL CONTROL OVER RESOURCES FOR MAINTENANCE.
4. OVEREXCAVATION BY DRAG LINES.
5. ENFORCEMENT OF LAWS PROHIBITING ACTS THAT HARM CANAL, DRAINS AND STRUCTURES.

MAINTENANCE - ISSUES FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION

- * WATER USERS INVOLVEMENT IN MAINTENANCE MANAGEMENT/MONITORING.

GROUP 5 - IIP

ISSUES

1. OPERATIONAL PROBLEMS: IMPLICATIONS OF CONTINUOUS FLOW IN THE ENTIRE SYSTEM.
2. FUTURE ROLE AND SUSTAINABILITY (STAFFING) OF THE IRRIGATION ADVISORY SERVICE.
3. IN WHAT GEOGRAPHIC ORDER SHOULD IIP BE DEVELOPED IN THE COUNTRY (WHAT IS CRITERIA FOR EXPANSION).

IIP - ADDITIONAL ISSUES FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

WHAT ARE SEPARATE BENEFITS OF INDIVIDUAL COMPONENTS?
EXPLORE WAYS TO INVOLVE PRIVATE SECTOR.

IMPLEMENTATION OF BY-LAW

WHERE AND HOW TO EXPAND IIP

-WHICH COMPONENTS?

-MEANS?

-CRITERIA AND STRATEGY.

BLOCK 3

GROUP 1 - RESEARCH

ISSUES

INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL

1. SHARING OF DATA AMONG INSTITUTES AND MINISTRY IS NOT OPTIMUM.

EXTERNAL

2. NWRC BEING PART OF THE MINISTRY, IT SHOULD COMPLY WITH THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE MINISTRY.
3. NWRC DOES NOT HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDS TO DO "BASIC WORK" FOR THE MINISTRY FREE.
4. (BOUNDARIES NOT RESPECTED)
OVERLAP BETWEEN PLANNING SECTOR AND NWRC.
5. NWRC AND NITI NEED BETTER COORDINATION.

INTERNAL

6. COORDINATION AMONG INSTITUTES LACKING.

RESEARCH - FURTHER ISSUES

HOW IS PROGRAM FOR NWRC DEVELOPED? WHO IS INVOLVED?

CONTINUE TO STUDY AND CLARIFY RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NWRC AND MINISTRY.

PUBLICIZE WORK OF NWRC.

WHAT ARE VARIOUS RESEARCH AGENDAS?

WHAT IS THE ACCEPTED RESEARCH AGENDA?

RESEARCH WHEREBY RESEARCH BECOMES POLICY?

LACK OF KNOWLEDGE OF RESEARCHES IN NWRC ABOUT THE
MINISTRY.
(AND OTHER SIDE)

Group 2 - ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

ISSUES:

1. CONSTRAINTS OF THE CURRENT MIX OF DEPTS. AND AUTHORITIES
 - DIFFERENT DEGREES OF AUTONOMY
 - DIFFERENT STYLES OF DECISION MAKING AND COMMUNICATIONS.
 - COORDINATION - INEFFECTIVE
 - MIXTURES OF UNITS ORGANIZED ON FUNCTION BASIS VERSUS PROGRAM BASIS
 - APPROPRIATE STATUS
 - INEFFECTIVE DATA EXCHANGE
2. APPROPRIATE EVALUATION OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL LOCATION OF NEW PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS.
3. VERY WIDE SPAN OF CONTROL AND SUPERVISION OF SOME KEY SENIOR STAFF.

GROUP 3 - DECISION-MAKING AND COMMITTEES

ISSUES

1. LACK OF SUFFICIENT DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY.
2. SUBORDINATES REFER DECISIONS TO SUPERIORS EVEN WHEN THEY HAVE AUTHORITY.
3. LIMITED NUMBER OF DECISION-MAKERS AT ALL LEVELS.
4. INSUFFICIENT INVOLVEMENT OF SUBORDINATES IN DECISION-MAKING.

OTHER ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

DECISION-MAKING

HOW TO BUILD DECISION-MAKING CAPACITY WITHIN MINISTRY.

COMMITTEES

ISSUE

- MANY COMMITTEES CONSIST OF VIRTUALLY THE SAME PEOPLE.
(UNLESS ESSENTIAL TRY TO AVOID THE SAME PEOPLE ON MOST COMMITTEES).
(REVIEW).

GROUP 4 - ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

PROPOSED FOLLOWING FUNCTIONS OF MINISTRY AS BASIS FOR ORGANIZATION:

- * DATA COLLECTION
- * PLANNING
- * DESIGN
- * CONSTRUCTION

- * O & M
- * REGULATORY

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE - ISSUES FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION

THE NON-INVOLVEMENT OF CONCERNED UNITS IN THE DIFFERENT STAGES OF UNDERTAKING SPECIAL PROJECTS.

- RESEARCH, DESIGN, AND IMPLEMENTATION

REVIEW ORGANIZATION BY FUNCTION VERSUS BY PROGRAM

GROUP 5 - HUMAN RESOURCES

ISSUES

1. INCORRECT NUMBER AND DISTRIBUTION OF STAFF FOR EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS.
2. NEED TO LINK JOB ASSIGNMENTS WITH TRAINING EXPERIENCE AND CAREERS FOR SOME POSITIONS WHERE SPECIALIZATION IS BADLY NEEDED, E.G. SHORE PROTECTION, ETC.
3. PAY LEVELS ARE BELOW A LIVING WAGE
4. NEED FOR ADDITIONAL TRAINING PROGRAMS.
5. NEED FOR NON-ENGINEERING AND SKILLS IN THE LIGHT OF CHANGING ROLES AND FUNCTIONS OF MPWWR.