



**Training on Water Governance and International Water Law (IWL)  
for improved transboundary water management in Africa  
5-12 June 2016, Kampala, Uganda**



**Analysis Report 2016**

## **Context**

The *International Water Law in Africa training course* took place at the Hotel Africana, Kampala, Uganda from Monday 6th to Sunday 12th June, 2016.

This International Water Law in Africa training was organised by Global Water Partnership (GWP), together with the African Network of Basin Organisations (ANBO), Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Makerere University, and Centre for Water Law, Policy & Science, University of Dundee (CWLPS). It was a follow up of a successful pilot training course that was held at Botanical Beach Hotel, Entebbe, Uganda 3<sup>rd</sup> – 5<sup>th</sup> August 2015.

The training was led by Dr. Emmanuel Kasimbazi, Chair, Environmental Law Centre, Makerere University and Dr. Alistair Rieu-Clarke, Reader in International Law, Dundee University, with additional facilitators including Ms Angela Klauschen, GWP; Mr. Kidanemariam Jembere, GWP; Mr. Kenge James Gunya, GWP; Ms Lesha Witmer, Special Advisor to WWF; Mr. Fred Mwangi, IGAD; Dr Mara Tignino, University of Geneva; Professor Hamidou Garane, University of Ouaga; Dr Musa Abseno, IWL Consultant, Ethiopia; Professor Richard Paisley, University of British Columbia; Dr Sonja Koeppel, UN Economic Commission for Europe; Dr Alan Nicol, International Water Management Institute; Dr Ali Said Matano, Lake Victoria Basin Commission; Dr John Nyaro, Nile Basin Initiative; Dr Ronald Maymbala-Kakungulu, Makerere University; Prof. Ben Kiromba Twinomugisha, Makerere University and Dr Callist Tindimugaya, Ministry of Water Uganda. These experts represented a broad range of expertise including both academics and practitioners that are active in the development and implementation of international water law across Africa and elsewhere.

The announcement to attend the training was open from 20<sup>th</sup> January to 10<sup>th</sup> March 2016 and attracted over 65 applicants from across institutions in Africa; with 55 ultimately being selected for the training. These applicants came from 28 countries across the African continent. The participants included experts that ranged from mid- to high-level practitioners and professionals who have a role in negotiating, drafting or reforming treaties and legislation (regulation, control), planning, decision-making on transboundary water. These were experts engaged in issues of transboundary water resources management specifically water management/development practitioners in positions to advise, and sometimes even make the decisions affecting transboundary water resources. The participants represented institutions such as government ministries, regional integration organizations, universities, civil society organizations, water companies and consultancies, and donor agencies. Such representation was critical because the participants were in position to contribute to specialized knowledge and experience on water governance in Africa.

## **Objectives**

The training aimed at strengthening capacities of water experts in addressing issues related to transboundary water resources management through enhancing knowledge and skills necessary for promoting cooperation among African countries and also enhancing negotiation skills and resolving transboundary water disputes in Africa.

## **Programme**

Good water governance requires International water law (IWL) which is implemented by people. Effective and coordinated management of transboundary water resources and cooperation across borders are among the major challenges faced by national governments, regional economic bodies and organisations throughout Africa. This is in part due to inadequate capacity within countries and basins in Africa. In order to address this challenge, the training on IWL is essential to provide the tools that will enable transboundary water resources to be managed efficiently, sustainably and equitably.

Thus for IWL to be effective there is a critical need to ensure that those involved in transboundary water resources management (both lawyers and non-lawyers) have a sufficient understanding of its role, relevance and content. This requires a concerted effort to train water resource experts in IWL, and offer enabling platforms whereby experts with different experiences can come together to share lessons learnt. At present, across Africa, like in many other regions of the world, knowledge and understanding of IWL amongst key experts is extremely limited. At the transboundary level, this can often give rise to misunderstandings and tensions between State representatives as they advocate different interpretations of the legal rights and obligations that pertain to transboundary river, lake and aquifer systems; or misrepresent the function of IWL in fostering cooperation between States. Only through advancing a *shared* understanding amongst experts across sovereign borders will IWL be able to effectively contribute to the implementation of good water governance.

In light of the aforementioned challenges, the regional training programme took on the laudable and much needed task of strengthening the capacity of individuals and institutions within countries and basin organisations across Africa to address issues related to the legal aspects of transboundary resources management. In so doing, the programme had two core functions, namely a) to enhance the knowledge and skills of IWL amongst experts working within Africa; and b) to provide a platform whereby those experts can share their practical experiences in the development and implementation of IWL within a particular country and basin contexts.

The programme covered key areas of IWL, including i) the role and relevance of IWL, and its contribution to global policies, such as the Sustainable Development Goals; ii) the key rules and principles that apply to transboundary rivers, lakes and aquifers across Africa; iii) contemporary challenges and good practice in the implementation of IWL across Africa; and iv) negotiation skills. These areas were tackled through series of activities, including lectures, information exchange case studies, group exercises and a field trip. The training was undertaken over seven days. The first four days of the training were dedicated to examination of the role and relevance of IWL, exploring the key legal instruments, studying and understanding IWL's core rules and principles, sharing experiences in the implementation of IWL, and the challenges as well as opportunities therein. The first day set the context. During the day participants were introduced to the international legal system, and the evolution and current status of international water law. The role and relevance of IWL was also set within the broader global water policy context, and in particular, the global commitment to transboundary cooperation under the Sustainable Development Goals.

In addition, participants were introduced to the key findings of the GWP TEC paper, *Promoting effective water management cooperation among riparian nations*. Significant time was then spent examining the main global and regional instruments that apply to transboundary waters across Africa. At the global level, the UN Watercourses Convention and the UNECE Water Convention were studied. As both instruments now operate at a global level, time was spent exploring their similarities and differences, as well as the likely benefits they offer to African states. At the regional level, three regimes were examined, namely the Economic Commission of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development

Community (SADC) and the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). These



regimes, which are at different stages in their evolution, were examined both in terms of their key regional water laws and policies, and the challenges and political constraints that have influenced their implementation. Day one was then concluded by a group exercise whereby participants were asked to reflect on the global and regional instruments, and consider what added value they might offer within

their particular county/ basin contexts.

While the first day, might be seen as setting the context, the second day began to explore the actual content of IWL, and shared experiences of how it was implemented in practice. The day began with a presentation on issues of scope in IWL. Through the presentation and the subsequent Q&A session, key issues of scope were explored. Particular emphasis was placed on the implications of using different terminology, such as shared, transboundary, or international watercourses, and the legal distinction between drainage basins and international watercourses, or the linkages between surface water and groundwater. The difficulties that ambiguity in the use of terms produces was explored through a series of case studies. Additionally, day two explored the main substantive norms of IWL, namely equitable and reasonable utilisation, no significant harm and the protection of ecosystems. A presentation was given that explained the evolution, meaning, current status and relationship between each of these key principles of IWL. This was followed by several participant-led case studies that spoke to the challenges and opportunities of implementing equitable and reasonable utilisation in practice, within the Volta Basin in West Africa, the Awash River in

and between Ethiopia and Djibouti, Lake Chala between Kenya and Tanzania and the Kagera Basin (Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda). The second part of the day was dedicated to an examination of the procedural rules of IWL, which support the implementation of the principle of equitable and reasonable utilisation. Though a couple of lectures and Q&A sessions, key procedural rules were explored, including the duty to cooperate, exchange data and information, notify and consult, transboundary environmental impact assessments, and stakeholder participation.



Group exercise work

The day closed with a group exercise whereby the participants were asked to consider a set of facts and circumstances within a river basin, and seek to make a determination of how the benefits from and uses of water from that river basin might be shared in an equitable and reasonable manner.

The third day continued with the theme of procedural issues. The day commenced with a series of participant-led case studies that illustrated some of the challenges in implementing procedural aspect of IWL in Rwanda (national masterplans), the Mara Basin (joint monitoring networks of Kenya and Tanzania), Orange-Senqu (ecosystem infrastructure schemes), and the Save River Basin (e-flow requirements between Zimbabwe and Mozambique). Moving on from procedural aspects, the programme then explored the closely associated topic of joint institutional arrangements. This involved an overview of the different types of joint institutional arrangements that exist, which drew from the significant wealth of experience gained from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) International Waters funded project on *International Water Governance*. A practical example of how institutional arrangements support the development and implementation of IWL was then given through the case study of the UNECE Water Convention, and the 20 years of experience thereunder. This was then followed by the example of the experiences in managing Lake Victoria via the East African Community's Lake Victoria Protocol. Drawing again from the experience of East Africa, the history of cooperation and future prospects for the Nile Basin Initiative as also presented. An additional element of the third day was to explore the role of non-State actors in the development and implementation of IWL. This was done through two presentations that explored human rights within an African transboundary water context, and a more overarching presentation that examined the different legal frameworks that provide a role for non-State actors in the management of transboundary waters. Day three also provided participants with the opportunity to apply the procedural rules and principles of IWL through a role-play group exercise.

The fourth day continued with the theme of implementation through a series of presentations from the facilitators and participants. The day started with an exploration of the different dispute settlement mechanisms that are available to ensure that states settle their differences in a peaceful manner. Practical insights in dispute avoidance and settlement were then offered through a series of case studies that addressed, women's access to water within a transboundary context, transboundary water cooperation in post-conflict countries, fostering cooperative dialogues in Lake Edward between communities and government agencies of DR Congo and Uganda, insights from the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (by the Executive Secretary, Dr Ally-Said-Matono), and insights from the Nile Basin Initiative (by the Executive Secretary Dr John Nyaro). An additional series of presentations explored the interface between legal arrangements at international level and national/domestic law and institutions. These presentations dealt the topic in general, whilst also providing practical experiences from the Incomati and Maputo River Basins, Mozambique, and stakeholder engagement in the Nile Basin. Finally, the fourth day featured a case study on transboundary aquifers, with particular reference to the Northern Western Sahara and North-Western Sahara Aquifer System between Algeria, Libya and Tunisia.



Participants at Bujagali Dam

The fifth day of the training workshop provided the participants with an opportunity to see IWL in practice, and network with colleagues in a more relaxed setting. The main sites that were visited during the field trip included the Bujagali Hydropower Dam, the Nalubaale



Hydropower (formally known as Owen Falls) Dam and the source of the Nile. Both dams are situated on the Nile River just downstream Lake Victoria. The aim of the visit was to understand how concerns of other countries in the Nile Basin are taken into account and get to know how the monitoring arrangements and dam operation mechanisms are addressed.

During the construction of Owen Falls Dam, the Colonial government (Britain) together with Ugandan and Egyptian technicians measured Lake Victoria levels at Jinja and lake outflow over Rippon Falls into river Nile (1947-1954). These measurements were used to establish a relationship between the Lake Victoria level and the outflow, now called the *Agreed Curve* (AC), and became condition for destruction and submergence of Rippon falls. Uganda uses Lake Victoria as a reservoir for Hydropower generation. Considering the increasing interest on Lake Victoria and the Nile river by the Nile riparian states and the developments already made and planned, Uganda government established sustainable release model and associated regulation limits of the lake based on Agreed Curve and this is enforced through Water Abstraction Permits issued to hydropower operators. Hydropower operators are required to release water as stated in the Water Permits and measure water levels and submit data to the Ministry of Water every 10 days. Ministry of Water also has its own monitoring station at Jinja to monitor water level for use and closely monitors the operations of the dams.

At both Bujagali and Nalubaale dam sites, participants were able to gain first-hand knowledge of the technical and operational aspects of the dams from the site managers; and also to ask questions about their evolution, issues of state cooperation in their development, and their impact on the ecological and social environments in which they are situated. Participants subsequently learnt about the notification and consultation arrangements that are carried out with other Nile basin states. The final part of the field trip took the participants to the source of the Nile near Jinja.



Participants preparing for the negotiation exercise

The last two days of the workshop were dedicated to negotiation skills training. This part of the training was initiated through a series of presentations by the facilitators that explained key theoretical approaches and strategies related to the negotiation of transboundary cooperation, as well as some practical experiences that the facilitators offered from their first-hand knowledge of being involved in, or fostering, negotiation between states on transboundary issues within Africa (Nile), South-East Asia (Mekong), North America (Columbia) and Central Asia (Aral Sea). The participants were then asked to break into groups and conduct several small exercises that were designed to get them to start thinking about interest-based negotiations. This led to a more detailed exercise where the participants were required to represent different positions in a series of negotiation rounds. The exercise, as with all other group exercises, culminated in the groups reporting back on their experiences and lessons learnt. An additional element of the negotiation training in the last two days was to consolidate the knowledge and understanding that the participants had

gained during the first previous days of the training. In other words, through the negotiation exercises the participants were able to structure their arguments in line with the key rules and principles of IWL, and to apply those rules and principles to the facts as presented in the case study.

### **Feedback from the workshop**

Feedback from this 1<sup>st</sup> IWL Africa training workshop was gained through a variety of means. Firstly, a meeting was held amongst some of the facilitators at the end of the workshop. A number of useful suggestions were generated, including:

- **Time management:** This could be improved by having less presentations and more time allocated to questions. The role of the Chairs was seen as also very important in this regard, as they should be very strict in terms of the time allotted to each of the presentations, group exercises, etc.
- **Group exercises:** these were seen as a very positive feature of the training. The facilitators felt that the use of group exercises could be enhanced in a couple of ways. Firstly, more use could be made of group exercises, with a rule of thumb being that there should be at least one group exercise for each day of the training. Secondly, and related to the first point, the group exercises on negotiation skills could be better integrated into the early days of the programme so that the participants were learning about negotiation and IWL in an incremental and integrated manner.
- **Facilitators:** while the facilitators represented different backgrounds and experiences, a gender balance, and a mix of international and African facilitators, more could be done to improve the number and role of African facilitators in the training. In particular, there felt to be a need to identify African women who have expertise in IWL, and its implementation. This is a challenge given the lack of experts in general, but the training should be seen as an opportunity to develop such skills and expertise. Participants in previous workshop or similar training events, such as the Dundee IWL workshop, might be approached.
- **Materials:** The participants were given a range of materials, although not all were available in hard copy, or in both English and French. The development of bespoke training materials might be considered to ensure that one text(book) could be used to cover the entire syllabus. This could then be available on-line and accessible to both past, present and potential participants.
- **Diversity of participants:** The diversity of the participants was seen as a positive thing but it did raise challenges. A key challenge was that the participants were arriving at the workshop with different levels of knowledge in IWL and transboundary water issues. More might therefore be done to level the playing field before participants attended the workshop. This could be assisted by the development of bespoke materials for the course, which might include an online module /MOOC that the participants take prior to the workshop and perhaps even prior to receiving funding to attend. An additional advantage of such an approach would be that it would make the face-to-face time more efficient with the facilitators able to skip basic issues and focus more on advanced IWL issues, and interactive discussion.
- **Participant case studies:** the participant case studies were evaluated favourably and seen as an important means by which the group could exchange experiences. However, it was noted that there was significant diversity in the quality and focus of

each of the presentations. More could therefore be done to work with the participants in advance of the workshop to ensure that the presentations were focused and of a high quality. Such an interaction would offer an additional learning opportunity associated with the training, and would potentially allow the case studies to be packaged and disseminated more widely following the event. The idea of having poster sessions dedicated to the participant case studies was also suggested as a useful means by which to exchange experience and foster good interaction amongst the group.

- **Field trip:** the field trip was viewed favourably as a means by which to foster greater interaction amongst the group and to learn about some of the practical aspects of IWL through Uganda hydropower projects on the Nile. However, it was felt that the participants could have benefitted much more from the field trip if an explanation of the legal issues associated with the field trip sites had been given prior to, rather than after the visit.
- **Capitalising on the training:** the facilitators were very impressed with the group of participants, and the collective experience and interests that they represent. It was therefore felt that effort should be put into capitalising on the training, and making sure that it was not just seen as a one off. Two broad opportunities to address this point were seen as advantageous. Firstly, thought should be put into establishing a network of alumni that could then continue to collaborate and share experiences with each other, as well as support the future development of the workshop. Secondly, the facilitators considered whether the workshop might act as a catalyst to allow experts to continue to deepen their knowledge and understanding of IWL and the practical issues associated with its implementation. This might involve enhancing the training through University accreditation, e.g. via Makerere University, and/or offering additional courses (both physical and on-line), that could lead to a postgraduate certificate, diploma or masters.
- **Themes:** another suggestion from the facilitators was to consider having different themes for future IWL training. Themes that were proposed included, water and infrastructure (especially transboundary hydropower), ecosystem protection and water, stakeholder participation in IWL, transboundary aquifers and the sustainable development goals.

A second opportunity to solicit feedback was taken at the end of the training, where some time was dedicated to a group exercise that asked the participants to reflect on what they enjoyed most about the training and what they felt might be improved. This yielded a further set of useful insights. The aspects of the training that the participants thought were good included:

- The high quality of the presentations
- The high quality of the facilitators and their international experience
- The way in which the course was structured and the different topics covered, including the exploration of the UN Watercourses Convention, the UNECE Water Convention and the regional cooperative arrangements.
- Their newly accrued knowledge of IWL
- The accessibility of the topic, especially to the non-lawyers
- The negotiation exercises and group discussion
- The case studies that reflected experiences from different countries both within Africa and elsewhere
- The interpreters
- The quality of the hotel [opinion differed on this point – see below]
- The diversity of the participants in terms of geography, expertise and backgrounds



- The usefulness of the materials [again, see more specific comments below]
- The opportunity the course provided to network with colleagues
- The location of the course in Africa where there is a need for more training.

In terms of areas of the IWL training that could be improved, a number of points were identified:

- Increase the number of interactive ways by which to present the materials, such as through poster presentations and photo galleries.
- The lack of internet access at the venue [this was seen as both positive and negative (e.g. distraction)]
- Need to involve more experts from civil society organisations.
- Need to have follow-up activities from the training, such as an alumni network that can keep in touch and continue to share experiences/ collaborate.
- The logistics and communication could be improved.
- The material should be distributed prior to the workshop, if hardcopies of training materials are made available there should be enough for everyone.
- Materials should be easily accessible and all materials available in French and English. Presentations should also be translated.
- Time management could be improved so that presentations do not run over, etc. Having less presentations in each session would assist with this, and there should be more time allocated for questions.
- More capacity building and case studies on negotiation vis-à-vis IWL.
- Too much focus on the Nile experience, bring in more on other basins such as Congo and Lake Chad.
- Some of the case studies overlapped.
- More time should be spent introducing each of the participants so that the group has a good understanding of each other's background, interests and expectations for the training.
- Consider rotating the workshop around Africa.

A third means to gain feedback was through a short questionnaire. 17 feedback forms were received from the participants following the event. The questionnaire asked a series of questions whereby the participants were requested to respond by using the measure agree, neutral or disagree.

All the participants that completed the questionnaire agreed that the course was interesting and professionally relevant.

Most participants agreed that the course materials were useful, although two of the respondents were neutral on this point. One felt the materials were not tailored sufficiently to the content of the workshop; and the other requested more hardcopies of the materials to be available.

Most participants agreed that the presentations were clear, although two respondents gave neutral feedback. Two similar comments suggested that while generally clear, some of the presentations could be improved.

In terms of the duration of the course, the respondents were split between those that felt it was too short (8), and those that felt it was just right (7). A couple of respondents felt that it would help if there was a break in the middle of the training, e.g. ½ day social outing.

On the question of whether there should be more courses of this kind all the respondents, except one agreed. One respondent suggested that there should be more advanced follow-up

training, whilst another made a similar comment that there should be a focus on training the trainers.

The majority of respondents felt that the facilities were adequate, although six respondents were neutral on this point. Also, the majority of the respondents agreed that the organisation of the training was adequate.

The questionnaire asked a series of more open questions. The first of these questions was whether there were areas that should be dealt with in more depth in future courses. Responses to this question included:

- More case studies related to the Nile River basin
- Produce training materials on the theoretical and general parts, which could then be illustrated with case study examples
- More of an introduction to the international legal system
- Explore the content of the two global water conventions in more detail
- The role of national institutions in the implementation of agreements on transboundary waters, including examples of best practice.
- More contributions from Prof. Ben Kiromba Twinomugisha, Makerere University
- Additional case studies on the Gambia River Basin, the Zambezi Basin, the Congo.
- More focus on how you take the knowledge and understanding of IWL and apply to existing work
- More explanation of treaty validity.
- Learn more from experts with practical experiences in mediation and negotiation
- The legal status of colonial agreements
- Negotiation skills within IWL frameworks
- Review of various pieces of legislation: global, regional and country levels.

The participants were asked to suggest additional themes and topics that could be addressed in future workshops. The responses to this question included the following suggestions:

- Climate change
- Water disputes and their resolution
- Sustainable development
- Multi-stakeholder engagement and facilitation
- Treaty negotiations, including best practice and political aspects
- Procedures for amending IWL
- Water stewardship and IWL
- Protocols on data and information sharing, and joint monitoring
- Application of IWL in Nile Basin Countries

Suggestions on how the training might be improved were then requested from the participants. A summary of the responses is as follows:

- Extending the workshop to two weeks but have a free day in the middle.
- Introduce panel sessions and more time for questions
- Improve the communication between organisers and participants (before, during and after)
- Ensure all materials are translated into English and French
- Participants share knowledge of how their work relates to IWL
- Increase number of case studies
- Ensure materials are sufficient and provide individual package of materials for each participant in advance.
- Improve time-keeping of facilitators, and more instruction of facilitators beforehand

- Introduce innovative ways to present content, e.g. posters, gallery walk through.
- Start day with feedback on lessons learnt from previous day.
- Speakers to not cover too much content and to speak slowly.

Participants were also asked if they found the field trip beneficial and all the respondents agreed it was useful. In terms of improvement, some suggestions included, visiting the Ministry of Water, improving the time management, spending more time at the source Nile, and having a briefing prior to the trip that links the sites to the theme of the training.

Participants were then asked to comment specifically on the negotiation exercise that was conducted as part of the training. Most respondents viewed the negotiation exercise very favourably. Suggestions for improvement included making sure all the facilitators were fully briefed on the exercise beforehand, that materials were available in French and English, and that participants contributed to the design of the simulation exercise in order to contextualise it into their own experience.

A further question posed through the questionnaire related to the translation that was provided during the training. Most respondents felt this was reasonable. Some areas to consider for improvement included briefing the translators on the presentations beforehand, and ensuring that the speakers do not talk too quickly.

Finally, the questionnaire asked whether there were additional comments that the respondents would like to make. Below is a summary of the main comments:

- Improve the integration of francophone participants
- Develop an alumni network of participants, possibly managed through GWP or IGAD.
- Send reading materials well in advance of the training
- Improve the venue and facilities
- Run more courses of this kind
- Improve social and cultural events
- Improve the logistics and communication
- Publish best papers and case studies

## **Recommendations**

The experience gained from this first workshop, as well as the invaluable feedback gained from both the facilitators and the participants offer a solid basis to make a number of recommendations for the future. Below is a summary of key recommendations, which draw upon on the key messages coming out of the various feedback noted above.

### Course content

The participants found the topic of the course very interesting and highly relevant. The mix of more theoretical aspects of IWL, and the practical challenges in its implementation was also appealing. It would therefore not make any sense to radically change the focus, content and structure of the course. However, a number of minor improvements might be considered, including:

- A better integration of the negotiation skills aspect of the workshop into the entire programme
- Consider themes for each year, which might be tied to the field trip, e.g. hydropower, ecosystem protection, transboundary aquifers, stakeholder engagement, basin commission, etc.
- Better integrate the field trip into the training themes, and ensure that the participants are fully briefed on the field trip in advance.

### Course delivery

In terms of course delivery, a number of aspects might be considered in order to strengthen the effectiveness of the training, including:

- **Targeted materials:** Develop a bespoke set of materials, e.g. textbook, case studies, lecture notes, handouts, that could be used for the training and sent to the participants in advance of the training. Ensure that these materials are translated into French and English.
- **Front-end the training:** The inclusion of different participants from different sectors, including the media, was important and worked well. Such diversity generated a great resource, and allowed stakeholders coming from different perspectives to better understanding each other. However, it meant that there was considerable diversity in terms of the knowledge and understanding of IWL amongst the group. In order to address this, participants might be requested to conduct core reading (e.g. the aforementioned textbook), and perhaps complete an online exam/ quiz, which covers the basics elements of IWL. This would then help keep the duration of the training short but ensure that all participants are at a similar level of knowledge and understanding.
- **Better time management:** Make sure that sufficient time is allocated to each session, and that presenters and chairs are strict with their time keeping. Ensure that there is plenty of time for questions, and that there is at least one group exercise every day, preferably after the lunch break. Providing more time for group exercises would also be beneficial.
- **More African facilitators:** The training organisers made a concerted effort to increase the number of facilitators from Africa. This worked well and might be an area that could be developed further in the future. There are a number of well-known experts in IWL in both Africa and the rest of the world that might be approached in order to contribute to the training. In particular, it would be good to target women IWL experts from Africa.
- **Consider course duration and online provision:** The training duration should be revisited. As noted above, ensuring that the participants are more prepared prior to the training would help make the time more efficient. This might mean that the more introductory aspects of the training could be skipped. A degree of on-line provision, e.g. webinars, might also be explored in order to make the face-to-face time more efficient.
- **Make better use of the case studies:** The participants come to the training with a wealth of experience, which was partially captured through the presentation of case studies. However, more could be done to strengthen this aspect of the training / knowledge sharing. Case studies could be prepared well in advance and then reviewed by the facilitators. A template might also be developed to help focus the case studies. Following the event, these case studies might be packaged and disseminated through the GWP website. An additional way in which to share the case studies amongst the group would be to require participants to develop them as posters, and have a poster session during the training. This might also act as a useful means to which to foster interaction amongst the group.

#### Course organisation and facilities

- **The venue and the facilities for the training might be revisited.** While the original plan was to host the training at Makerere University that proved to be difficult. Hosting the training in Entebbe might prove to be the best option for future events, given that GWP East Africa is based there, as well as Nile Basin Initiative, Lake Victoria Basin Commission, Nile Basin Discourse and the Ministry of Water. Entebbe might allow for a smoother transfer of participants from the airport. Another option to be explored is to rotate the training among Makerere University, University of

Nairobi and Addis Ababa University until a permanent venue at a university is determined.

- **Ensure clarity on invited facilitators and organisation of content:** An advantage of the training is that the key institutions involved can draw upon their networks in order to bring in high quality facilitators. However, one person should take overall responsibility for this process in order to ensure that there is clarity regarding who has been invited to act as a facilitator, what subjects they might cover, and whether or not they have confirmed. This should be done well in advance of the dates. GWP will take a lead as this also relates to contractual arrangement for the facilitators and there is need to balance the number of international (outside Africa) with those African based facilitators as well as assigning equal roles.

#### Next steps

- **Consider accreditation of the training course:** in order for the participants to benefit further from the training in terms of their career development, it would be worth exploring whether the training might be given some form of academic accreditation, perhaps through Makerere University or other institutions such as UNITAR. GWP has had its WACDEP training on the Economics of Climate Change Adaptation accredited by UNITAR, a similar approach might follow for the IWL training.
- **Provide opportunities for the participants to continue to learn:** Especially if the training could gain accreditation, the workshop might provide one module, that could then be built upon in order to gain a postgraduate certificate, diploma or masters in water law and policy. Opportunities for one University, or a consortium of Universities to offer such modules (both physical and online) might be explored, together with the interest of potential donors to support such an endeavour.
- **Develop and maintain an alumni platform:** a platform, such as a linked-in site or Facebook page, might be established in order to allow the participants to keep in touch following the training, and therefore to continue to collaborate and share experiences.
- **Improve collaboration with related initiatives and institutions:** the potential to increase the collaboration with other institutions and initiatives that are working on IWL related activities across Africa should be explored. Such institutions and initiatives might include GEF IW Projects, Green Cross International, UNESCO-IHP, UNEP, SADC, ECOWAS, GIZ, SIWI, IWMI, IUCN's Environmental Law Programme. Such institutions and initiatives might be willing to offer experts as facilitators and/or share case studies.
- **Develop a training manual for International Water Law in Africa:** The training manual on international Water Law in Africa aimed to provide the readers and participants with practical and "learner-centered" training materials on international water law issues in Africa should be developed. The manual should focus on African international water law and policy education as well as on negotiation and dispute resolution training. Further, the manual should aim at informing both lawyers and non-lawyers in dealing transboundary water issues.
- **Training of Trainers Course:** There is need to have a Training of Trainers course. The aim of the course will be to prepare facilitators of future courses by building on and enhancing past learning experiences, building and maintaining ownership within



Africa and enhancing technical expertise in International Water Law at the African regional level.