

Practitioner Input Form
Submitted: 15/02/2005

Input Record Number	014
Name	Bruce Lankford Barbara van Koppen Henry Mahoo
Contact Information	b.lankford@uea.ac.uk b.vankoppen@cgiar.org hmahoo10@yahoo.co.uk
Organisation(s) Involved	UEA (School of Development Studies), Sokoine University of Agriculture (Soil Water Management Research Group), Tanzania, and International Water Management Institute (IWMI)
Geographic Area	Sub-Saharan Africa, RIPARWIN = Raising Irrigation Productivity and Releasing Water for Intersectoral Needs. A DFID project.
Dates	2001-2005
Communities Involved	The Great Ruaha river, in Southern Tanzania has six main water resource users from upstream to downstream can be differentiated here: 1) Rainfed farmers and domestic water users in the high catchment, 2) Irrigators in the plains at the base of the escarpment, 3) Domestic users and rain-fed maize cultivators on the plains, 4) Pastoralists and fisher-people in the central wetland, 5) Wildlife and tourists to the Ruaha National Park that surrounds the riverine reach, and 6) The Mtera/Kidatu hydropower schemes. The document here relates to irrigation water rights and intakes found on the Usangu Plains of the Great Ruaha river.
Duties and Responsibilities/ Purpose of Project	DFID/IWMI-funded 'Raising Irrigation Productivity and Releasing Water for Inter-sectoral Needs' project aims to continue to study the role of irrigation efficiency and productivity in releasing water for inter-sectoral needs. The main partners in this collaborative research are Sokoine University of Agriculture, the Overseas Development Group of the University of East Anglia, and the International Water Management Institute. The project is also studying water conflict, environmental water needs and institutional frameworks related to water management.
Context of Intervention	Irrigation, Inter-sectoral allocation, conflict-resolution, formal and informal water rights, irrigation intake technological change.

Practitioner Reflective Case Study

Input Record Number	014 RCS Bruce Lankford
<p>1) Irrigation access and performance was supposed to be improved via the construction of concrete intake replacing traditional construction (so called irrigation improvement projects handled under the World Bank funded RBMSIIP project). Alongside this, was the implementation of formal water rights designed to provide a volumetric water right that was paid for. This was in keeping with new water rights legislation, funded by the World Bank. RBMSIIP = river basin management and smallholder improvement project.</p> <p>2) As documented in (van Koppen B, Sokile, Hatiby N C, Landford, B A, Mahoo H and Yanda P, (2004) <i>Formal Water Rights in Tanzania: Deepening the Dichotomy?</i> Working Paper 71. Columbo, Sri Lanka; International Water Management Institute), the water rights and new intake technology failed to ensure improved access to water. Briefly this was because the rights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">→ Failed to recognize the swings in water supply, due to rainfall and seasonality.→ Could not be tied to actual water taken, because no measuring structures were in place.→ Were not related to the actual discharge capacities of the new intakes→ Were not related to the demand of irrigation systems.→ Were not, when cumulatively added to other water rights, related to the overall supply in the river system.→ Could not be guaranteed by the Government in any shape of form.→ Could not be requested and 'bought' by those who could not abstract water – therefore, fisher-people and cattle keepers who used in-stream water could not apply for a right. <p>3) Much greater incidence of water related stress and conflicts arising, greater observation of requests for conflict resolution to the basin water authority. Also recorded in the Pangani basin.</p> <p>4) Problem focussed, grounded water research building on real needs of local community, and ensuring that adopted ideas from the lexicon and discourse of IWRM are fully tested and explored by a number of local and outside water professionals and users before being applied.</p>	

Practitioner Input – Part II

Input Record Number	0014II Bruce Lankford
9)	<p>We continue to work closely with our main client the Rufiji Basin Water Office in order to steer some of their work to address water problems that apply to resource-poor users. In particular, we are hopeful of addressing the impacts of recent irrigation improvement projects and water rights legislation by reviewing these two items in the light of a new possible donor project to bring them in line and to tie them to the real needs of the local communities. A possible approach to this reconciliation of technology and water rights was covered by Lankford B A and Mwaruvanda W, 2005. A framework to integrate formal and informal water rights in river basin management. In; International workshop on ‘African Water Laws: Plural Legislative Frameworks for Rural Water Management in Africa’, 26-28 January 2005, Gauteng, South Africa, See:</p> <p>http://www.nri.org/waterlaw/AWLworkshop/papers.htm#LANKFORD</p> <p>For background reading, please see:</p> <p>Van Koppen B, Solile, Hatibu N C, Landford B A, Mahoo H and Yanda P (2004) <i>Formal Water Rights in Tanzania: Deepening the Dichotomy?</i> Working Paper 71. Columbo, Sri Lanka; International Water Management Institute.</p>
10)	<p>Not in this explicit way (and not sure what a mechanism of access is??)</p>
11)	<p>We have found that the role-playing game title ‘The River Basin Game’ works very well in the instance. It is a two-day workshop designed to get water users to talk to other water users to explore impacts of projects, and pathways and mechanisms to solve water problems. It has been trialled three times in Tanzania and seems to work very well. See this link:</p> <p>www.iwmi.cgiar.org/Africa/files/RIPARWIN/05/downloads/Fact-The River Basin Game Factsheet.doc</p>
12)	<p>Further research with communities, possibly using the river basin game.</p>
13)	<p>Integrated water resource management in Tanzania: Interface between informal and formal water institutions (Charles Sokile, Willy Mwaruvanda, and Barbara</p> <p>http://www.nri.org/waterlaw/AWLworkshop/papers.htm#SOKILE</p> <p>van Koppen B, Sokile, Hatiby N C, Lankford B A, Mahoo H, and Yanda P, (2004) <i>Formal Water Rights in Tanzania: Deepening the Dichotomy?</i> Working Paper 71. Columbo, Sri Lanka; International Water Management Institute.</p>

Lankford B, Sokile C, Yawson D, and Léville L, 2004. The River Basin Game: A Water Dialogue Tool, Working Paper 75. Columbo, Sri Lanka; International Water Management Institute.

Lankford B A, van Koppen B, Franks T, and Mahoo H 2004. Entrenched views or insufficient science? Contested causes and solutions of water allocation; insights from the Great Ruaha River Basin, Tanzania. *Agricultural Water Management*, 69:2 pp 135-153.

Lankford B A, 2004. Irrigation Improvement projects in Tanzania; Scale Impacts and Policy Implications. *Water Policy*, 6(2), pp 89-102.

Tanzania – River Basin Management and Smallholder Irrigation Improvement Project Document Type: Staff Appraisal Report.

http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDS_IBankServlet?pcont=details&eid=0000009265_3961029231024