FRACTAL
FUTURE RESILIENCE FOR AFRICAN CITIES AND LANDS

City Governance Dialogue and Talanoa Dialogue Report

Lusaka, Zambia | August 2018

FUTURE CLIMATE FOR AFRICA

UKaid from the British people

NERC SCIENCE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

Governance Dialogue

The Governance Dialogue was held in Lusaka to discuss the findings of research undertaken in 2017 by the FRACTAL project (Future Resilience for African Cities and Lands).

FRACTAL IN LUSAKA - BRIEF OVERVIEW

An overview of the FRACTAL project was given by Dr. Gilbert Siame from the University of Zambia. He explained the activities that had been undertaken since the inception of the project in 2016. There have been several engagements in the city of Lusaka. These have included four learning labs, one city dialogue on water resources, and research on decision-making and climate change in the water and energy sectors in Lusaka. He explained that the project was focusing on getting climate information to decision-makers at a city level.

TERMINOLOGY SESSION

The programme then began with a session on terminology that is commonly used so that participants all had a similar understanding.

An innovative method was used by the team to unpack challenges around key climate change terms. During the Lusaka Dialogue, the participants were divided into two groups to unpack the challenges linked to: **climate versus weather** and **governance versus sustainability versus resilience versus vulnerability**. These complex terms were written on larger pages with many activities/impacts/interventions being written on smaller pages. Participants began to align the smaller pages with the bigger themes. Discussion then occurred around the specific placement of the smaller pages with the facilitator supporting capacity building.

Terminology activities

Participant examples of confusing words: justice, equity, accountability, democracy, adaptation, mitigation.

Confusing words discussed in the exercise: (1) **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)** (2) **Adaptation** (3) **Mitigation:** Water reclamation (LWSI representative, this is one way of mitigating an expected situation) (4) **Development**.

Mitigation in the climate change sphere is about GHG reductions. DRR is about short-term risk mitigation (e.g. flood monitoring). Adaptation takes a longer view of vulnerability (e.g. flood defence infrastructure).

NGOs, civil society, the private sector and multi-stakeholder platforms cross-cut all four and are bound to be misconstrued. Terms need to be precise when talking to communities and it is sensible to avoid the broader, more ambiguous terms.

Discourses (language) of different domains e.g. pro-growth development. Neoliberal discourse against social justice discourse.

Confusing words discussed in exercise: (1) **Weather** (2) **Climate**

Weather is the atmospheric conditions. Short time-scales. What you see. Climate is longer-term, maybe over 20-30 years using statistics. Many cards were moved from weather to climate using the "long-term" characteristic of climate. Discussion about variables in the middle. Prevailing easterly wind moved to climate as it is an "expectation".

Heatwaves are seasonal – they may last for weeks, days or months. Quiet group. Average daily wind speed caused debate. Average wind speed today is weather. Average (expected) daily wind speed is a variable in between weather and climate as it can be short-term or long-term.

Adaptation is managing longer-term expectations, whereas DRR is about managing short-term risk which pertains to weather extremes. We don't need to adapt to the weather (flooding) in the Western Province, but climate adaptation might be necessary over a longer time period. This might be moving farmland away from newly flood-prone areas to higher ground. Using the climate risk narratives to deal with uncertainty. You can test what adaptation responses would work in each scenario.

"The language is hard for me to understand, what about people on the ground?" Need to share the language for others. Need to understand this for our plans.

Key points raised from the **climate versus weather** group:

- Activities related to wind speed, temperature and rainfall were often incorrectly placed;
- Advice given to the participants was centred around the need to have a timescale attached to the variable;
- A discussion then occurred which linked directly to "making climate real" – participants asked for clarity on how they could do this effectively.

Key points raised from the **governance** group:

- The exercise was being run with a climate change lens. Therefore, although some activities could be seen as mitigation or disaster risk reduction they may be incorrectly placed if not positioned by a climate adaptation expert. It was then communicated that this is not wrong, but rather that all have different understandings of terminology and this needs to be understood.
- A discussion then occurred around "coping' and "adaptation' in which it was made clear that climate change information is at the heart of adaptation.
- Quote – "the way we phrase something affects policies"

SEASONAL FORECASTING SESSION

The terminology session was followed by a role playing skit, steered by Dr. Chris Jack from the University of Cape Town.

Role play

Chris, Jess and Max – short role play of seasonal forecast information being sent via Whatsapp. Information about El Niño and drier conditions being shared informally between individuals and how these or what these individuals would use it for.

Introduction from Chris: What decisions are you taking? Who would you share it with? For what purposes? How? Thinking back to the issue and actor mapping from previous Learning Labs we need to decide which institutions we're going to look at here?

The institutions that were listed included:

- Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company
- National Water and Sanitation Council
- Met Office
- University of Zambia
- Lusaka City Council
- The Media
- Lusaka Water Security Initiative
- Slum Dwellers Association
- Ministry of National Planning, where a secretariat on Climate Change was coordinating the planning and implementation process – the institution was setting standards, building public awareness and sharing information at a national scale

Feedback was given from the different institutions (see responses below).

LuWSI

The group reported that they would first identify who has the information and assess who is likely to be affected. They would also map out the key decision makers in the city. LuWSI would then call a meeting of the collaborators within secretariat and schedule an emergency meeting.

The group also proposed that they could form a task team that feed into the task team on community engagement. It was also mentioned that there isn't a representative from the Ministry of Lands in the LUWSI secretariat. It was also suggested that there was a need to bring in more of the community voice and civil society organizations.

A brief was done on the proposed Lusaka Water Action and Investment Plan. The meeting was informed that a plan was being developed with Lusaka City Council leading the community engagement process. A task team was set up within LuWSI to identify who is not in LuwSI, who is important and who can be brought in.

The role of LuWSI is to coordinate activities and awareness raising. Also to leverage resources and support Lusaka water and sewerage company to take action as well as avoid duplication of activities. LuWSI aims to have a coherent and coordinated approach and share expertise.

National Water and Sanitation Council

NWASCO reported that they would communicate to the utilities regarding water demand management plans and the minimum level of service they need to provide. They would implement:

- Rationing plans
- Water restriction programmes: red/amber/green
- Alternative water plans

In an extreme case, they would implement a complete restriction to non-essential users as well as send out messages to the public: the institution would prepare society and stakeholders on water conservation and being water wise. They would sensitize their companies to expect lower sales and lower revenues which would then limit them in meeting their financial obligations. Cost control mechanisms would have to be implemented. The Ministry of Health would have to be engaged in order to assess the expectancy of disease manifestation, increase in waterborne diseases.

It was explained that most water utilities are thinking about the increase of production rather than short term demand reduction. They opt for short term measures rather than going for the longer-term measures. There is also need to assess the inter-basin water transfers in the long term and how these transfers may promote the transfer of disease vectors from one part of the country to another. More research needs to be done.

After the role playing of people joining various institutions, Chris explained in plenary that it took a while for people to come to the Met Office. He was expecting everyone to go there immediately but instead the participants representing the other organizations opted to meet with other institutions.

Lusaka City Council (report back by Bwalya Funga)

Lusaka City Council (LCC) visited and verified with the Met Department on whether the information given was accurate and what the impacts were likely to be. They were helpful and given information at an individual community and national level impacts. The group playing the role of the Met department was commended. The role players of LCC. Also constituted a team drawn from different departments at LCC. They developed materials in line with info from Met and carried out a door to door campaign. They sent this information to the office of Mayor and the ward councillors. Also visited LWSC as they needed to work with us. The information was disseminated through:

- Ward development committees
- Drama groups and PA system

- Community assemblies

The group reported learning and realizing that they cannot work in isolation and need to collaborate with other organizations. When questioned why it took long to visit the Met office during the role playing exercise, they explained that they were negotiating with community based organizations because they know the wards better than the technocrats.

After LCC got the news, they started by looking at operational strategies. They also identified the areas which will be most affected by the heatwave. They discussed how best to merge their messages. Before commencing the awareness campaigns, they reviewed the Disaster Risk Management Plan and identified the gaps in it. During this review, a baseline survey was undertaken on which people are the most vulnerable. They also encouraged people to plant drought resistant crops. Water rationing plans were also discussed with NWASCO – health and hygiene waterborne diseases.

When questioned on whether the Met service was useful? They responded that they were helpful in identifying the most vulnerable.

Lusaka Water and Sewerage Company (LWSC)

- Heard on TV from Met Department.
- First wanted to confirm the reliability – upon confirmation with them went further to plan what to do. For us it is critical – our mandate is to provide water and sanitation to Lusaka province.
- Currently 230,000 cubic metres per day against a demand of 400,000 cubic metres per day. Expecting more with Kafue bulk water supply. Also with the MCA – also bring back Iolanda treatment plant – expect we will meet the demand more but we are worried and we need to plan more.
- Go to Met Department – and clarification. We need to know how to project demand. Met Department couldn't tell us – only rainfall reduced – a figure they were not really sure of. Just a promise that there would be a reduction in rainfall and it would affect the surface and groundwater. Let's pass through coordinating team – quick to refer back to the researchers. We are only here to coordinate. Ask researchers – take this as research, but they were demanding for money. The met doesn't have this mandate to provide this information. Went to researchers in the name of the President – can you expedite this research? Researchers need money to be able to do this research. We went back to offices and sat down and looked at the historical date – we are not full time researchers – it is not good to look only at historical data. We looked back at 2016. Lost much of production based on drought. Only had 8 hours of pumping hours. We couldn't sell enough water and our revenue went down and we couldn't meet our demand. We came Came up with figures what we are expecting to meet – we won't meet our statutory obligation / service level agreement with our regulator NWASCO – need to sensitise people about this.

- Won't do it alone – we will hold sensitisation programmes with other groups (multiple stakeholders)
- Need to change the way we are operating – need to be able to communicate to customers about the water conservation measures that are needed. Need to send these messages to customers.
- Looking at leaking pipes and reducing the leakage.

UNZA

Tried to verify with the Met Department. 70-80% chance of El Nino.

Policy review of different policies that touch on drought.

Then went to see LWSC and find out current water demands and if there is a need for more water supply. They said they have spent $200million on infrastructure development for water supply and yet still could not supply or meet service demand. That got us thinking. We need to think about sources of financing for water supply in the city.

Visited NWASCO – their min standards for level of service provision – we can see there's a mismatch here. What's the mismatch?

Again we will do comparison with what is in the policy and what is coming out from these interviews. Currently preparing an MOU with LUWSI. LWSC also got in touch and they asked us to analyse the potential different brown water options and hydrological modelling but they won't pay for this even though we are offering tools and TLCC.

One on transform leadership, preparedness and financing options.

Coordinating at national level:

- When we heard – we hired a consultant – to do a baseline assessment of the climate vulnerability through donor funding. The consultant came up with a comprehensive report of the impact of this drought. Biggest sector affected water and city. And agriculture and tourism. These are most sensitive to climate change impact.
- Coordinating team – as national government coordinating team – National Development Plan and Vision 2030 – we need to look at these. We Came up with a database on which areas we need to come in and engage. LuWSI came to us and presented the situation. We advised them that we have these stakeholders. We are going to engage different stakeholders through LuWSI.
- Wrote project proposal to GEF to avail funding in terms of research. Ongoing problem we have – also looking forward to engage research universities. This is an area of research we need to engage for the longer term.
- Also… programme with agriculture? How farmers are going to adapt to CC? e.g. CSA. Need to bring in different stakeholders – ownership of project.

Biggest challenges:

- Coordination – even if they are a coordinating authority I didn't see them. There is a lot of time wasting. I didn't see a command role here. I found this to be problematic.
- If someone had stood up and said we will communicate!
- Hearing different things from different people – risk communication was different. Risk could have been communicated better.
- Lusaka DRR coming to civil society – at what point do they come?
- Gilbert – difficulties to build bridges. What can we do for you? Quite difficult to step out of your own interests. Real challenge in our own spaces.
- Doing the same thing. Repetition of the same activities of the same institutions. They are fragmented implementation of different activities.
- We trust LuWSI!
- District Development Coordinating Committee (DDCC).
- As a local authority we don't have funding for climate change – we were reacting to an issue – we do firefighting. We are fire engines.
- Issues to do with funding. There is no funding to institute the DRR plan. This is the problem.
- Some move quicker than others – some already had a plan and others didn't – they didn't approach at the right time.
- People are happy to work on their own. Until disaster breaks out. And then everyone is running around once cholera breaks out. That is the issue – joint planning and resourcing before disaster happens. DDCC – dominant for the public sector and no private and only 1-2 community reps so the reach in terms of other spaces is still weak and needs to be strengthened. How do we bring in these interests more directly?

Feedback from participants:

1. The medium-term plans are necessary as well as long term. What can we deliver in these timelines?
2. Operate on our assumptions – we are different in our interests and mandates.
3. I learnt a lot here.
4. We need to be proactive and not reactive.
5. Climate science is becoming very relevant to cities – thinking of project to link with cities.
6. We have a lack of capacity – we need information before we act.

POLICY BRIEF SESSION

Four policy briefs were developed by FRACTAL. They were themed around: water supply, over-abstraction, pollution and flooding. FRACTAL held two high level breakfasts to disseminate the briefs to ministers and other key senior officials. The briefs were co-produced during four FRACTAL meetings, and went through two learning lab iterations.

The briefs asked what climate are we expecting? Lusaka has warmed 1 degree C in the past 100 years. The rate of warming is increasing – it will be potentially wetter, but there is scientific uncertainty about the extent to which it could get warmer and wetter. The model regions: Kafue catchment area and Lusaka city. Displayed the three Climate Risk Narratives, which had been developed by FRACTAL as a climate information communication device and which promoted conversations around future scenarios.

Must acknowledge what is already happening i.e. projects, plans, strategies.

1. Flooding

Lusaka has a high water-table and seasonal rainfall. Likely to be an increase in intense rainfall. Infrastructure and peri-urban areas vulnerable. Drainage and solid waste management infrastructure insufficient. City-wide Slum Upgrade Strategy includes cleaning up solid waste and implement a solid waste system. Urban and Regional Planning Act 2015 restricts development on flood prone areas.

2. Groundwater

Supplies half of Lusaka city supply. Key source of informal water supply. Regulation and monitoring is critical (SI 19 enacted to license boreholes = 30m between pit latrines and boreholes). Much criticism of SI 19, so needs to be marketed better. Recommendation that recharge areas are protected. Kafue pipeline projects – unless adequately distributed additional supply won't help. Recommendation that Water Use Associations should be recognized.

3. Water Supply

No aquifer recharge or to sustain levels. 46% water loss which presents a significant challenge for utility companies. There is a growing gap between current supply and future demand. Recommendation that we need to strengthen collaboration (21 partners involved with LUWSi Initiative).

4. Water Quality

Need for monitoring. High risk of not addressing water quality e.g. cholera. Investment in infrastructure needed along with design standards. Pollution from pit latrines when water table is high. There is a need to coordinate monitoring. Need to build capacity for testing of contaminants and diseases. Need to send out the message about the dangers of using shallow boreholes even for washing clothes (e.g. cholera).

Cross-cutting issues – monitoring of groundwater levels and quality. Creating an information portal for water and climate information. Feedback loops between water themes.

Comments:

Briefs are great, but missing an analysis of the root causes of the issues including the associated governance issues, so the same mistakes are not made elsewhere. Suggest which structures can implement the recommendations.

Expand the lapses that the Urban and Regional Planning Act does not cover. Articulate specifically what water technologies we want?

Talanoa Dialogue

LUSAKA, 22 AUGUST 2018

Attendees: Primarily local government representatives from Lusaka City Council, national representation from NAWASCO and LWSC and other local actors such as GIZ and LUWSI. Representatives from the University of Zambia were also present.

Key statistic: Approximately 22 attendees, of which 13 were men.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

At present, urban communities contribute up to 70% of greenhouse gas emissions globally. They are also among the most vulnerable hotspots for climate change impacts. This reality means that urban communities are at the centre of how we achieve global climate targets. It is critical that national, regional and local governments jointly shape, align and implement climate policy at all levels.

What are the Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogues?

The Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogues – a series of in-country climate consultations starting in 2018 – are designed to kick off a collaborative process involving all levels of government. They convene national, regional and local governments to take stock of, shape and strengthen Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). This process also engages other key climate actors within a given country.

The concept of the Talanoa Dialogue was framed during the 23rd United Nations Climate Change Conference in 2017 (COP23) and serves as an initial stocktaking exercise in 2018 to prepare for future NDC submissions.

The word Talanoa itself refers to a style of dialogue practiced in Pacific Island countries, which fosters openness and inclusiveness. This is the spirit of the Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogues, designed to help make climate action a more ambitious and collective global effort.

Format: What do Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogues entail?

Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogue events convene local and regional governments, host organizations and national ministries of climate, environment, and energy among others. What distinguishes these dialogues is that they examine the local dimension of climate action and look at how multilevel governance – coordinated action across all levels of government – strengthens the NDCs.

The Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogue is guided by three simple questions, tailored to look at the urban and subnational dimensions of climate action:

1. Where are we?

Participants review national commitments, the current national greenhouse gas emissions profile, the quantitative impact of interventions and subnational commitments and actions. They also look at whether sustainable urban development is adequately reflected in national climate policy.

2. Where do we want to go?

Participants identify possible links between climate action, the Sustainable Development Goals and national urban development policy. They consider how to strengthen NDCs by integrating commitments and actions by local and regional governments, as well as how local and regional governments can support implementation of current NDCs.

3. How do we get there?

Participants look at how national, regional and local governments can work together to mobilize technical, financial and policy resources to deliver on and strengthen the NDCs. They explore potential models for collaboration across levels of government, through new or existing institutional mechanisms and structures.

What are the outcomes of Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogues?

Throughout 2018, Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogue events will take place around the world. As a focal point of the LGMA – the Local and Regional Governments and Municipal Authorities Constituency of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) – ICLEI will communicate the results to the UNFCCC. Each Cities and Regions Talanoa Dialogue event will contribute to the broader Talanoa process and will feed into the climate negotiations at COP24.

ZAMBIA TALANOA DIALOGUE

A Talanoa Dialogue was run in Lusaka, as part of the FRACTAL Governance Dialogue discussions.

Participants broke up into smaller groups and answers sub-questions related to each core question under the Talanoa structure.

Where are we?

1. How can local and regional governments help national governments (including ministries of climate change and urbanization) to seize the potential of sustainable and integrated urban and territorial development in the implementation of NDCs?
    - Local and regional governments are responsible for the distribution of electricity and water, waste management and other public services.

- Therefore, all the above need to be implemented in a sustainable manner which would align with the NDC.

2. Does the current NDC refer to national urban policy or does it have any specific references to urban sectors like buildings, transport/mobility, waste, demand-side energy efficiency, renewable energy, sustainable consumption or production, procurement, biodiversity (e.g.: reality check with UN-Habitat document)?

a) If yes, are these consulted with the respective local and regional governments?

- Only two delegates were aware that the NDC existed.
- Apparently there was a meeting held at a provincial level to discuss the NDC and this was then circulated to all districts.
- According to those who have read the NDC, it does refer to national policies and makes reference to transport, waste and energy. But do not know what it says explicitly.

b) If not, is there any room to integrate existing plans, actions or commitments of local and regional governments into the current NDCs (e.g. captured at carbon Climate Registry or GCoM Commitment or others as appropriate), as well as those developed by other ministries responsible on urbanization?

- Majority of delegates were not aware that an NDC existed.
- Local policies should always fit in national policies but they do not know if the comments made in the NDC align with commitments made in local policies.
- At a local level there are policies that would contribute to the NDC but do not know if in the reporting process local level is included.
- There is a need for responding and monitoring at a local level to report back for the NDC.
- They have policies for energy, water and waste but not specifically urban ones.

Where Do We Want to Go?

1. What are the options to integrate commitments and actions of local and regional governments in to current and future NDCs?

- Make use of international days that bring all stakeholders together;
- Various coordination committees that report into each other (e.g. DDCC - PDCC - NDCC) with sub-committees under these (e.g. environment, agriculture and natural resources sub-committee);
- Incorporate into existing strategic and development plans;
- Current decentralisation policy being formulated - can use as a guide;
- Local Government Association of Zambia (feeds into SADC);
- Wade Development Committees; and
- Full council meetings (when drafting and approving by-laws).

2. How can national commitments integrate existing and future commitments (e.g. captured at carbon Climate Registry or GCoM Commitment or others) of local and regional governments into current and future NDCs?

- Existing commitments include Earth Hour Challenge, Carbon registry and GCOM. There is already "some" feedback from national government but this needs to be strengthened. Many participants were unsure if anything that local level commits to is feeding upwards for national to be aware of.

3. How can national governments enhance the ability of local and regional governments to adapt to the adverse impacts of climate change and foster climate resilience through their multilevel engagement in NDCs or National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)?

- Capacity building (individual and institutional level);
- Information sharing (stock-taking exercises and then communication plans);
- More resources to flow to local level (as well as support in building an enabling environment for the resources to make an impact);
- Build communication feedback systems;
- Improve local level training;
- Improve coordination through platforms (focus on sector linkages); and
- Upskilling.

4. How can the cities mainstream issues to contribute to NDC? Are the city strategies/policies aligned to national level targets?

- Better identification of needs on the ground;
- Communication to go both ways (strengthen communication feedback systems);
- Alignment of commitments and activities to the NDC;
- Gain a better understanding of the NDCs; and
- Improve research at a local level (more info on CC, housing, drainage challenges etc).

How Do We Get There?

1. Which measures and changes are required in order to support local governments' action towards the achievement of NDCs?

- Understanding the mandate of cities
- Integrated development planning

2. How can national governments collaborate with local and regional governments to mobilize appropriate capacity building, technical, financial resources and policy/legal framework to realize solutions addressed in delivering and raising ambition; in 2018, towards 2020, towards 2050?

- Increase collaboration with other local governments
- Share common goals and ambitions at local level
- Improve mechanisms for financial reforms (e.g. complete devolution)

- Improve revenue collections

3. How effectively could cities' priorities be considered as part of national priorities?

- Having a specific focus on city region planning
- Through DDCC subcommittees
- Information to be broken down into specific regional/areas and cities
- Reconstitute Ward Development Committees and build capacities in integrated planning
- Improve the frequency of district coordination

4. What steps have so far been taken to ensure cities' adaptation requirements are considered in the NAP process?

- Risk assessments to be done
- Formulating the NAP tools through a consultative process
- Recommendation developed to integrate NDCs in NDP (i.e. a roadmap of sorts)

Figure 1: Participants that made up the Zambia Talanoa Dialogue

Actions and way forward

- ICLEI Africa to draft a workshop report as well as put the main points from the dialogue into the report template for the UNFCCC. These documents to be shared with the Lusaka FRACTAL Embedded Researcher, to be shared widely.
- ICLEI Africa to send the UNFCCC report template to Mr Kasanda for editing – prior to submission.

- MNDP to send the NDC and supporting policies to the Lusaka FRACTAL Embedded Researcher, to be shared widely.