

Multiple Use System (MUS)

Everisto Mapedza

5 November 2012

Fresh Water Governance Conference
Drakensberg



Photo: David Brazier/IWMI



Presentation Outline

- Why MUS?
- Illustration from Irrigation
- Lessons Learnt
- Acknowledgement - (Barbara van Koppen and Khan – some images)



Why MUS

- Holistic nature of life
 - IWRM
- Professions vs. 'living life'
- Productive and re-productive roles
- Gender 'sense'



Irrigation

- “Irrigation is not about pipes, canals and dams, it is about people. And it is about pipes, canals and dams only as far as pipes, canals and dams can serve the needs of people”



Irrigation

- Multiple use of water were hardly integrated in both study areas
- Over 20% of the households got drinking water from the stream/river/irrigation – of which half got their water from irrigation scheme – 90% of the respondents did not do anything to make the water safer for domestic consumption
- About 24.9% used water from irrigation for laundry purposes
- Human and livestock requirements - hardly included
- Rupike was better than Fuvhe-Panganayi



Irrigation

- 2008 – there was an outbreak of Cholera as a result of drinking water meant for irrigation – 27% of the respondents had no access to toilets. (Even fewer toilets within irrigation schemes F/P)
- Women requested domestic water provision as a key priority.
- FAO – looking at irrigation-plus
- Incidences of deaths of livestock attempting to drink from canals



‘Illegal’ use for ‘legitimate’ needs



People use any water available



Lessons Learnt

- MUS approach address water requirements in a holistic manner
- MUS – has potential to increase productivity and household nutrition (crop, fisheries, livestock)
- Future water investments – build on local water requirements
- Gender water requirements addressed by MUS – can address some gendered water needs
- Calls for professionals, researchers, civil servants and policy makers to act together



Thank You.

