

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FIGURES	III
TABLES.....	IV
BOXES	V
GLOSSARY, ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	VI
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	IX
PART I - GUIDELINES.....	15
1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1. STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT	2
1.2. STAGES OF THE WATER MANAGEMENT CYCLE	2
1.3. MCDA METHODS.....	4
1.3.1 Value measurement MCDA - VM-MCDA.....	5
1.3.2 Goal programming MCDA – GP-MCDA	7
1.3.3 MCDA for spatial planning problems - Spatial MCDA	12
1.4. SUMMARY	13
2 STAGE 1: RESOURCE CLASSIFICATION AND RESERVE DETERMINATION	15
2.1. BASIC TASKS AND STEPS OF THE RESERVE DETERMINATION PROCESS	16
2.2. MCDA FRAMEWORK AND METHODS.....	17
2.3. PREPARATION FOR STEP 1: PROBLEM STRUCTURING.....	20
2.3.1 Selecting criteria.....	21
2.3.2 Developing a value tree.....	22
2.4. STEP 1: EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES - SCORING AGAINST INDIVIDUAL CRITERIA.....	23
2.4.1 Developing scoring systems or indices.....	23
2.4.2 Scoring	25
2.4.3 Analysis, feedback and refinement.....	25
2.5. STEP 2: AGGREGATION OF SCORES - FINDING THE SEPARATE ECOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL IMPACTS FOR A RESOURCE UNIT.....	27
2.5.1 Problem structuring.....	27
2.5.2 Swing weighting for criteria within a Resource Unit.....	27
2.5.3 Analysis, feedback and refinement.....	29
2.6. STEP 3: AGGREGATION OF SCORES - FINDING THE SEPARATE ECOLOGICAL, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STATUS / IMPACTS FOR THE RIVER	29
2.6.1 Problem structuring.....	30
2.6.2 Swing weighting of RU sites	30
2.6.3 Analysis, feedback and refinement.....	31
2.7. STEP 4: AGGREGATION OF SCORES - COMBINING THE ECOLOGICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC EVALUATIONS	31
2.7.1 Problem structuring.....	31
2.7.2 Swing weighting of social, economic and ecological issues	31
2.7.3 Analysis, feedback and refinement.....	32
2.8. STEP 5: CHOOSING A MANAGEMENT CLASS	33
2.9. STEP 6: DESIGNING A RESERVE TO ACHIEVE THE MANAGEMENT CLASS	34
2.10. RELEVANT CASE STUDIES IN PART II AND PREVIOUS REPORTS	34
2.11. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	35
3 STAGE 2: WATER RESOURCE AND ALLOCATION PLANNING	37
3.1. INTERNAL STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVES AND CATCHMENT MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES	37
3.2. MCDA FRAMEWORK AND PROCESS FOR A RESOURCE PROTECTION STRATEGY AND WAP	39
3.3. SITUATION ASSESSMENT	39
3.4. WATER RESOURCE PROTECTION STRATEGY	39
3.4.1 Problem structuring.....	40
3.4.2 Criteria and value functions.....	41
3.4.3 Aggregation, assessment of overall scenario value and attribute importance.....	42

3.5. WATER ALLOCATION PLANS	43
3.6. RELEVANT CASE STUDIES IN PART II AND PREVIOUS REPORTS	45
3.7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	45
4 STAGE 3: WATER-USE AUTHORISATION.....	47
4.1. BASIC TASKS FOR INDIVIDUAL LICENSING.....	48
4.2. MCDA FRAMEWORK AND METHODS.....	50
4.2.1 <i>Establishing a system of indices</i>	50
4.2.2 <i>Steps 1, 2 and 3: Legal requirements, pre-assessment, extent of detailed investigations</i>	51
4.2.3 <i>Step 4: Potential impacts of the water-use - assessment</i>	51
4.2.4 <i>Step 5: Potential impacts of the water-use - technical and socio-economic evaluation of assessment</i>	51
4.3. COMPULSORY LICENSING.....	52
4.4. RELEVANT CASE STUDIES IN PART II AND PREVIOUS REPORTS	53
4.5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	53
5 SYNTHESIS: AN INTEGRATED PROCESS.....	55
5.1. INFORMATION NEEDS AND FLOW.....	55
5.2. DECISION-MAKING	57
5.3. WAY FORWARD	58
PART II - CASE STUDIES	59
6 THUKELA PROJECT: MCDA ANALYSES OF STEPS 2 AND 3 OF STAGE 1	61
6.1. ASSESSING SCORING SYSTEMS AND THE ECOSTATUS (STEPS 1 AND 2).....	61
6.1.1 <i>Conclusions</i>	64
6.2. COMPARING DIFFERENT SCORING AND WEIGHTING APPROACHES TO STEP 3	64
6.2.1 <i>Assumptions regarding gaps between categories and weights</i>	64
6.2.2 <i>Summary, conclusions and future developments</i>	67
7 DRIFT AND DRIFTSOLVER	69
7.1. THE DRIFTSOLVER MODULE	69
7.2. THE DRIFT CATEGORY MODULE	71
7.3. WEIGHTS	73
7.4. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS	74
8 EVALUATION OF WATER SUPPLY AUGMENTATION AND DEMAND MANAGEMENT OPTIONS FOR CAPE TOWN....	75
8.1. CRITERIA, SCORING SYSTEM AND WEIGHTS	76
8.2. RESULTS	80
8.3. CONCLUSIONS	84
8.4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	84
8.4.1 <i>Annexure 9A - Scores and criteria levels of options for each criteria</i>	85
8.4.2 <i>Annexure 9B - Aggregate scores and ranks of options for each criteria group and overall</i>	88
8.4.3 <i>Annexure 9D - Criteria descriptions</i>	88
9 THE USUTU-MHLATHUZE GIS-BASED DSS	89
9.1. DATA, METHODS AND MCDA FORMULATION	89
9.2. CONCLUSIONS AND POTENTIAL FOR USE IN WATER ALLOCATION AND LICENSING	92
10 A GENETIC ALGORITHM APPROACH TO MULTIOBJECTIVE LAND USE PLANNING	93
REFERENCES	117

FIGURES

Figure 1.1. The water resource management process (adapted from DWAF 1999 and DWAF 2003).	3
Figure 2.1. Steps in Stage 1 of the water management cycle (the RDM process). VM-MCDA-II, VM-MCDA-IIIa, etc. refer to particular phases of the process of VM-MCDA as applied to the Steps.	16
Figure 2.2. General structure of the value tree for STAGE 1 of the water management cycle.	22
Figure 2.3. Hypothetical scoring system for impact on baptism rituals (a measure of social well-being).	24
Figure 2.4. Hypothetical value function for effects on commercial farming of changes in water availability.	24
Figure 2.5. The value functions of Box 2.3 converted into value functions relating to percentage change from the <i>status quo</i> .	25
Figure 2.6. Sensitivity of the overall river score for Economics E to the weight on RU1 (information from the Thukela study).	32
Figure 2.7. Overall (river level) performance of the scenarios. Left: Unweighted aggregate scores (deviations from current) for ecology (Ecol), resource economics (RE) and market economics (ME). The line indicates the score from the weighted sum of the three values. Right: Weighted contributions.	32
Figure 3.1. General structure of a value tree for evaluating the water resource protection strategy.	41
Figure 3.2. Left: Linear scoring of water-use as a proxy. Right: Direct scoring of scenarios in terms of their effect on aquatic habitats based on specialist assessment of land-use, water-use and other scenario attributes.	42
Figure 3.3. Left: Comparison of different scenarios of land-use. Right: The open squares show the effects on the <i>status quo</i> of different incentive strategies.	43
Figure 3.4. GP-MCDA applied to water allocation, showing a simple weight sensitivity analysis. The bars show the proportion of water allocated to the three sectors under four different weights for Rands/m ³ . The line indicates the four different weights.	44
Figure 4.1. The licensing process simplified from DWAF (2000). The steps of the process are on the right, and links to other stages or information sources on the left. See abbreviations on page vi.	49
Figure 4.2. Preliminary assessment of a licence application showing uncertainty in the predicted affect on three criteria (error bars indicate the range of possible effects).	51
Figure 4.3. Final assessment of a licence application showing the reduced uncertainty in the predicted affect on three criteria (error bars indicate the range of possible effects) relative to Figure 4.2.	52
Figure 5.1. Information flow for the water management cycle.	56
Figure 6.1. Scores associated with different categories by the various models.	64
Figure 6.2. Translating categories to a numeric scale. The figure on the right shows equal gaps between categories while that on the left shows increasing gaps with each fall in category.	65
Figure 6.3. Two systems of weights for the sites: Equal weights (unshaded), and double weights to sites of high ecological importance (shaded).	65
Figure 6.4. Overall status of the river for the different scenarios under the four different assumptions described in the text. (Note that assumption 2 leads to scores on a different scale to those of assumption 1, but that the scales are essentially arbitrary).	66
Figure 7.1. Relationship developed in DRIFT CATEGORY between volume and the overall Integrity Score. The bands show hypothetical zones of transition from one river category to the next. The circle indicates the <i>status quo</i> . The square and diamond show different distributions of the same volume of water, one optimal (square) one suboptimal (diamond).	73
Figure 8.1: Value tree of the criteria for evaluation of supply and demand options.	76
Figure 8.2: Non-linear value functions for three of the quantitative criteria.	77
Figure 8.3. Weights given to criteria and criteria groups.	79
Figure 8.4. Criteria group weights and relative contribution of each criterion.	80
Figure 8.5. Overall results for all options. The dotted line shows the rank, and the solid line the score. The "error bars" for the ranks indicates the minimum and maximum with the different weights sets, and for the scores, the standard deviation. The triangles are the three new options added in Phase 2, and these together with the larger circles are the supply augmentation options.	81
Figure 8.6. Overall scores (solid line) and ranks (dotted line) for the supply options. The standard deviation for scores and range for ranks are shown based on the three weight sets used in the sensitivity analysis.	82
Figure 8.7. Sensitivity of scores to weights of the main criteria groups. Dotted vertical lines = actual weights.	83
Figure 9.1. Top left : current land-use. Top right : "Best" land-use, given current weights. Bottom left : MCDA scores of current land-use, Bottom right : MCDA scores of "best" land-use.	90
Figure 9.2. Left: Current land-use. Right top: weights as in Figure 9.1. Right bottom: New weights.	91
Figure 9.3. The calculation of VM-MCDA scores for three RUs (or quaternary catchments) and the WMA for two different land-use scenarios.	91
Figure 9.4. An example of one of the ArcView windows from the WMA C DSS, where land-uses are changed to maximise a particular objective or combination of objectives. Resultant changes from the status quo are shown.	92

TABLES

Table 1.1. Scores, weights and total scores	6
Table 2.1. Factors which may contribute to the overall classification of a water resource unit.	15
Table 2.2. VM-MCDA phases linked to the Steps of STAGE 1 of the water management cycle	18
Table 2.3. Notation used for STAGE 1.....	19
Table 2.4. Example of the outcome of Steps 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the STAGE 1. The r_{ij} , e_{ij} , and s_{ij} are ecological, social and economic scores (from 100 = no impact) at the RU level. The R_i , E_i , S_i are the integrated scores for each RU_i . The R , E , S are integrated scores for the river. The weights (α_i , β_i and μ_k) are used in the aggregation of Steps 2 to 4. Scores and weights are from the Thukela study.	26
Table 2.5. STEP 2: Finding weights for market economics criteria (information from the Thukela study).....	28
Table 2.6. STEP 3: Finding weights for the RUs for the market and resource economics evaluations of the whole river (information from the Thukela study). Note that this is just one set of weights (see text)	30
Table 2.7. STEP 4: Deriving weights for the aggregation of social, ecological and economic evaluations using the approach of Box 2.5 (weights not from Thukela).....	32
Table 2.8. Analysis of trade-offs between criteria when moving from one scenario to another (see Box 2.8). Information for RU2 (shown in summary on Table 2.4).....	33
Table 3.1. VM-MCDA and pragmatic SBPP stages envisaged for water resource protection strategy development.....	40
Table 3.2. Parameters and results for the GP-MCDA application to water allocation.....	45
Table 4.1. Licence application steps aligned with VM-MCDA phases.....	49
Table 4.2. Examples of S27 and other indices adapted from Perkins (1999a*).....	50
Table 6.1. An example of the summarised scenario evaluation (IFR Site 1 on the Thukela River).....	62
Table 6.2. Coefficients produced for the different categories of the five ecosystem components during the exploratory regression analyses.	62
Table 6.3. Scores applied to categories for ecosystem components as derived from various linear programming models. (SS = sum of squares of the residuals of the given ecostatus and derived ecostatus). All=same score for all components, AI=Aquatic invertebrates, F=fish, G=Geomorphology, RV=Riparian vegetation, WQ=Water quality, ES=Ecostatus.	63
Table 6.4. Overall status of the river for the different scenarios under the four different assumptions described in the text.....	66
Table 6.5. Rank order from scoring each of the sites for which the scenario performs better, the same or worse than the EC. If a scenario is better than the REC it scores 0, the same 1, worse -1.....	67
Table 7.1. Mathematical notation used for DRIFTSOLVER.	70
Table 7.2. Example of a flow scenario for Site 2 on the Molenaars River (natural Mean Annual Runoff (MAR) = $160 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ a}^{-1}$ and present day MAR = $145 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3 \text{ a}^{-1}$). Integrity ratings X_{ijm} for each flow reduction level and for the chosen reduction level, and the overall Integrity Score Z are shown. PH = physical habitat, WQ=water quality, Veg=Vegetation, MI=macro-invertebrates. For explanation, see text.	72
Table 8.1. Original and three later additional options that were compared.	75
Table 8.2: Criteria, criteria levels and scores	78
Table 8.3. Criteria group scores for supply augmentation options (PPI = Political, public, institutional). Range given where relevant.....	81
Table 8.4. Scores and ranks for three different weight sets.....	82

BOXES

Box 2.1. Example of the use of a “veto” criterion.	20
Box 2.2. A brief description of the DRIFT and Stress-Index scoring approaches which are used as part of the RDM process.	21
Box 2.3. General development of scoring systems (see Box 2.4 for suggestions more specifically for STAGE 1).....	24
Box 2.4. Development of scoring systems for STAGE 1	25
Box 2.5. The general swing weighting procedure	27
Box 2.6. STEP 2: Finding the overall economic and ecological impacts on a RU / site.....	29
Box 2.7. STEP 3: Finding the overall ecological, economic or social impacts on the river	31
Box 2.8. Trade-off between Irrigation agriculture and Riparian vegetation when moving from Scenario 1 to Scenario 2 (information from Thukela project, and Table 2.4, Table 2.7 and Table 2.8).....	33
Box 4.1. Section 27 of the NWA.....	52