

Joint session of the GWP Technical Committee (TEC) – WMO/GWP Associated Programme on Flood Management (APFM) – WMO/GWP Integrated Drought Management Programme (IDMP)

Friday, 23 August 2019, 16:30 – 18:00

Venue: Global Water Partnership offices, Linnégatan 87D, 104 51 Stockholm

Participants: GWP TEC members, members of the APFM and IDMP

The joint meeting of all TEC members and the participants of the flood (APFM) and drought (IDMP) programs was introduced by Frederik Pischke (GWP/WMO) and Ranu Sinha (GWP). The objective was to start a conversation between the different programs/actors, to create synergies and to come up with new ideas. In order to do so, the different organizations delivered short lectures on their work followed by breakout sessions with mixed groups (TEC + IDMP + APFM). The groups discussed the following questions and shared their results at the end of the session:

1. What are the gaps, trends, and opportunities in integrated approaches to drought and flood management?
2. What ideas do you have for the flood, drought and GWP TEC community to work together in the next year (give concrete steps)?

The first speaker, Bob Stefanski (WMO), presented the gaps, trends, and opportunities in the IDMP community. He stated that to face the current lack of information there is a need for more work on drought vulnerability (socio-economic) and impact assessments. In this regard, user feedback is needed to improve national drought plans. He also noted that feedback is needed to improve the different elements of national drought planning, for which the Integrated Drought Management HelpDesk has been established to help countries strengthen what the IDMP has termed the three pillars of integrated drought management (monitoring and early warning, vulnerability and impact assessment; and drought mitigation, preparedness and response) Opportunities lie in the successful coordination of activities between regions and different initiatives.

Paul Pilon (WMO) presented his take on the gaps, trends, and opportunities in the APFM community. He recalled the definition of integrated flood management as a combination of risk, water resources, and land use management to help countries to maximize net benefits and minimize human losses in a well-governed and integrated program (flood & drought). Gaps were identified by Dr Pilon in the lack of implementation of available technological solutions, the lack of integrated flood management concepts for different scenarios, and the absence of a real multi-stakeholder dialogue, leading to national policies and implementation strategies. According to him, opportunities can be seen in the cooperation with countries, with GWP and other organizations.

The last speaker, Jerome Delli Priscoli (GWP TEC Chair), presented the work of the TEC (IWRM) within GWP and how TEC is currently changing with GWP and its new strategy. He stressed that TEC moved from advocacy to implementation by planning to follow up papers with concrete case studies. The main tasks besides producing knowledge products were identified as to define and implement the role of a think tank to peer review own and external work and to mentor and monitor GWP's work.

[Team exercise, please find questions above]

The results of the team exercises were then presented:

- Group 1: Uncertainties were the main gap identified. The group identified a trend in more integration of expertise and improvements in drought forecasting. They pointed to opportunities in raising more public awareness and engaging with educational institutions to overcome the existing gaps.
- Group 2: This group noted that floods and droughts shouldn't be regarded as different phenomena, but overlapping institutional mandates still constitute a challenge. Integrating both worlds is not easy, and this must be recognized to be able to come up with proper solutions.
- Group 3: Team 3 stated that there is huge geographic variability – every situation is different. It identified a lack of integrated social-economic work. Working together on a policy brief (TEC, IDMP, APFM) analyzing possible overlaps and possibilities of cooperation was suggested.
- Group 4: Gap in institutional/governance arrangements identified but a trend in more integration (combined forecasting, shared infrastructure, and tools) was also recognized by this group.
- Group 5: The group noted that there's a general need for improved management of crises: How can drought enable progress? Where and how to erect the safety net? The goal is to protect people but not shield the system. A nuanced view is needed and a better understanding of floods and droughts. Decision scaling could be brought forward by cooperation of the three communities (TEC, IDMP, APFM).
- Group 6: the group suggested to focus on the private sector, especially insurance and reinsurance. The absence of insurance-related stakeholders in the meeting was noted, and regarded as a gap. The way forward was identified in funding joint projects, smaller in number but smarter.
- Group 7: According to group 7, gaps were identified as resulting from differences in scale (time, geographic), different narratives and emotions, different types of trainings and experts. The trend is to think in an integrated way but the reality on the ground looks different. A need for more student trainings was expressed with a special emphasis on getting the social sciences on board. The way forward was proposed to share information between the groups and also to create pieces together: e.g. a provocative blog post that would initiate a dialogue between the communities.