

Minutes of TEC meeting, September 6, Athens, Greece

TEC members: Jerry D. Priscoli, Dan Tarlock, Adrian Cashman, Mike Young, Barbara Janusz-Pawletta, Nicola Fohrer, Winston Yu, Kenji Nagata, Danka Thalmeinerova

GWPO: Monika Weber-Fahr

GWP MED: Michael Scoullos

Abbreviations: PP (perspectives paper), BP (background paper), TFP (technical focus paper), WP (workplan)

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
The TEC meeting focused on the two key areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Activities to be completed by end 2018, achievements in 2018 - Discussion on how TEC contributes to a new GWP Strategy, and consequently what should be roles, functions, forms for TEC 			
Part 1: Unfinished business and/or continuing projects (with perspective to include them in 2019 workplan)			
<p>PP Water Sharing: final draft completed and ready for design/printing. Aim of the paper is encourage water managers and water users to increase the robustness of water sharing arrangements. TEC suggests that water sharing (the allocating and reallocation processes for water) is the logical follow up to IWRM implementation. The TEC will work with the GWP Executive Secretary to determine whether/how this would fit into this and/or next year's work program and strategy; if positive, then the TEC Chair and the ES will work together in defining the objective for this work more specifically, within the broader context of other initiatives, including a uptake strategy (including timing, target group, activities, etc.). Ideally, the work on water sharing would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide input to the GWP Strategy (content). One proposal is for the water-sharing initiative, while feeding into and perhaps even being one of the intellectual cornerstones the GWP Strategy, could be a GWP flagship. The ES will discuss this with Regional Teams as part of the regular calls/work planning with the Regional Executives (Coordinators and Chairs) - Become part of a broader effort towards "IWRM 2.0/reloaded". - Provide 3-4 key messages, short and simple summary with recommendations to support the Management Team and GWPO. <p>If moving forward, it would be important for key aspects/messages to be pre-launched/made available ahead of time. Different means for outreach (including perhaps webinars) should be discussed as part of the "uptake strategy"</p> <p>-</p>	3-4 Key messages developed for a Communication plan	Jerry/Monika Mike Young Mike Young with Steven Downey	End September End December
<p>PP Corporate Water Stewardship</p> <p>This is on-going work requested by several RWPs and considered strategically relevant by GWP's leadership and by several funding partners. A draft PP was developed by a young professional and reviewed by TEC members (May 2018). In parallel, GWPO had produced a Strategic Position paper on Engagement of GWP</p>	Validate and complete in One paper	Winston and Sara Traubel (GWP consultant)	End December

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>with Private Sector (April 2018).. The ES felt that the draft Perspectives Paper had two significant shortcomings: (a) it compares IWRM with Corporate Stewardship – as if these were two concepts ‘at the same level’ –and that the latter is a sub-theme/subordinated to the former; and (b) it does not describe/address the challenges and nuances for IWRM initiatives to engage with the private sector more broadly and stewardship initiatives specifically. There is no shortage of papers, both older and more recent, on Corporate Water Stewardship (e.g. WWF, ICMM, IUCN, CEO Water Mandate) but none discusses the uncomfortable space between stewardship initiatives on the one hand – and government/multi-stakeholder initiatives on the other. The TEC together with the ES decided to consolidate the PP and the “Beyond the Fence” paper; the “Engagement with the Private Sector” paper will be taken off-line shortly.</p> <p>Discussion included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Terms are important (management, corporate stewardship) – make clear distinction - Comparison of IWRM and Corporate Stewardship – should not be compared 1:1 – but linkages should be explained? - The paper should help those who work in IWRM on how to work with a private sector, how to remove or manage tensions and where Corporate Stewardship offers a contribution to the IWR (management) - As part of outreach, engage with the Regional teams for uptake and promotion <p>Next steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - consolidate the paper in a “simple-to-digest” form (to avoid academic language) - decide on a form (e.g. TEC perspective paper, GWP position paper) - edit/design/graphics of the paper - decide on a launch and communication the paper - suggest a series of papers covering private sector and water management (including, where appropriate, a literature survey to be taken first to avoid repetition of what is already published elsewhere) 	<p>Decide on form of paper (adopted to series of TEC perspectives papers or stay as GWPO position paper)</p> <p>Communication plan and identify the events to launch the paper</p> <p>Publish/disseminate the paper to RWP/CWPs</p>	<p>Jerry and Monika</p> <p>Steven Downey with Monika/Jerry</p>	<p>End December</p> <p>Include in Workplan 2019 (timing, budget)</p>
<p>Financing multi-purpose (MP) infrastructure</p> <p>The PP paper was strongly supported by GWPO last year as well as by the African region. TEC to address the question who, when, why finance MP infrastructure. MP Infrastructure is needed in to achieve IWRM and smarter infrastructure throughout Africa. Aim is to look at wicked and different examples to illustrate dilemmas on financing MP structures in the international environment. The paper is pending to clarify interest, need and fit to GWP Strategy.</p> <p>Next step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - offer the Concept Note to GWP Africa region for purpose of Africa Investment Plan program to seek “buy-in” and collaboration for the future paper 	<p>Concept note to re-submit to GWP Africa units</p> <p>Consider including the development of the paper in 2019</p>	<p>Winston to connect with GWP Africa (Andrew Takawira and A. Simalabwi)</p>	<p>asap</p>
<p>International Water Law training</p>	<p>Wait for the request from</p>		<p>ASAP</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>A TEC member is embedded in GWPO driven course on IWL in Africa. TEC members serve as lecturers. Several other partners and universities. There are already lessons learnt from previous trainings that should be considered when expanding to Asia. In addition, there are other training modules to help the course expand and or improve in areas on building consensus, building river basin organizations, using participatory processes. The type and format of work going forward will depend on the broader work program being drafted by GWPO in October/November.</p> <p>Next step: TEC will support this initiative by expertise and will wait for GWPO how this will be structured to a) in terms of sustainability and b) extension globally</p>	<p>GWPO and include into TEC workplan and consult with TEC chair on additional topic training modules</p>	<p>Barbara to liaise with Yumiko and TEC chair</p> <p>Jerry to discuss and agree with Monika once the work program has become clearer</p>	
<p>Collaborative modeling</p> <p>It is on-going initiative of TEC to offer training on CM in basins, regions where requested. Built on experience from GWP WAF, TEC has committed to provide one CM training in 2018 – target South Eastern Asia (specifically Mekong River). The training is a cooperation between several partners: USACE -IWR, MRC and GWP SEA. It will be held in October 2018 in Vientiane (Laos). It will include both short training for GWP SEA and observation of the model at work (it has been used by the MRC), real time, among the MRC .</p> <p>Next step: Depending on interest and financial support, 2019 CM training will be decided in spring 2019</p>	<p>Conduct the CM training</p> <p>Consider including CM training in 2019 (demand driven rule to be employed)</p>	<p>Barbara and TEC Knowledge Partners IWR and DELTARES</p>	<p>October (22)24-25 training</p>
Part 2: Avenue for a new GWP Strategy and TEC roles in a new period			
<p>GWP is at the zenith of the current Strategy with several assessment reports. Driven by Executive Secretary, the discussion at TEC meeting focused on a role and shape of TEC, forms of interactions between GWPO/RWP/TEC and expected input from TEC members to articulate the content of the new Strategy. The following is the capture of the discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - future role and functions of the TEC will depend on a new Strategy and resources (human and financial) GWP wants to invest in knowledge management. - GWPO is seeking input from TEC members to contribute to the development of the Strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o October: Key Messages - to be discussed with Regional Steering Committees o November: Framework Document - Draft to Global Steering Committee o Early December: Steering Committee approves Framework Document o February 2019: GWPO and Strategy Consultants write Strategy Draft o March/April: 2nd/last round of consultation o May/June: Approval by Steering Committee – and Network Meeting 	<p>New TOR for TEC members to be presented to Steering Committee</p> <p>Establish a mode of operation between TEC and RWPs – based on and in context of the GWPO workplan.</p>	<p>Monika and HR of GWPO</p> <p>Jerry/ Monika</p>	<p>To be endorsed by SC mtg in Dec 2018(?)</p> <p>Part of a new Strategy</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ September/October: Workplanning - The Executive Secretary is looking for strong TEC engagement at various phases - A number of background papers – including on IWRM 2.0, on Multi Stakeholder Partnerships, and other topics – are currently considered to be developed as part of the Strategy Process - Regions have been engaged through the Regional teams since May; October/November will see discussions with Regional Steering Committees; 	Develop TEC workplan in line with RWPs workplans and based on and in context of the GWPO workplan	Danka with input from GWPO/RWP	Mid - October
<p>Separate from the Strategy process, there are important aspects of the TEC role that the ES and others proposed for discussion of the TEC role going forward:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TEC advice and insight needed by regional teams: Regions regularly develop papers and other documents – and would require input and perhaps peer review. At the same time, there are papers developed with a direct spin off to regional activities, some papers discussed important/emerging issues but not attracted by RWPs. Also, at times there are some issues important for RWPs but these are not available in the right time. - How to balance Regional Demand with TEC delivery capacity?. Past experience indicated challenges in coordination between regions and the TEC (despite efforts to involve regional expertise to global TEC papers, not much effort has gone into targeted shaping of formats and dissemination). The ES is currently piloting various new ways of engaging the regions better through the workprogram, and one of the suggestions is to align the TEC work with the overall GWP work program effort. The TEC work is formally embedded in GWPO workplans since 2016, but only ad-hoc consultation made to work. The GWPO “planning” days (always in autumn) were not effectively used to consolidate GWPO/TEC workplan. - While the last 3 TEC meetings have been changing the mode of operation, in recent and previous years TEC workplans have been developed without a close link with RWPs and GWPO and especially with workplans. Engagement in dialogues of priorities at regional level were limited to general anticipated outcomes of the current GWP strategy. The TEC chair has systematically been invited to – and participated in – Regional Days; one consideration may be for TEC members more broadly to be invited. - TEC was asked to look at evaluate the criteria GWPO uses for impact. 	Consult with GWPO (Ralph P) on rapid evaluation of criteria used by GWPO to assess impacts	Winston/Dan Aligned with GWPO M&E team	End of December
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How to balance Regional Demand with TEC delivery capacity?. Past experience indicated challenges in coordination between regions and the TEC (despite efforts to involve regional expertise to global TEC papers, not much effort has gone into targeted shaping of formats and dissemination). The ES is currently piloting various new ways of engaging the regions better through the workprogram, and one of the suggestions is to align the TEC work with the overall GWP work program effort. The TEC work is formally embedded in GWPO workplans since 2016, but only ad-hoc consultation made to work. The GWPO “planning” days (always in autumn) were not effectively used to consolidate GWPO/TEC workplan. - While the last 3 TEC meetings have been changing the mode of operation, in recent and previous years TEC workplans have been developed without a close link with RWPs and GWPO and especially with workplans. Engagement in dialogues of priorities at regional level were limited to general anticipated outcomes of the current GWP strategy. The TEC chair has systematically been invited to – and participated in – Regional Days; one consideration may be for TEC members more broadly to be invited. - TEC was asked to look at evaluate the criteria GWPO uses for impact. 	Revisit how to handle TEC papers (revisit, take actions?)	Jerry/Monika	End of October
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ES asked and TEC discussed: Should the TEC be more action-oriented or should it serve as a “foreward-thinking group” that will bring challenging topics on the board regardless if these are embedded in regular workplans? - Format matters: The thought was expressed: Academia do not practice, and practitioners do not read. There is an elegant way how TEC could converge these conflicting aspects – TEC papers and workshops should translate research/scientific proven facts into attractive and simple papers to galvanize the discussion. is this fully used? 	Draft a new description of the TEC role going forward – for discussion	Monika/Jerry	End December

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should ToolBox (a knowledge flagship of GWP with practical case studies) be reviewed by TEC members for a better uptake at regional and country levels? There are good examples on ToolBox working at universities as complementary knowledge source in educating water related subjects, but ToolBox is perceived to be a static instrument for engaging RWPs and CWPs to populate stories on IWRM implementation. Should this be an agenda for RWPs/CWPs with assistance of TEC members help to articulate case studies? In general, there is a deficit of case studies from the regional and country levels to illustrate “tools in action” but there are many stories to tell about success and pitfalls in IWRM implementation. TEC should help harvest such lessons. Should TEC outstanding papers (e.g. No.4) be revisit and updated? – note: there is a paper No. 22 that intended to do so. What about other papers – which are obsolete and not be re-printed and disseminated? Which topics were not sufficiently addressed? TEC should take a stake of the portfolio of TEC papers in this regard and identify a) up-to-date, b) out of date and c) emerging new topics (what is not yet on a menu). - Another approach is to summarize “20 years of impact” in knowledge evolution and summarize what has changed and what did not change in knowledge production - The mission of “having IWRM on top agenda” is a victory of the GWP past; the focus should be “management” in water scarce regions. Should GWP focus on implementing IWRM? Is GWP equipped to conduct the IWRM projects? TEC should be a leader in formulating “IWRM re-load”. - Should TEC think about “SDG-oriented paper” with the aim to explore how SDG agenda goes beyond SDG6 – integrated approach. Important to note: the current IWRM Task Force does just that (or at least attempts to) - ES suggested and summarized 3 key roles for TEC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peer review function (both for externally outsourced writers and regional papers) - Signature products creation – branding to provide an intellectual leadership of GWP; keeping in mind that “how” is more important than “what”. It is also envisaged that TEC group should identify missing topics, but also identify missing expertise within GWP network - Interpret the world – leadership role – advising to GWP Management to speak to global fora. It also includes an input to IWRM Task Force (led by WWC) and some other global events. - Support GWPO with a review and identification of relevance of outcomes reported by RWP/CWP 	<p>Revisit TEC for a rapid “20 years impact” paper – to possibly be followed commission a review to external consultant</p>	<p>Adrian</p>	<p>End December</p>
<p>Other issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request that next TEC meeting will be held side-to-side with Regional Days - Depending on decision of GWPO Management, TEC might seek for new TEC members that might be delegated by RWPs (or coming directly from regional TECs) 	<p>Consider and, if appropriate, Plan for Regional Days</p>	<p>Jerry to discuss with Monika</p>	<p>End October</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GWPO needs to define the funds available for the TEC in order to complete the workplan 2019 	<p>together with TEC presence and TEC mtg</p> <p>Define funds for TEC work in 2019</p>	<p>Jerry to work with Monika/Jac / Steven on this</p>	<p>Budget will be made available in late October</p>