

Minutes of TEC meeting, September 1-3, 2017; Stockholm

TEC members: Jerry D. Priscoli, Dan Tarlock, Eelco van Beek, Adrian Cashman, Kala Vairavamoorthy, Mike Young, Barbara Janusz-Pawletta, Nicola Fohrer, Tom Panella

GWPO Staff: Danka Thalmeinerova, Francois Brikke, Gabriela Grau, Manuel Fulchiron, Yumiko Yasuda, Jacques Rey, Ralph Philip, Rudolph Cleveringa, Kenge James Gunya, Steven Downey, Josh Newton; Nicolas Delaunay

Invited regional technical experts: Ruth Beukman, Zhiping Shao, Yillin Ma, Richard Muller, Zelina Zaiton, Carlos Saito, Vangelis Constantianos

The TEC meeting comprised an internal TEC members meeting (September 1) and TEC/RWP consultation meeting (September 2-3).

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 three key areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reporting on achievements in 2016-17, progress in knowledge products to complete the 2017 TEC Workplan, and formulating new projects (knowledge products/activities) to be considered in 2018 (2019) - Discussion on Knowledge and Learning activities - Discussion on how to strengthen linkages between global TEC, regional TECs (think tanks) and operational programmes of GWP 			
Part 1a: ongoing activities			
<p>PP Climate Insurance and Water-related Disaster Risk Management. The PP is a work in progress; The draft was widely consulted with different support groups on insurance, however, the progress was not made to complete the paper as envisaged.</p> <p>The PP will be an invitation to open a dialogue between different knowledge partners (in water and insurance sectors) who can bring contrasting points on climate change induced insurance. Several insurance products are now available to insure climate risk catastrophes, but it is not always clear what their impact has been and to what extent they lead to actions to reduce climate risks for potential damages and enhance capacity to manage uncertainty which is central to setting a baseline for socio-economic development versus reimbursement of damages suffered. Thus, a basic research question to be addressed in the paper is if there is a role of insurance sector in contributing to socio/economic by reducing potential damages from water disasters and thus helping to building platforms for growth. After describing how insurance is working in developing countries water experts are invited to reflect on this question.</p>	<p>Final draft of PP to be delivered</p> <p>Need to advise on communication strategy to launch the paper</p>	<p>Adrian</p> <p>Steven/Danka</p>	<p>October 15, 2017</p> <p>End year</p>
<p>Benefit of Action and Cost of Inaction – a knowledge product developed in coordination of WMO. Support requested from TEC (Eelco) to review the future knowledge product. It is a project based initiative and question is how to embed it into a core activity of WMO. The initiative is not fully linked to HLP on Disasters. It is expected to have the WMO/GWP publication ready by the end of 2017. TEC is requested to attend APFM and IDMP Advisory and Management Committee meeting in September 2017.</p>	<p>Continue to support BaCi initiative</p>	<p>Eelco to attend WMO meetings in 2017 (if the activity span to 2018 – need replacement)</p>	<p>4-8 September 2017 Geneva</p>
<p>International Water Law for Africa – the GWPO organized the training and requested TEC to provide the technical expertise (Dan Tarlock). The training was attended by employees of RBO authorities and</p>	<p>Continue to support GWPO in</p>	<p>Dan Tarlock</p>	<p>On annual basis</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>technical position staff of water ministries. The participation level was high. The participants were not lawyers; thus, it is strongly recommended to extend the course to 5 days (to move from theory to the practical application). Since part of the demand for this course stems from need to understand how to build basin organizations/agreements, negotiations, conflict management several other topics could be usefully incorporated into this course. TEC is examining how these issues might be embedded within a suite of courses and/or training modules. With the better integration of principle and example, the Africa IWL training can serve as a model for other GWP planned trainings in Asia and Central Asia</p>	IWL in Africa and expand to Asia	Barbara Janusz Pawlleta with review by Kenge J. Gunya	
<p>Collaborative Modelling – built on the PP, regional training in GWP WAF, and the event during the Water Week. This initiative is offered to all RWPs. The CM is to bring modelers and stakeholders together to jointly create models or algorithms to be used to jointly identify trade-offs in WRM. This collaboration is a major part of the future of WRM. There are academic as well as practitioners of both modeling and participation who are in early stages of forming associations for this effort. The GWP Network has great potential to facilitate and be part of these efforts. It is suggested to</p> <p>a) continue in CM training based upon the demand from the RWPs, b) develop a practical Manual and “How to video” to capture lessons learnt and provide guidance to the practitioners especially in conjunction with cases already done, and c) participate in creating a Community of Practice to exchange experience</p>	<p>Identify 2 CM training workshops in 2018</p> <p>Develop CM Manual (2018) Video (2018)</p>	<p>Danka</p> <p>Will be outsourced to experts on CM</p>	<p>October 2018 to select the RWP(s)</p> <p>In 2018 workplan</p>
<p>Water and Migration –GWP was requested first by SC and FPG to do adress this topic. FAO then asked GWP to collaborate with it and to contribute to the Food and Agriculture Report 2018. TEC was requested to conduct a Literature Review (20-25 pages) – analysis on linkages between migration and WRM (and vice versa). There is a Task Force (SEI, SIWI, IWMI) as well. TEC outsourced the literature review to two experts from Oregon State University (supervising young PhD students as well). Based upon the results of the Literature Review, the TEC will determine the next steps. FAO is forming a migration and water task force under the FAO water scarcity and world water architecture and GWP TEC has been asked to co-chair with FAO Food and Water Directorate.</p>	<p>Literature Review on Water and Migration</p> <p>Consider follow up in 2018 workplan</p> <p>Co-Chair FAO task force</p>	<p>Jerry and Dan T</p> <p>Jerry and Dan T.</p> <p>Jerry</p>	<p>October 1, 2017</p> <p>In workplan 2018</p>
<p>BP on Coordinated Land and Water Governance: completed, in print house</p>	Contribute to GWP Gender thematic area	Madiodio	completed
Part 1b: newly emerged activities			
<p>Water Sharing Initiative – Based on presented concept paper, TEC suggests that water sharing (the allocating and reallocation processes for water) is the logical follow up to IWRM implementation. Practical tools for implementing IWRM are much needed and the WS initiative would seek to provide such practical</p>	Develop perspectives Paper on Water Sharing to be	Mike Young Jerry	2 weeks prior to TEC meeting in February 2018

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>tools and models to help water managers develop robust water sharing systems which are the center of practical IWRM processes.</p> <p>This initiative could be a flagship initiative of GWP for the ongoing period (and be considered as entry point for GWP Strategy 2020). The interest needs to be explored from RWPs.</p>	<p>discussed at next TEC meeting</p> <p>Danka to approach RWPs, GWPO to embed the Initiative into 2018 workplan</p>		
<p>Financing multi-purpose (MP) infrastructure - The preliminary concept note was distributed among TEC members. Research question: how to finance long term capital intensive investments that include both clearly vendible as well as highly distributed public benefits is difficult; especially in international situations. There are many stakeholders benefiting from MP infrastructure and there might be conflicts over priorities (scale), and environmental impacts (in addition to transboundary aspects) and disconnects among the operating rules for multipurpose structures and financing priorities. Never the less MP water structures are critical to achieving IWRM in many parts of the world. Academic papers are many and call for sustainable investments. However, political realities and practical implementations go far beyond the academic exercise.</p> <p>A strong argument to this initiative came from GWP SAF as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - GWP has a role in getting a balanced portfolio of infrastructure investments. The idea though is to focus on basin resilience whilst driving a developmental agenda especially in Africa. The idea is to build resilience and a mixture of investment in infrastructure - large, small and green. A basin approach that will ensure resilience is built whilst supporting the development agendas. <p>Some other suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - broaden the scope to include the overall process of planning and operation of MPPs. This would give room for looking at MPPs in the contexts of river basin that are entirely within a country as well as in transboundary rivers. It is also wide enough to allow coverage of both the planning of new dams and lessons learning from the planning and operation of existing dams. - Financing needs to be highlighted in IWRM processes (3Es to be complemented with financing) <p>A Concept Note to be developed and presented at the next TEC meeting. Consider the focus of PP that GWP will benefit (promoter of IWRM), in other words: infrastructure financing is major element of IWRM (not only three pillars).</p>	<p>Develop Concept Note for the future PP</p> <p>Incorporate into Workplan 2018</p>	<p>Winston Yu and Tom Panella to lead with Jerry</p>	<p>By October 15 to be incorporated into Workplan 2018</p>
<p>Multi stakeholder platforms -GWP identifies itself as a multi stakeholder network/partnership (MSP). Many tools are available for a MSP to operate both among partners and for the interactions of partners with stakeholders. TEC and GWPO were requested to conceptualize how and when to use MSP in digital</p>	<p>Develop Concept Note how to use MSP within GWP</p>	<p>GWPO Com team, Jacques, Jerry</p>	<p>End November 2017</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>age. There are growing tools (ranging from simple google drive, drop box, yammer, via WIKI, MOOC, webinars, online chats to Community of Practice) and these tools could become means. TEC will initiate the discussion in GWP Network on this issue. Request to GWPO Com team to develop a Concept Note.</p> <p>The GWP and TEC involvement in designing and running consultations for the HLP on water show how a MSP can be useful to many important actors in the world water community</p>	<p>Network and bring it to discussion at Regional Days session</p>		<p>Session at Regional Days 2018</p>
<p>Water Stewardship – GWP is well situated between the governments and private corporations. Companies are faced to water disruptions that impact their production chains. They are called upon to improve their management of water including adoption of standards of ‘water stewardship’ for responsible water management respecting shared use of water between water users in catchments and river basins, beyond just individual own use. However, there are some studies that show a little move away from “business as usual”. Some pioneering corporates (and other actors, such as NGOs, donors) are aiming to show how to make up for the ‘public governance gap’. Private companies should surely not be looking to fill the public governance gap. Instead, through water stewardship, the private sector and civil society (large companies and NGOs) are exploring afresh which roles and responsibilities in implementation of water resources management may be delegated to them; thus forming some connection of private stewardship and IWRM. It is suggested to initiate the discussion within GWP on these aspects.</p>	<p>Concept Note to outline challenges in bridging governments and corporates in IWRM processes</p>	<p>Tom Panella, Mike Young supported GWP China leads, Nicolas GWPO, Ross Hamilton SC</p>	<p>End year 2017 and bring it to the discussion in 2018 Regional Days and TEC meetings</p>
<p>Cost Benefit Analysis (BCA) for Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Mega Cities.</p> <p>Background Paper would build on Professor Bernard Barraque and AgroParisTech – ENGREF paper on the topic which has already looked at 20+ mega cities. It will add partnering with the UN SG High Level Panel on Water and Disasters. The High Level Panel on DRR will solicit case studies from its members on DRR BCA in mega cities. Agro Paris Tech and GWP TEC will design a simple format for these case studies. Two products will result.</p> <p>First, a GWP TEC background paper reviewing/summarizing the DRR BCA in various cities. I would include suggestions for methodological guidelines on how to approach DRR BCA in mega cities, data needed and summary of cases.</p> <p>Second, a compendium case of studies published by Water Policy as a Special issue. This would be jointly compiled by GWP TEC, the HLP Water and Disasters, Agro Paris Tech – ENGREF, GWPO persons from Urban Program and Disasters related programs. It would contain 12-15 new cases and the GWP TEC compendium would include these plus previous case studies resulting in 30+ case studies.</p>	<p>Concept note for BP on BCA for DRR</p> <p>Consider case studies for ToolBox</p> <p>Embedded in 2018 workplan</p>	<p>Jerry in cooperation with Frederik, Francois</p>	<p>End of 2017</p>
<p>Part 2: Knowledge and Learning discussion (TEC members, RWP representatives and GWPO network operation)</p>			
<p>GWPO commissioned the K&L assignment to indicate how Knowledge and Learning in GWP can be improved. Ruth Beukman (K&L consultant) presented preliminary results of the assignment. All participants received the Inception report prior to the meeting. The project built on the recommendations</p>	<p>conduct interviews with TEC members and</p>	<p>Ruth Beukman</p>	<p>Late October 2017</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p>of previous studies and assessment of KM Chain, KM Approach, and some others in GWP. The assignment includes interviews with knowledge partners, RWPs, CWPs and will continue with reviews of TEC members and NOs. The work comprises three elements: a) what is KM framework, b) strengthen K&L functions and c) action and implications for RWPs. Preliminary findings are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Is Knowledge Chain mechanism functioning? Not fully or difficult to implement - Is KM Approach appropriate? Not fully or not enforced and feedback is missing - Do we ensure inter-regional connectedness? Due to a diversity of regions and diversity of contexts the linkages are limited and where applied are not cost effective - Do we engage with external strategic knowledge partners? Very much at all levels (regional programs, global initiatives) <p>Discussion points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - TEC members were not clear who are target groups and beneficiaries for this assignment. This was not communicated properly with TEC (although a significant part of the assignment regard TEC) - Any mentioning to ToolBox – a very important part of K&L processes - TEC members are not embedded in regional programs therefore, the loop is not closed. There are other disconnects that needs to be explored (GWPO-RWPs, thematic exchanges within GWP Network, ad hoc tapping on external partners) <p>Summary: The session generated considerable useful discussion around the topic on how TEC can integrate seamlessly into GWPO – a conceptual diagram was offered by Vangelis to describe this discussion which was used to help the group focus.</p>	<p>submit the final report to GWP</p> <p>The next steps will be tailored by GWPO Management who commissioned the report</p>	<p>GWPO Management Team</p>	<p>???</p>
Part 3: Looking for 2018-19 work with RWP, GWPO and other knowledge partners			
<p>The invitation was sent to all RWPs and the representatives from 7 RWPs took part at the meeting and shared their experience, achievements in knowledge products and expressed demands to TEC. The key points from the following RWPs are summarized:</p> <p><u>GWP China</u>: reported on activities (mainly with students and children) and suggested to have an integral plan for education</p> <p><u>GWP Central Asia</u>: WRM is linked to drought and overexploitation of WR. Issues of water management (governance and enforcement). Most of TEC activities are relevant for GWP CACENA. A big interest in CM training, IWL training</p> <p><u>GWP CEE</u>: very rich on knowledge products developed as a part of program on IDMP. Several CWPs also involved in SDG processes. Important role in Danube Commission. Significant focus on the youth (summer school conducted using ToolBox). Demand on TEC: knowledge products on financing (not only capital investments but also O&M, soft infrastructure). Also important to help GWP CEE to connect to global agenda.</p>	<p>Continue in RWP/TEC exchange (one TEC mtg/y hosted by RWP and combine with technical workshop)</p> <p>Develop suggested ways in which Regions can feed interests and views on</p>	<p>Jerry and Vangelis</p>	<p>Ongoing diagram and write up by next TEC meeting Being a part of workplan 2018 process</p>

ITEM/Discussion	Action taken/Decision	Who is in charge	Timing/deadlines
<p><u>GWP SEA</u>: Most knowledge generation comes in the form of studies or workshop proceeding, without follow up. As today, weak linkages between SEA and TEC. GWP SEA is mostly a facilitator of processes (not a do-er).</p> <p><u>GWP SAF</u>: (capturing several African GWPs) – rich experience in WACDEP program (incl. knowledge products fit for purpose of the program). Interest in MP Investments financing (see above)</p> <p><u>GWP MED</u>: felt confident about regional technical expertise, working on variety of programs. Interest in MP Investment financing with nexus accent. Active in working on Water and migration (under water job agenda). High interest to Insurance Paper and CM training.</p> <p><u>GWP SAM</u>: showed the approach in WRM planning cycle. At each step, the knowledge is needed and/or produced; both knowledge and learning exercises are employed</p>	<p>needs to TEC and GWP on regular basis</p> <p>Clarify and write up the interaction process based on the Vangelis diagram</p>		
<p>SDG Preparatory Facility: Josh informed on SDG countries that committed to support the governments in SDGs. The SDG process is led by the national governments and GWP is perceived to be a facilitator to get together all stakeholders. The TEC was thankful for the brief It was felt that the TEC needs to wait to see how indicators are flushed out before making recommendations of how GWP TEC should intervene.</p>			
<p>GWP Work planning process and heads up for Strategy 2020: GWPO employed a robust planning mechanism for the full 2014-19 Strategy. The time comes to a) review the achievements and b) construct approaches for 2020 GWP Strategy. Monitoring and reporting system of GWPO includes each and every unit and is oversighted by Management Team.</p>			

Next Meeting: early February 2018, venue will depend on the interest of RWPs to host the meeting combined with CM workshop.

