

Brief synthesis of Experts meetings # 01
[IHP Secretariat -Task Force & Experts]
to elaborate the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX (6 Jan. 2021)

Presentation

This first meeting had an average of 48 people.

Abou Amani, welcomed the participants to the meeting and recalled the revised timeline for finalizing the 3rd order draft of the IHP-IX Strategy as decided at the 2nd Extraordinary meeting of the IHP Council 30 November – 1 December 2020.

In the introduction explained that the work schedule will be very tight under the current dead line. Until 4 January 2021: Countries and partners to send their written comments or statements on the current 2nd IHP-IX order draft: https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/ihp-ix-xxiv_ref_1_ihp-ix_2nd_order_draft.pdf).

Emphasized that to date, 32 comments have been received (16 from Board members, 5 from MS, 10 from EoMS and 1 from a Chair). He added that these are comments of a different nature: some general, others specific and others for a better editing. At the same time, BSP has been working on a proposal for the drafting of outcomes and outputs

A 3rd order draft is expected for January 31, which is why it is necessary to have two or three meetings per week (13:00 – 15:00 hours, Paris time) between Task force, Experts of Members States in charge of the preparation of IHP-IX and MS with the support of the Secretariat to produce a 3rd-order draft based on comments received. Also, during this process the consultants Carlos Estévez and Richard Meganck will support the work of the Secretariat.

In the first half of February the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX will be circulated, to receive comments from Countries and partners. Then, between 22-24 February 2021 will be held a 3rd Extraordinary IHP council to discuss the IHP-IX 3rd-order draft.

Before this meeting the Secretariat circulated all the comments received and the “base document”.

Topics Discussed:

Topics / Issues raised	Main ideas	Actions Agreement
A method to work on the different comments received.	Nathalie Dorflinger (France): She suggests reviewing the different types of comments, categorizing and prioritizing them.	The Secretariat will circulate all the comments to the draft with a tracking change format.
Comments from regions	<p><u>Poliopetro (Mexico, Group III — Latin America and the Caribbean)</u>: In general, the comments from the LAC region tend to agree with the 2nd order draft. There are proposals for minor corrections that they have received from the countries of the region. He suggests writing alternatives for writing from the regions.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: Do not forget that the task force team has a regional representation.</p> <p><u>Zhongbo Yu (China, Vice-Chairperson Group IV - Asia and the Pacific)</u> explains that his region also shares the progress noted in this draft and that they will contribute to the ongoing process</p> <p><u>Manuel Melendez (Spain, Vice-Chairpersons of the IHP Council Group I - Western Europe and North America)</u> considers that it is not possible to incorporate every suggestion received from the countries of group I. Germany, France and Switzerland have wondered if perhaps the draft implies leaving the borders of UNESCO's mandate and that eventually it would be entering the political issue. He points out that he does not share that position, but believes that a better wording would be necessary on issues such as water diplomacy, conflict and hydro-sociology.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: Share what Manuel pointed out and remember that several of these terms are already in IHP-VIII. UNESCO has spoken out for an actionable science, where facts and evidence can be put at the service of water governance.</p> <p><u>Mitja Brilly (Slovenia, Vice-Chairperson Group II - Eastern and Central Europe)</u> indicates the convenience of the document having an attached glossary that includes the most innovative terms.</p> <p><u>Imasiku Nyambe (Zambia, Vice-Chairperson Group Va - Africa)</u> notes that while there were countries in Africa that did not comment, others did and that does not seem to have been collected so far.</p>	<p>Abou Amani agrees that from this date all comments will be accessible online.</p> <p>He adds that the Secretariat will incorporate new comments made from the members of this instance.</p> <p>He proposes to have a meeting next Tuesday 12 and Thursday 14 at the same time and that on Monday 11 there will be a document that has compiled all the comments, which will be shared prior to the meeting.</p> <p>It is also agreed to separate substantive comments from those merely editorial ones.</p>

Brief synthesis of Experts meeting #02 to elaborate the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX (12 Jan. 2021)

Presentation

This 2nd meeting had an average of 45 people.

Abou Amani, in the introduction explained that all the comments have been compiled in the document. He also emphasized that the ongoing process has a tight work schedule and that after this sub-stage we will work with an editing and writing team, for whose integration a proposal will be made at the next meeting.

Next, María Donoso was asked to lead the meeting. She pointed out that she has differentiated between those comments that are rather editorial (which will not be discussed in the following meetings) and those of a more substantive nature, which, in turn, it is suggested to subdivide between some of a general nature and others that are specific.

Finally, she added that the document will be opened for online access so that new comments or suggestions can be added.

Topics Discussed:

Topics	Main ideas	Actions or agreement
1. Integrated Water Resources Management	<p>Ensure Integrated Water Resources Management is a component of the strategic document.</p> <p><u>Nathalie</u> (France): Although this concept is still valid, it does not seem necessary that it be in the strategic objective of the document.</p> <p><u>Jan Szolgay</u> supports Austria's comment (recommended that integrated approaches to water management, such as the source-to-sea, should be taken into consideration).</p>	
2. Groundwater to be strengthened.	<p>Ground water is already present, but it can be emphasized and made explicit.</p> <p><u>China</u>: Although it seems that it is already in the document, the interaction with surface waters, the aspect of water quality and that of transboundary aquifers could still be highlighted.</p>	It is agreed that Nathalie Dorfliger (France) and Zhongbo (China) will contribute to improve this aspect.

<p>3. Ensure a clear linkage with other UN Agencies</p>	<p><u>Mitja Brilly</u> (Slovenia) asks that the document contain a glossary with some relevant definitions. Some of them could be worked with other agencies.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> (Secretariat): Very constructive comments received from WHO</p> <p><u>Nathalie Dorfliger</u> (France) suggests that at the end of each of the 5 priority areas add a specific paragraph to highlight partnership related to collaborative and complementary work with other UN agencies.</p>	<p>It is agreed to develop these definitions. Mitja and Jan are asked for their collaboration in this matter.</p> <p>The idea of advancing collaborative work with WHO is supported.</p> <p>It is suggested to check if there are opportunities to link the document with collaborative actions (Maria Donoso)</p>
<p>4. Young Professionals (Gender)</p>	<p><u>Zhongbo</u> (China) share what is already expressed in the document.</p> <p><u>Agatha Tommasi</u> (Brazil, TF): In the water education section is strongly addressed the young professionals, but maybe we could make more references in the other sections as well.</p>	
<p>5. Governance based on science</p>	<p>Nathalie (France) considers necessary to reread this priority area and the interaction between science and governance carefully. It is appropriate to delegate this to the writing team. Request a 48-hour window to comment on the text.</p>	<p>It is agreed that this rereading and editing proposals be delegated to the writing team.</p> <p>Regarding the space to comment on the document online (on this and other matters), it is agreed that it will be 36 hours, due to the fact that there is a tight dead line. A link will be sent to all EoMS and Task Force.</p>
<p>6. Repetitions/Glossary/ Concepts</p>	<p>It is requested to avoid repetitions and duplications in the document.</p> <p><u>Karima Attia</u> (Egypt) highlights the convenience of justifying and reinforcing the purposes of the main ideas of the document, especially for their better implementation in diverse realities.</p> <p><u>Mark Honti</u> (TF/Hungary): The proposed main tasks of IHP IX were formulated by clustering the wishes of member states.</p>	<p>The idea of taking over the replays is ongoing. It will be one of the tasks of the writing team.</p>

	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: Although sharing the idea of reinforcing or clarifying certain definitions, it is also true that as the Program is implemented, the level of success of the different lines of action can be identified.</p> <p><u>Maciej Zalewski</u> (Poland) points out that it would be appropriate to correct the name of the 2nd priority area: “Water Education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution”, he considers that the “industrial” concept should move towards that of sustainability.</p> <p><u>Mitja Brilly</u> (Slovenia): Instead of fourth industrial revolution we should talk about the era of informatics.</p>	Poland is asked to make a title proposal for this priority area and this invitation is open to anyone who wants to comment on the document.
7. Circular Economies / Environmental Economy	<p>Enhance references to circular economy</p> <p>Alexandros (IHP): Some experts from the water family could be invited to develop it</p>	Everyone is invited to propose some phrases for this.
8. Citizen Sciences	<p><u>Maciej Zalewski</u> (Poland): a valuable component of citizen science is its contribution to long-term monitoring, particularly in ecohydrology.</p> <p><u>Blim Blivi</u>: Citizen Science is appropriated note to public to be vigilant and efficient through intelligent modes of education.</p> <p><u>Patricia Herrera</u> (EOMS Mexico): I have some doubts about citizen science, maybe the best concept could be “citizen knowledge”</p> <p><u>Mishra Anil</u> (IHP): The participation of the general public in the research design, data collection and interpretation process, together with scientists is often referred to as citizen science.</p> <p><u>Sandra de Vries</u> (TF, Netherlands): There has recently been quite some work by UNESCO and led by Uta When from the IHE Delft concerning citizen science and open science. She provided a link by chat.</p> <p>https://en.unesco.org/sites/default/files/csgp_csos_cop_short_paper_on_open_science_may_2020.pdf</p>	
9. Open Science	<p><u>Jan Szolgary</u>: It is important to keep this concept in the document, even politically.</p>	

	<p><u>Ann Van Griensven</u>: There is a call from UNESCO and other UN agencies to develop this line of open science and free access to data.</p> <p><u>Mark Honti</u> (TF/Hungary): Data openness and availability are emphasised in task 3 and the entire task is derived from the open science initiative.</p> <p><u>Mishra Anil</u> (IHP), by chat:</p> <div data-bbox="565 552 1008 1178" style="background-color: #333; color: #fff; padding: 10px;"> <p>● UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science: The draft Recommendation define shared values and principles for Open Science, :</p> <p><i>“The ideal behind Open Science is to allow scientific information, data, and outputs to be more widely accessible (Open Access), and more reliably harnessed (Open Data) with the active engagement of all the stakeholders (Open to Society).”</i></p> </div>	<p>She was invited by Maria Donoso to complement the text in the next 36 hours.</p>
<p>10. Water Diplomacy</p>	<p>It is an emerging concept. Science is understood to provide elements to support and drive policy. Also “water democracy” is an emerging concept.</p> <p><u>Karima Attia</u> (Egypt) (chat): It would be appropriate to define well what we understand by water diplomacy, since it can be a delicate concept for diplomacy. However, it is clear that science must be a fundamental contribution to diplomacy.</p> <p><u>Blim Blivi</u> (chat): Water diplomacy is very important to develop by UNESCO due to different level of technologies from countries that exploits transboundary water. Also due to the fact that regarding transboundary water the need of diplomacy is high within exploitation through appropriated negotiations.</p>	

	<p><u>Patricia Herrera</u> (Mexico): We must promote that negotiations between the countries are carried out on the basis of reliable information for all parties, leveling the power between the actors and allowing them to better resolve their differences in water management from that base.</p>	
--	--	--

Carlos Estévez – Richard Meganck

Brief synthesis of Task Force & Experts meeting #03 to elaborate the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX (14 Jan. 2021)

Presentation

Meeting opening:

Abou Amani gave a brief introduction and noted that approximately 30 individuals, representing M.S., Experts, Partners, provided inputs to this draft version of the Strategy, the majority using the on-line format for commenting. He noted that several people had difficulty accessing the document and therefore sent their comments via text or email to the Secretariat. Maria Donoso chaired the meeting on behalf of the Secretariat.

Topics Discussed:

Topics	Main ideas	Actions Agreement
1. Citizen Science	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: Introduced topic and noted that it is related to all aspects of the document. A question was posed to engender the discussion: "What is the added value by including citizen science to the policy decision-making process?"</p> <p><u>Sandra de Vries</u> / the Netherlands: Questioned the value of our trying to defend this topic when it was so well researched and known by the international community?</p>	<p>A simple direct statement the citizen science will help implementation of the Strategy.</p>
2. Open Science	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: UNESCO has a clear position that favors "open science" and "open data sharing".</p> <p><u>Jan Szolgay</u>/Poland: Many references in support of these concepts which are fully in-line with UNESCO policy. A paragraph supporting this reality should be included in the introduction and in the glossary.</p> <p><u>Zhongbo</u> /China: Noted that both open science and open data are vital concepts, particularly when dealing with transboundary water resources</p>	<p>Jan will review the draft Strategy with respect to open science / open data, and suggests changes/ additions to the document.</p> <p>Brief text in the Strategy noting the importance of</p>

	<p>and issues. He also noted that these concepts support UNESCO policies even though they may, at times, be controversial.</p> <p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: These concepts support the advancement of science and IHP will support protocols to that end.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: The Secretariat will link with UNESCO's policy on open science / open data.</p> <p><u>Karima Attia / Egypt</u>: Most countries want to share data but somehow we must strive to standardize a methodology to collect and record data so that it is understandable by all scientists. We have all failed to a certain degree in this regard.</p>	<p>standardizing collection and recording.</p> <p>Should a statement be included in the Strategy or in the Implementation Plan?</p>
3. Water Cooperation	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: In principal everyone favours cooperation but at a certain level issues of sovereignty enter into consideration for both surface and sub-surface water policy and management.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: It is very important that M.S. understand that we cannot cooperate without scientific knowledge and evidence and that IHP-IX and UNESCO programmes such as PC-CP are contributing to better decision making processes.</p> <p><u>Zhongbo / China</u>: We should expand our knowledge as to how we can promote greater levels of cooperation particularly in the transboundary context by supporting mechanisms to enhance the technical capabilities for developing countries that do not have all of the technologies to meaningfully cooperate at this time.</p>	<p>Statement in the Strategy?</p>
4. Water Diplomacy	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: All programmes within UNESCO and the IHP promote a scientific base to better management of resources. Water diplomacy must be understood in that context.</p> <p><u>Mitja Brilly / Slovenia</u>: We should focus on scientific issues as inputs to the debate that diplomats have. We want to avoid being seen as exceeding our scientific role.</p>	

	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: This concept has always been UNESCO's role. IHP has always kept to the science issues and models. Methodologies to assist in organizing data and helping policy decisions is our role. That spirit continues today in the IHP and in the IHP-IX draft strategy.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: This is the spirit of the entire Organization. IHP doesn't undertake negotiations but helps building: i. that capacity, ii. Producing best practices, and iii. Augmenting core hydrological knowledge – all as inputs to diplomats and negotiations between countries. Noted “hydro-diplomacy” term and its relationship to “water diplomacy”.</p> <p><u>Patricia Herrera / Mexico</u>: Raised the issue of the “Stages of the IHP Programme” and asked rhetorically as to the proper timing for the IHP to take “new steps” to help M.S. face the issues we will confront in the future? She noted the border issues as an example and stated that IHP needs to contribute vis-à-vis science to these debates.</p> <p><u>Mitja Brilly / Slovenia</u>: Stressed the IHP “Mission” and “Vision” and that we should consider preparing a separate document on these topics prior to the approval of the OHP-IX Strategy.</p> <p><u>Zhongbo / China</u>: Noted that the IHP must pay attention to differences of opinion between the M.S. and what can be done better. He noted mega-cities, priority issues in LDCs and concerns of the public as potential issues.</p> <p><u>Yasuto Tachikawa / Japan</u>: IHP's mission is unique and we must stress clearly our collaborative efforts.</p>	<p>Secretariat to take decision.</p>
--	---	--------------------------------------

<p>5. IHP-IX Strategy Title / Glossary</p>	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u>: Noted the various titles suggested by the Secretariat and the M.S. After a brief but spirited discussion it was decided that the drafting and editing committee will consider two principal options: i. <i>“Science for a Water Secure World in a Changing Environment”</i>, and ii. <i>“Science for Water Security in a Changing World”</i>.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: Supported this decision by noting the history and evolution of the IHP by stating that the commitment is for “Continuity with Change”. He also noted that there will also be a glossary with both defined terms and citations as to the source of the definitions.</p>	<p>Drafting and Editing committee to consider.</p> <p>TF, EoMS, Sect. to contribute to a glossary and citations</p>
<p>6. Next Steps / Timeline <u>Abou Amani</u></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Input from all contributors will be compiled 2. A new version of the Strategy will be produced on 15 January 3. It will be open for comment until Monday 18 January mid-day (Paris time). 4. We will hold a new meeting on Tuesday 19 January (13:00-15:00 hours Paris time). Alexander will issue an invitation. 5. The Document will then be closed at some time after the Tuesday meeting. 6. The Draft and Editing team will then take over and work on 20-22 January. 7. The document will then be shared as the 3rd Order Draft. 	

Brief synthesis of Task Force & Experts meeting #04 to elaborate the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX (19 Jan. 2021)

Presentation

Meeting opening:

Abou Amani gave a brief welcome, thanking everyone for their contributions and noted that today's meeting would focus on the timeline for finalizing the 3rd draft of the Strategy by the end of January before it is distributed to the M.S. as well as finalizing the members of the drafting and editing team. Maria Donoso facilitated the meeting and started by providing an overview of the process to date, noting both "general" and "specific" issues topics that were discussed and reported in the meeting summaries for 6 and 14 January 2021.

Topics Discussed:

Topics / Issues raised	Main ideas	Actions Agreement
1. Culture	<u>Maciej Zalewski</u> : Noted the relationship of "culture" to achieving sustainable development goals. He stated that culture is also "background" to discussions on science and helps to broaden the understanding of man and the biosphere. Finally, he noted that culture is a reference point for the establishment of watershed management plans.	Maciej asked for consideration to include a short statement on culture someplace in the Strategy.
2. Glossary	<u>Jan Szolgay</u> : Asked how to proceed with the development of a glossary. He noted the list that was circulated by the Secretariat – some widely known terms, others that need further discussion as to an acceptable definition. He also noted that it may not be the best idea to include a glossary in the Strategy. In this regard he noted the WMO-UNESCO glossary which is available in several languages and should be put on the IHP-IX website for easy access to all who are interested. <u>Alexandros</u> (Secretariat) noted that the WMO-UNESCO glossary will be used for the terms included in the Strategy. The	

	<p>necessity of having a glossary stems from the fact that some non-technical people may have difficulty understanding parts of the Strategy simply because they do not have the academic background related to the subject matter or because they have a different perception of the same term.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> noted that there is the WMO-UNESCO glossary and there are additional terms that are used in the Strategy. These are two different things.</p> <p><u>Poliopro Fortunato Martin</u> stated that a glossary is not a dictionary; there are many definitions of the terms used in the Strategy, but that we should only use term defined in UN documents.</p> <p><u>Omar Salem</u> noted that when technical terms are translated it can have “other” meanings (than its technical meaning in the language in which it was originally published).</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> noted that the IHP-IX Strategy will eventually be available in all six UN languages.</p> <p><u>Mitja Brilly</u> asked that the glossary be translated into other languages, beyond the 6 official UN languages, inviting Member States to contribute to it.</p>	
<p>3. Editorial / Drafting team</p>	<p><u>Abou Amani</u>: The composition of the team will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1 TF Member (Mark Honti) 1 EoMS (Zhongbo Yu) 2 Consultants (Carlos Estevez, Richard Meganck) 1 Facilitator (Maria Donoso) Secretariat Staff (up to 6) 	<p>Maria will redraft first sections of Strategy; Mark will work on Priority Area 3; Richard and Carlos on PAs 1,2,4,5. To be submitted to Secretariat no later than January 23. The Secretariat will work on the Results Chains / Theory of Change.</p>
<p>4. Next Meeting</p>	<p>No firm date but possibly on 26 January.</p>	<p>Secretariat to take inform the TF and EoMS members according to the progress in drafting.</p>

Brief synthesis of Experts meeting #05 to elaborate the 3rd-order draft of IHP-IX (28 Jan. 2021)

Presentation

Abou Amani welcomed everyone and noted that this is the final meeting before the draft Strategy is submitted for translation and distribution as the 3rd order draft. He also mentioned that the editorial and drafting team (Secretariat, Maria Donoso, Zhongbo (MS), Mark (TF) and the two consultants) had worked primarily on the comments received and in those expressed in previous meetings. The document was reorganized in order to better capture and understand the flow of the strategy for its reading/understanding. Furthermore, an effort was made to add descriptive paragraphs to each output for better understanding.

Maria Donoso proposed not to focus on minor editorial issues as the text will be examined by a professional editor, but rather on the so-called red flags or major issues that are not identified or discussed properly. She also stated that neither the partnership and outreach section (with no changes) nor the glossary were included in the document that was circulated prior to this meeting, but naturally they will be included. She mentioned that the partnership and outreach sections had no changes. Finally, she explained the method of work: the meeting would examine the document chapter by chapter and when we reach the priority areas are reached the members of the task Force will open the discussion.

Topics Discussed:

Topics / Person	Main ideas	Actions or agreement
1. Title	<u>Maria Donoso</u> : Science for a water secure world in a changing environment is the title that prevailed in the discussion. A space for comments was opened.	There were no disagreements with the title.
2. Introduction // Preamble	No comments	
3. Global water landscape: challenges and opportunities	<u>Maria Donoso</u> : Both sections were integrated to reduce duplications. <u>Harald Koethe</u> requested that the relationship between Agenda 2030 and the UNESCO Water Family be strengthened by including a very clear	The Secretariat will enhance the reference on the SDG 6 Global Acceleration Framework.

	<p>statement to the effect that “UNESCO supports the SDG 6 Global Acceleration Framework – Action Space.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: noted that references are made in this chapter, under “Meeting the SDGs and other water related International Agendas” in the box on page 6. Then on p. 32 there is an explicit relationship between UNESCO and SDG 6 Global Acceleration Framework (at the end of PA 2).</p> <p><u>Harald Koethe</u> considers it convenient that this reference be made from the beginning.</p>	
4. The comparative advantage of UNESCO and its Intergovernmental Hydrological Programme (IHP)	<p><u>Patricia Herrera (Mexico)</u> raised the convenience of adding some regional agreements to the end of the chapter. This is the case of the ESCAZU Environmental Agreement in LAC.</p>	The Secretariat will take another look around this idea.
5. Assuring Continuity with Change	<p><u>Maria Donoso</u> explained the logic of this chapter and that only a few activities were chosen as examples on how to showcase the transition from IHP VIII to IHP IX.</p> <p><u>Nathalie Dorfliger</u> asked about the possibility of mentioning the FRIENDS program in the in the part where "new issues" is mentioned.</p> <p><u>Maria Donoso</u>. Representative activities were chosen for each of the five IHP-VIII themes. FRIEND although is a relevant initiative and actually the oldest one, could not be mentioned alone, leaving out the rest 16.</p> <p><u>Jan Szolgay</u> noted that the 3rd paragraph on pg. 11 it is stated that IHP-IX will address five priority areas (those that are developed later), and it may be convenient to list them.</p> <p>He also noted that CRIDA is mentioned too often as compared to other programmes.</p>	<p>The Secretariat noted that all 17 UNESCO initiatives are important to the success of IHP-IX. These programmatic relationships will be addressed more directly in the Implementation Plan.</p> <p>Care will be taken when mentioning these examples in order to avoid that some programs may be interpreted as better than others.</p>

	<p><u>Harald Koethe</u> shares what Jan has pointed out regarding CRIDA, he considers that it is developed in much more detail than the other programs mentioned.</p> <p>He believes that many readers may wonder why some programs stand out and others do not.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u>: the purpose of mentioning these programs is to illustrate continuity and change, since IHP builds on what was previously advanced.</p> <p><u>Patricia Herrera</u> wonders why in paragraph 5 there is an emphasis on groundwater “During phase IX, IHP will further develop activities dedicated to research and scientific cooperation on the essential role of groundwater to support resilient water use...”, when it should be water governance usually.</p> <p><u>Maria Donoso</u> explains these paragraphs are just examples, but understand that can be read / understood from another perspective.</p>	
<p>6. IHP Vision and Mission</p>	<p><u>Nathalie D.</u> noted that some comments on the part related with water culture and water ethics were not properly reported in the document that was circulated before this meeting. She suggested to include this on the fifth mission element.</p> <p><u>Jan Szolgoy</u> mentions that the relationship between the Vision and Mission statement are not totally consistent, because the main purpose of the Vision is: “water management and governance to attain sustainable development and <u>to build resilient societies.</u>” This inconsistency is repeated in the theory of change diagram between the “Impacts” and the “Outcome” where a reference to building resilient societies is also missing.</p>	<p>This change was inadvertently left out of the document that was circulated, but is going to be corrected in the master copy.</p> <p>The Secretariat takes note of this concern, although it indicates that in the fourth element of the Mission there is an explicit mention of resilience.</p>

<p>7. Outcomes</p>	<p><u>Harald Koethe</u> asks why in the last paragraph of p. 13 the UNESCO Second Objective is highlighted first.</p> <p><u>Alexandros Makarigakis</u> explained that the 2nd Strategic Objective is to be addressed by the Science sector whereas the 1st by the Education sector. Thus the order (to showcase the SO that the Programme will focus on).</p> <p><u>Nathalie Dorfliger</u>, instead, she supports the way it is stated.</p> <p><u>Jan Szolgay</u> noted that on page 14 the Performance Indicators are fine but there is no baseline from which to measure relative improvement, especially in PI 3 and PI 4. He thinks we should not have this paragraph related to the indicators, because they could be formal, dangerous and unnecessary, not easy to successfully complete.</p> <p><u>Harald</u> support this concern</p> <p><u>Alexandros M.</u> Regarding what was indicated on the baseline, he considers that the indicator can be declarative in the first part and then developed more fully in the complementary implementation document.</p> <p><u>Patricia Herrera (Mexico)</u> believes that PI 4 is very general, that something related to gap reduction would be better.</p> <p><u>Maria Donoso</u> maybe we can reword PI #4 to be less “political”</p>	<p>The Secretariat noted that many of these details will be dealt with in the forthcoming Implementation plan.</p>
<p>8. Result chain // Theory of Change</p>		<p>No comments</p>
<p>9. Priority Areas 9.1 Scientific research and innovation.</p>	<p><u>Helmut Habersack</u> questioned output 1.1 (wording), about 1.6 that some sentences about water cycle (hydrological cycle) are not clear and 1.7 which he claimed was “too broad in its goals”, but also an unnecessary emphasis is placed on the urban component. He offers to write a rewording.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> noted that the editorial team tried to combine ideas to reduce the total</p>	<p>The Secretary points out that in the editorial work it will be seen if it is necessary to divide output 1.7 into two different outputs</p>

<p>9.2 Water Education in the Fourth Industrial Revolution.</p> <p>9.3 Bridging the data-knowledge gap.</p> <p>9.4 Inclusive water management under conditions of global change.</p>	<p>number of outputs and that is why 1.7 is such a “big” output. <u>Maria Donoso</u> noted that the idea was to break the “silo approach” and deal with issues in an integrated fashion.</p> <p><u>Agatha Tomasi</u> (TF Brazil) reinforced some concepts of this PA and the importance of the relationship between science and education in water matters. No further comments.</p> <p><u>Mark Honti</u> (TF Hungary) explained that some minor changes were made, for example, the last output was removed, which was merged with another. There were no comments on this PA</p> <p><u>Sandra de Vries</u> (TF Netherlands) explained that “inclusive” is a proper concept to be use, because when speaking on global changes you must also consider local impacts. <u>Helmut Habersack</u> he refers to output 4.2 and indicates that it is very relevant. However, he estimates that the text should be reworded and that he will send a few lines. <u>Patricia Herrera (Mexico)</u> values the concept "inclusive" although it lacks a direct mention of access and inequality. She considers it necessary to be explicit in reducing inequalities in access to water. <u>Sandra de Vries</u> stated that “inequality” may fit better on 4.1 or 4.2 <u>Zhongbo (China)</u> noted that certain ideas were missing from this PA: surface and sub-surface water; water rights or transboundary water. <u>Harald Koethe</u> noted that the outputs tend to end with an “aim” but there is no reference to who is responsible to monitoring it. For example, in output 4.7</p>	
---	--	--

<p>9.5 Water Governance based on science for mitigation, adaptation, and resilience</p>	<p>it is not clear what UNESCO is responsible for.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> explained the thinking behind drafting the outputs and considers that in output 4.7 all that is written before "supported" would be UNESCO's work, therefore, it is clear who is in charge of what.</p> <p><u>Patricia Herrera</u> spoke in relation to 2nd paragraph in 5.1 especially on the phrase "and to intervene to avoid unwanted modifications". She considers that it is appropriate to make certain adjustments and indicates that she will send an email about it.</p> <p><u>Maria Donoso</u> ask her to do so.</p> <p><u>Harald Koethe</u> pointed out that PA 5 is very clear in pointing out water governance is based on science. However, it considers that water governance is not the mandate of UNESCO but rather to provide science and information for those who make decisions.</p> <p><u>Abou Amani</u> agreed with him and pointed out that the first sentence in the paragraph under "Cooperating with other UN Agencies and scientific partners" in this PA clearly states "UNESCO's role in water governance is to reinforce the scientific base upon which decisions and policies are framed by providing scientific knowledge, which will take into consideration the effects of global change."</p> <p><u>Nathalie Dorfliger</u> shares the spirit of what is indicated in 5.5, but considers that it will be very difficult to implement this output using a scientific basis.</p>	<p>Patricia will write it and send an email to the Secretariat.</p>
<p>10. Meeting Closing</p>	<p>Before closing, Maria Donoso recalls that there will be a complementary implementation document and that a</p>	<p>Abou noted that there would be more fine tuning of the document before the 3rd order draft is submitted</p>

	<p>Glossary will be added as an annex at the end of this document.</p> <p>Regarding more specific comments, remember that you can send emails, but remember that there is almost no time remaining.</p>	<p>to the M.S. by 31 January. Then there would be a two-week period for any final comments to be input before the 22-24 February Extraordinary IHP Council. In April it should be submitted to the review of the Executive Committee. Finally he thanked everyone for their hard work and inputs to this important document.</p>
--	---	--