

**De :** Johannes Cullmann [Deleted by the IHP Secretariat for reasons of data protection]

**Envoyé :** lundi 4 janvier 2021 13:17

**À :** Hydrology Programme <ihp@unesco.org>

**Cc :** Amani, Abou [Deleted by the IHP Secretariat for reasons of data protection]; Makarigakis, Alexandros K. [Deleted by the IHP Secretariat for reasons of data protection]; Otte, Alexander [Deleted by the IHP Secretariat for reasons of data protection] Nair-bedouelle, Shamila [Deleted by the IHP Secretariat for reasons of data protection]

**Objet :** RE: EN/FR Consultation on the Strategic Plan for the Ninth Phase of UNESCO's Intergovernmental Hydrological Programme (2022-2029)

**CAUTION:** This email is external from UNESCO. Please be vigilant on its sender and content. **ATTENTION :** Cet e-mail est externe à l'UNESCO. Soyez vigilant sur son expéditeur et contenu.

Dear Abou

I have read the draft carefully and discussed it with colleagues in WMO. I believe that you have put together the pieces of IHP's future. Compliments for that.

I have 4 general thoughts after reflecting over the weekend:

- 1) The draft focusses a lot (and rightly so) on science and research, as well as on informed decision/policy making. The true connectors in science to policy/operations are the need to select, validate and adapt those products of research that can be regularly used to support decision making process and those that can improve operation. I think this could be more explicitly targeted in the objectives: UNESCO-IHP can champion the connectivity between science and practice and WMO would like to be a partner in this. I would maybe describe this explicitly in the mission statement
- 2) Whenever you mention hydrological modeling or forecasting you do not make the link to numerical weather prediction. Hydrology does (in most relevant cases) not work without precipitation/snow/ice input. I would like to motivate you to thin about linkages that will allow us to develop more integrated hydro&meteorological systems.
- 3) We will have the 2023 conference and, as a result, significant guidance on how to shape activities 2024 to 2030. I am sure that you have, to the best of the UNESCO water family's knowledge, thought about what IHP can contribute to the SDG Agenda. However, I would think about discussing if it makes sense to start the IHP IX with a 2 year acceleration/analysis/preparation/pilot phase and then do a review in the fall of 2023 to take into account 2024 to 2030 as the main delivery timeframe inline with the 2023 conference decisions. This would harmonise the IHP with SDG processes. It would also give us a chance to review and redirect the WMO hydro related activities that we are planning in 2 year cycles. Our planning cycle ends in Deember 2023 and we will have the chance to use the fall of 23 to design the first jointly designed UNESCO-WMO hydro plan in response to the 23 UN conference.
- 4) Outcome 2 and especially priority area 3 are very closely related to WMO related activities, some expected outcomes are almost the same. The measuring, monitoring, data access and modeling related formulations in the current draft could be explicitly linked to a partnership with WMO (we can then design joint activities and roles). Some formulations in the current draft could be improved, e.g. centralized data management which will likely cause debates. I am willing to help finding a good expert who could work with your team to review this section of you are interested.

Some more specific ideas:

- A lot of emphasis on citizen science, the regulatory and standard setting role of WMO (may be in partnership with ISO) could bring useful synergies (outcome 2, page 11)
- Scientific research, under 1.9 (enhance timely forecast of disaster) this is also being addressed in the WMO hydro action plan and we could integrate the 2. WMO leads on operations and UNESCO on science.
- Water education, especially 2.2 (tertiary and vocational education) and 2.3 (training for decision makers and water managers) could potentially be areas of complementarity (we have training on stream gauging, IFM, management of NHTs), also the idea of reviewing the BIP for hydrologists....
- under inclusive water management 4.5 and 4.6 refer to cryosphere measurements and to impacts of global change on water cycle. Harmonization of activities may be beneficial.

As for the International Glossary of Water: it is not very clear whether it will expand and supersede our joint International Glossary of Hydrology or will complement it. Also, the resolution is very generic, referencing to "natural sciences, social sciences, engineering, biotechnology, and last but not least, health sciences" which would turn the IGW into a universal encyclopaedia. The idea to "establish IGW commission under the custody of IHP UNESCO" could be reformulated to a joint ownership as has proven lengthy but worthy in the current International Glossary of Hydrology.

I write these comments in a positive and cooperative spirit as I will always be a member of the UNESCO Water Family. Please let me know how WMO can be of more specific help in the process of developing the 3<sup>rd</sup> draft and the final product.

Best regards and a happy and health new year,

J