



IWG TASK GROUP SEMINARS

10th IWG Coordination Committee Meeting

JUNE 30/JULY 01, 2021

14:00 - 17:00 CET/ 08:00-11:00 EST

■ Day 1 (June 30)

WELCOMING REMARKS AND ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Gunilla Björklund (IWG chair) welcomed all participants to the virtual two-day seminar, in the hope that everyone will be able to attend both days. The work that has been done in the 4 different groups, will be discussed. Each day 2 groups will have their presentations, afterward, the discussant will start a discussion, the audience will have the opportunity to raise questions too, the time allotted for the discussion is 60 minutes, and the same procedure will be applied to all groups. Thus, the introduced agenda of the seminar highlighted the schedule for the first day but also informed that the program for the second day will be a little bit longer, synthesis team will have the presentation of the highlights. The proposed agenda was adopted unanimously. **Gunilla Björklund** then gave the floor to Daniel Tsegai (Secretariat) to present the Objectives of the Task Group Seminars.



OBJECTIVES OF THE TASK GROUP SEMINARS – SECRETARIAT

Daniel Tsegai thanked **Gunilla Björklund** for the kind introduction, underlined that this Task Group seminar is really a good milestone for the IWG. Started the presentation with TOR (important for the structure of the IWG report). Stock take - the survey has been done where 70+ countries responded to questions, this was analyzed and presented at the first IWG meeting, beyond that, another round of stock take, have been done, desk research on what countries have done on drought, national policies on land, biodiversity, climate change, all three Rio conventions, this will be validated by countries (by the end of July 2021). The IWG considering options, what are existing options for the UNCCD, and COP also Wider partnerships. Group work modality is based on the 3 pillars, at the current stage, the IWG is considering options and recommendations, the final stage is proposal options for decision, for the COP, which will be held in May 2022. He briefly summarized what Task Groups will present during this seminar. Task Group 1, SPI work support on Multiscale Approaches for Assessment and Monitoring-the Resilience of Vulnerable Populations and Ecosystems to Drought ... thanks to colleagues who are parallel members of both groups IWG and SPI, to make it available to the IWG to discuss it, have at disposal and insight into this document. Task Group 2 made an independent report on vulnerability assessment (they made a survey, 42 countries responded) come up with results, what countries saying about their costs, vulnerability, what are challenges, options to reduce vulnerability. Task Group 3, incredibly good and intense work with the support of Global Mechanism consultant on financial instruments resulted with Guidance notes on drought finance- Innovative Financial Instruments for Drought Mitigation, Preparedness, Response, and Recovery.

The next milestone is the final report. By the end of July, the synthesis team will come with a zero draft of the final report. During the period July till September drafting of the IWG report (led by the synthesis team) based on the group reports and substantive documents is expected, and the first draft review by IWG during September. The second draft and COP Bureau review in October. If feasible, a blended meeting will be held in November, followed by the finalization of the report



and the final IWG Meeting. In December IWG report should be available among COP documents. Optimistic and hopeful, that tasks will be finished according to the timeline, as planned. The COP is likely to happen in May 2022. Four task groups have been operating for more than a year, independently, this seminar is a great opportunity to present what have been doing for a year, advise each other on what can be elaborated, exchange ideas, and discuss the key outcomes from the task groups, constructive comments on the task group reports, all reports, and documents, presentations are available on MS Teams, by Jul 15, key messages that task groups come up will be consolidated. At the end of this 2-day seminar, task groups will be able to finalize task groups reports, consolidate the key messages.

Abdu AlSharif had a question about options and recommendations, which one is in the TOR. Daniel Tsegai responded that in TOR are options, with the intention that if time allows returning to that issue. Gunilla **Björklund** thanked to Daniel Tsegai and gave the floor to Sara Jade Govia.

TASK GROUP 2 (VULNERABILITY ASSESSMENT)

Sara Jade Govia thanked the team members and explained that Task Group 2 specific assignment was to assess impacts, vulnerability, and risk of drought, noticed that the mention was minimal, and went back to the national focal points specifically on vulnerability and impact assessment, and administrated the second survey through UNCCD, 46 countries participated. The survey consisted of four questions:

1. Are there any specific assessments that you have developed or are using to understand and reduce drought effects? Analysis was done by Jose Fidel Pérez and Sara Jade Govia.
2. What are the needs to reduce the drought impacts and vulnerability in your country? Analyzed by Abduvokhid Zakhadullaev and Suruchi Bhadwal.
3. What are the main barriers and challenges in addressing the vulnerabilities to drought? analyzed by Caroline King-Okumu and Marijana Kapović Solomun.



4. What are the policies or practical measures undertaken recently to cope with drought in your country? analyzed by Maher Salman and Andries Jordan.

Most of the response came from the African annex; had 15 % response from Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC); 12,5 % Northern Mediterranean (N-MED); 15% Central and Eastern Europe (CEE). Equal participation from the countries 40 (NFPs) and 5 civil society organizations (CSO). An additional response was received from South Africa.

The first question addresses the drought vulnerability assessment being carried out in the countries and the methods/tools applied to conduct this assessment. A total of 37 responses to this question. 30 countries and 7 CSOs. One-third (33%) of the countries did mention conducting a vulnerability assessment, 31 countries have Drought Monitoring (watch), 21 countries have Drought Early Warning Systems (forecast). Some of the responses mentioned specific drought monitoring indices used in their drought monitoring and assessment. Several of the responses mentioned some form of impact assessments being used to monitor the effects of droughts or drought itself.

Question two, practical and broad - What are the needs to reduce the drought impacts and vulnerability in your country? Twenty of the forty countries (50%) explained their mechanism to reduce drought impacts and vulnerability in their country. Fifteen of the forty countries (37.5%) described the problems of drought impacts and vulnerability but did not describe nor gave details on their solutions at the state level. The remaining 5 countries (12.5%) have only reported general problems.

The responses to question three included comments on barriers relating to several issues and can be categorized into these four classes: 1. Institutional, legal, and regulatory framework, poor coordination between the institutions; 2. Limited funding and little financial resources; 3. Inadequate institutional capacity, human resources, and material resources; 4. Limited knowledge, low technology, little or no research, and problems with information or access to information. The four categories that were identified as barriers by at least half or more of the countries are: Limited knowledge, low technology, research, and problems with Information or access to information was commented by 62.5% of the countries. Limitations with funding and financial resources were pointed out in 55% of the countries. The capacity barrier came after 55% of the countries facing



issues with inadequate institutional capacity, not enough qualified human resources, or material resources. The institutional, legal, and regulatory framework, poor coordination between institutions, was identified as a barrier by 50% of the countries. Sustainability of Drought Monitoring and Improving Forecasts, countries identified as barriers and challenges. The main constraints on early warning information system implementation include lack of a national and regional drought policy framework; Limited coordination between institutions that provide different types of drought early warning, risk management and risk reduction, that results from a national policy; and Inadequate social impact indicators to form part of a comprehensive early warning system and inform policy response. Put in words of one of the NFP the goal would be to achieve multiscale, multilevel, multisector drought vulnerability assessment. “Existence of an information deficit that makes the framing and assessment of (drought) situations critical”; “Lack of simple but effective approaches/methods for early drought assessment for use at the local level to enable proactive drought management”; “Institutional and technical capacity for drought assessment and management”; “There are differences in perceptions of vulnerability; and that “different industries or regions have completely different understandings of it”; “Availability of suitable drought assessment tools.” Challenge of Inclusion and Participation plus the Gender issues as one of the barriers. The challenge goes beyond just considering women. It is having more inclusion and participation in general, of communities, population groups, and stakeholders. “Poverty of the rural population, in particular, women”, “non-involvement of rural women in the management of natural resources”, “the low level of representation of women in decision-making bodies and the poor consideration of gender in the design and implementation of projects and programs on drought”, “women play an essential role in forestry, in food production and security”.

Question four - What are the policies or practical measures are undertaken recently to cope with drought in your country? According to the feedback received through the survey, the number of countries with national drought policies in place is quite low (38%), and their relevance even lower (34%). Thorough policy mapping of sectoral policies may prove highly beneficial for countries where national strategies are not in place. Local interventions should be further investigated to evaluate their relevance and effectiveness. The international community and dedicated initiatives are best placed to increase awareness, develop capacities, and support countries reaching this goal.



Many countries have done drought vulnerability assessments, but many others still need to do theirs. Concepts of vulnerability and risk, which are not the same but are found often to be ‘equated’ as if they were. “Challenge within this challenge”, is that there are far too many methodologies that differ between themselves and that result in different results of the assessment. The challenge, in general, is to be able to have more holistic DVA, which are multisectoral, multi-industry, multilevel, multifactor, multiscale. By multifactor drought vulnerability assessment, it is meant that groups of factors need to be considered in the analysis which would include natural factors, like geophysical, climatological, environmental factors. But it should also include socioeconomic factors to finally estimate overall vulnerability. These two questions are to be dealt with, one is which indicators to be used for exposure and which to consider for sensitivity for instance. The other point is which weight is to be given to each factor. The countries are implementing many actions to reduce drought impacts which can be classified in different ways. There are three classical ways to define and group the different measures, and the three describe the actions described by the countries in their response: Structural measures and non-structural measures; measures to increase water supply and measure to manage water demands, and mitigation and adaption measures. Most of the structural measures are aimed at increasing the water supply or availability of water. Adaptation measures, non-structural measures, and managing water demand seem to go hand in hand, although are not the same. One area that needs a lot of improvement in the countries is institutional strengthening. These include measures aimed at achieving improvements in the legal and institutional framework. This includes drought planning and the drought policy framework. There are many countries with different existing policies measures, which can be classified into the following five categories: Locally tailored interventions; national strategies or plans of action; policy measures embedded; drought dedicated national strategies; International Agreement subscribed. Some of the policy measures for drought management are not integrated into a comprehensive national strategy. In some cases where specific national strategies are missing, drought-coping measures are often nested within climate change adaptation policies. In some cases, the drought instances are tackled through environmental and land degradation legislations, with reactive, rather than proactive approaches. The policy measures are undertaken to cope with drought often fall within sectoral policies, such as



agriculture-related interventions. There is evidence of the need that the elaboration and implementation of comprehensive policy instruments on drought.

Putting the full picture together - The UNCCD advocates for a proactive, coordinated, and holistic drought risk management based on three key pillars: Early warning and monitoring systems, Vulnerability and impact assessment, and Drought risk mitigation measures. The barriers identified in the survey are present in several of the factors at the same time and explain the following causes: Unsustainable drought monitoring systems and drought early warning systems; Lack of and confusion in drought vulnerability assessments; National plans that are not integrated or whose implementation is not well coordinated; Reactive and crisis-driven drought management; Weak or ineffective policies. To bring all findings together, a fishbone diagram has been created to illustrate the cause-and-effect situation that would explain how all the shortcomings send up resulting in droughts till found to cause more and more impacts.

General Recommendations - Improve Vulnerability Assessments by strengthening regional platforms; Establishing communications and data management protocols; Regional and/or national programs to provide training to local government for use of mobile technologies; National and regional initiatives to review and enhance available maps of vulnerability including models of water demand and availability at the watershed level; Simple guides to the assessment of economic risks of drought to be discussed with Regional Economic Commissions; Case studies and pilot testing to be done with national governments and local governments.

Recommendations for Drought Risk Reduction at National Level - Thresholds for the different drought classes should be standardized and different indicators should be used to monitor drought; SPI/ SPEI for meteorological drought; Water supply / Water demand ratio into water supply region for irrigation, domestic and industrial water use; Streamflow, dam levels and groundwater level for hydrological drought; supported with exposure and other socio-economic vulnerability and resilience indicators.

Recommendations for Drought Vulnerability and Risk Assessments - The territorial unit of assessment should be linked to socio-economic-ecological boundary instead on administrative boundaries e.g. catchment level; Capacity to deal with drought, adaptation exposure should all be



included in the risk analysis; More emphasis on proper training; National Drought Plan should rather be a policy that provides guidance to line departments and different sectors to complete sector-specific and region-specific drought plans. These plans should focus on drought risk reduction as well as a response; Mindshift to treat drought within contingency plans rather than a disaster which requires external support but rather can be managed with proper planning and timely activation; Most countries have drought risk plans called differently. Countries should identify those programs with a DRR element and use it to create awareness; The need for a coordinating body co-opted with key stakeholders is essential.

Gunilla Björklund thanked **Sara Jade Govia** for quite an interesting and useful presentation and asked Natalie Van Haren to take the floor.

MODERATED DISCUSSION WITH DISCUSSANT NATHALIE VAN HAREN AND THE AUDIENCE

Nathalie Van Haren gladly shared her observations, especially liked the fishbone diagram, as one can see immediately challenges and what is needed, graphic presentations help to understand and digest complex information. Made six observations that are accompanied by clarifying questions or suggestions to consider. One observation with a general character, and 5 observations specifically on the work of task group 2.

1) General observation is about the survey that was used to make the assessment of impacts, vulnerability, and risk of drought done by task group 2.

The survey was not shared with all UNCCD parties, such as several countries in Europe, North America, and the Australian continent, while these countries are affected by drought as well and might have to deal with challenges and might have taken measures to deal with drought and its impacts. In addition, asking for their challenges and take measures might support the global awareness and readiness to take joint action. **The general question is: What is the reason that the survey was not shared with all parties of the convention?**



2) About the objective of Task Group 2

The assignment of Task Group 2 is to assess impacts, vulnerability, and risk of drought. In the document and in the presentation, that the question is sub-divided into 4 themes: Understanding and reduction of drought effects, Reduction of drought impacts, Barriers, and challenges in addressing the vulnerabilities to drought and Policies or practical measures to cope with drought? There is no mentioning of the risk of drought. Parties would look for a part in the document and/or for a reference regarding the Risk of Drought. **Would it be possible to do this more explicitly in the document?**

3) On the recommendation in the presentation

Although recommendations are not really allowed in the final rapport, there is one -very valuable recommendation in the presentation. Namely, the recommendation that drought should not be treated as a disaster but as an extreme event with extreme consequences for people and ecosystems if no preparations are made for the next drought. It is a valuable recommendation as it helps to focus on what people can do to limit and mitigate the negative effects of an unpredictable circumstance as drought. It helps to think about the actions that policymakers, politicians, scientists, communities, businesses can take to deal with drought. This recommendation might be central in the IWG report to COP.

4) About Knowledge for drought preparedness and response

In the presentation, there is several mentioning of Lack of Knowledge of actors in drought preparedness and drought response as a limiting barrier. This is an important observation, and a difficult one to overcome. Therefore, it would be good to give options on the sort of concrete actions that can be taken to improve knowledge development. One could think of:

- mentioning some good examples of knowledge exchange platforms between policymakers, communities, scientists. A good example of knowledge development for drought response is the WOCAT database that contains over 1500 land management practices from all over the world and provides insight and inspiration on actions.



- providing guidelines on how to meaningfully facilitate knowledge exchange and development between policymakers, communities, and scientists within the country and internationally.
- providing criteria for drought monitoring and droughts early warnings systems such as access for communities and policymakers.

5) About Coordination for drought preparedness and drought response

In the presentation, it was mentioned that there is a lack of coordination between actors. In many countries, there is a lack of horizontal or intersectoral coordination between the different departments and there is a lack of vertical coordination between the different levels of administration. It would be good to have some concrete suggestions for improvement of coordination:

- what kind of platforms or dialogues between different departments (the ministries of environment, of agriculture, of infrastructure, of climate, of finance, etc.) can create a common understanding and can facilitate coordinated action on drought preparedness and drought response.
- what kind of actions, platforms, and information flows would help dialogue and coordinated action between government departments, regional administration, and local authorities?
- what kind of measures and actions can be taken to have meaningful participation of women, indigenous and local communities that are affected by drought or are to be affected by the drought. How can women, indigenous people, and local community meaningful participation in decisions regarding drought preparedness measures and drought responses? What is needed to make drought information, drought data, and responses (knowledge, cooperation, and finance) easily accessible for women, indigenous people, and local communities? The Voluntary Guidelines for the Responsible Governance of Land tenure that were adopted by the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) and that is a condition for Land Degradation Neutrality give good guidance on how to do this.

6) About Financial resources



In the document, it is several times being remarked that there are limited financial resources available for drought preparedness and response. As finance is always a very precarious subject, it would be good to give concrete options on how to link governance for drought preparedness and drought response with already agreed text on Land Degradation in the UNCCD and especially on already agreed financial mechanisms, like Adaptation Fund, Green Climate Fund (GCF), the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) and International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD).

Gunilla Björklund thanked **Natalie Van Haren** and asked Sara Jade Govia and other team members as well to respond and to engage in discussion.

MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS:

Sara Jade Govia thanked **Nathalie van Haren** for her time and appreciate her comments. The intention was to share the survey with all focal points, which **Daniel Tsegai** confirmed, the survey was circulated to all countries and 72 countries provided good feedback, but not enough on drought vulnerability assessment, that is why an additional survey was again circulated, this time 42 countries expressed willingness to participate and send the answers. Sara added that for the fourth question it is possible to expand some more options, the community of practice for drought management can build up in the second revision of the report, it is important to come with recommendations, linked issues with other groups, it is necessary to have a wider discussion and pick from different items.

Caroline King noticed that so many issues come out, Natalie has raised important questions, which is good, and the assignment for this group is now to identify options to present to COP for discussion.

Fidel Perez had clarification about risk, a third of countries or less, did vulnerability assessment, some mentioned risk, often confuse vulnerability and risk, in some countries have very correlated different methodologies, section chapter 2 talks about risk and vulnerability.



Stephen Muwaya appreciate Natalie's informative comments, particularly interested in the lack of coordination. Vertical and horizontal coordination linkages are important. Drought is one of areas, where the emergency response comes late, there is challenge of coordination, how quickly information is reached, and to what extent, is it possible that decision-making is carried in good time. We should be able to look at coordination right from the global level, at regional, at the national level. In most vulnerable areas there is a strong interrelationship between global decision making and effort to address vulnerabilities in these areas. It would be important to provide a bit of analysis on the institutions and structures available on the regional and global level and how they impacted and how their capacity can be improved and how they coordinate to deliver concrete support for this vulnerability. Another area noted is the issue of knowledge, it is important that we use available systems, such as networks, meetings, to assess knowledge. It is necessary to create partnerships that can support capacity building and knowledge transfer, so communities can assess their vulnerabilities much faster, find meaningful solutions, to address the coordination role knowledge gap more decisively.

Michael Brüntrup, notice overlaps with TG4, highlighted that is good, shows that we are on the same track, but timelines of assessment is not considered by TG2. Clarification - cascading, multisectoral, multi cross-sectoral, multi cross disaster approach is needed, one drought can strike on the certain way but if there were another drought previously, changes the effect, if one drought strikes it is a problem, but if they happen successively it starts to affect plants, trees. Another example, cross disaster COVID19 and drought, accessibility of some areas, possibilities for food trade, strongly affected, drought vulnerability and the possibility to react, both people and government. Example - Conflict in Tigray. Vulnerability is not static must be closely observed in time, the combination of longer-term assessments and forecast 6 months in the future meteorological forecast with the local context, short term recombination, and actualization of this, to highlight vulnerability assessment, needs of the bottom-up short-term adjustments in line with longer-term forecast. These short-term adjustments must be strengthened in these recommendations on vulnerability.



German Kust was interested to find out if these results are comparable, analysis reports, prepared by these countries or they may have already compared with UNCCD drought initiative preparation action plans.

Theodore Horbulyk commented how nicely the report shows that we need to look beyond hydrology, meteorology, other dimensions, even with the same country there could be different conditions, infrastructure, income levels, preparedness for resilience. Asked is there a need to develop new tools, would it pay to work more on the methodology, and approaches; if yes, whether these results will be comparable over time and unique situation, not to standardize everything but some amount of comparability is necessary, is it done enough, what priority tools can be used, methodology and tools for assessments.

Abduvokgid Zakhadullaev raised the issues of criteria and indicators and linkages, how everything is connected, and issues cannot be observed in isolation. Lack of knowledge, lack of coordination, important point. Capacity building institutions and decision makers to monitor evaluation. Understanding impact of drought on socio- economic development. Inclusion of stakeholders is important. It is difficult to receive good qualitative data information. Lack of national criteria and indicators combating desertification, indicators are not included in important agendas of the countries. To develop coordination mechanism together with national criteria and indicators is needful.

Caroline King highlighted that it is necessary to recognize the need for coordination and work on it (Example Caribbean how it works on the regional level). What are the problems on a national level? How we understand connection across different levels, and can we improve it? Sometimes Policy framework is inadequate, or there is no plan at all, or where assessment exists, in different countries done in a different way. Evaluating every country's strategy is a huge task.

Gaius Eudoxie expressed concern how the recommendations will be implemented, how effective it will be, that perspective is needed. How task groups' recommendations/options are helping UNCCD coordination, will it be more effective, clearer?



Abdu AlSharif stressed the need for capacity building at all levels, also coordination, linkages, and synergy. Indicated the need for binding document, legal document about drought in general, technology transfer, at all levels.

Gunilla Björklund thanked everyone for their contribution, gave the floor to **Gaius Eudoxie** (Vice-Chair) who is also a **TG3** member, who introduced briefly exceptional work and gave the floor to group leaders.

Luca Perez complimented an excellent exchange on Task Group 2, framing a few issues, the pieces of the puzzle begin to fit together, which is important, what can the IWG and UNCCD do to convert clear recommendations to action, it is a crucial point.

TASK GROUP 3 (FINANCING DROUGHT)

Before the overall discussion of TG3, For Task Group 3, the presentation of the and group effort, document Guidance Note on Drought Finance, was made by group leader Luka Perez, with the active participation of the members of the group, their comments, and sharp responses, contributed to a better understanding of the presented document, which was supported by a consultant John Ikeda (Global Mechanism), but thanks to the guidance and cooperation with Task Group 3 shaped and with content and format that has today. The main highlighted messages were that Drought is different from other natural disasters, making it more difficult to finance, that drought finance strategy should be part of a national drought action plan or policy with multilayer approaches and a smart mix of tools which should enable basically combine a new and existing source of financing, but also ensure the shift from responding to disaster to actually building resilience in the first place, reducing the vulnerability, putting in place effective mitigation strategies.

We must look at financial tools and options in relation to steps for disaster and through risk management, from preparation, response, recovery, mitigation, and what does it mean across priority areas. Investing in solutions and options which both structural and non-structural in nature, increase supply, reducing or managing demands for water, but also reducing exposures and



vulnerability is equally important. Promoting more sustainable agriculture, efficient agriculture, diversify can manage the risks, investment in response and recovery is also particularly important. We need to use a smart mix of financing tools, existing financing tools, and new ones that can be built in different policies contributing to disaster risk reduction, this can be done in several tools that are at disposal to governments and developing partners when it comes to transfers, taxes. There is an issue with how to make sure that revenue, savings, insurance mechanisms can be in place. Case studies from the report show that several solutions are there, being implemented on a national level, that there is no one size fits all type of response. Taking into consideration the specific national or in some cases subnational circumstances. A lot can be done in terms of sharing knowledge and promoting successful models. Different financial tools may target different audiences, businesses, households, governments, can be used in different levels and stages of the cycle from mitigation to recovery. Can be applied to specific sectors. The important issue of development of financing, issue of coordination, aiming to an integrated approach that cuts across the sectors, across vertically, level of governments from the community up to the national level, a federal level where applicable. Looking at the national level, the Ministry of finance plays the key role that finances go to the right places, that there is integrate view on the national level to make sure that investments in assets, tools available. Reinforcing the point where we have several existing financing strings, potentially overlapping that can contribute to robust drought financing strategy, climate finance, agricultural finance, infrastructure, environment as well investment in social, disaster risk finance in the response and recovery cycle. We have several mixes, domestic and international financial mechanisms, providing a lot of inter points work on drought risk management. Some of the steps, countries to follow when developing drought financing strategies, how to put in place mechanisms for inter ministries, how to make sure that strategy is available, clear mechanisms related to implementation, communication. The role of different partners can play in the process including both national governments and looking at individual's business, communities, with some specific potential options for actions at the different levels.

All of this already there, but the big issue is how to turn all this knowledge into the right steps and the right tools into action.



Roger Pulwarty summarized the input from TG3 with the accent to the major issue we have seen, alignment, not simply what is the action but what things make us act, then we can talk about what we can do. Key things here fragmented responsibilities among the different groups, vertical linkages from global to local, horizontal mechanisms, has a lot to do, different funding structures plans different agencies and groups working on things related to drought but not coordinated. Data available, but you can data granularity needed for clear actions. What is innovative, not to be just reactive but we can be proactive, we know this for a long time, something is stopping us to be proactive, it is not just being proactive, but being prospective, not to let new risks, not to be trapped.

Recommendation, to make the link between capacity building and community-based implementation, potentially thinking about the strategy the operations, aligning catalytic fund for financing drought in a way testing out, we learn from innovations. Risk is socially constructive, we should be doing better, we know about those 50-60 years already. Being proactive is set in so many settings, and it is an extremely critical question for us is what stops us from targeting, prioritizing where innovative financing alignment can take places, we must test our ideas and make links in capacity building and community-based implementation more explicit on the subnational scale.

Gaius Eudoxie thanked to Roger and Luka for summarizing and opened the floor for discussion. Thanked John Ikeda for support.

MAIN DISCUSSION POINTS:

Caroline King indicated that understanding community-level economy is essential. Financial questions are especially important, horizons of integration, especially vertical ones. International finance can be catalytic force change within the national system, devolving finance. It is a must to understand how the economy works at the community level, government cannot work otherwise in a complimentary.



Michael Brüntrup raised the issue how to evaluate investment into prevention, how to evaluate investments into preventing droughts where they have not happened in a long time, specific tools are needed, others than usual.

Roger Pulwarty, what is the benefit of avoided disaster? The idea that you do not get benefits for saving the future costs is an important public and government question, that is why we distinguish between being proactive and prospective, helping reduce the emerging of new risks. The private sector across the globe is not that interested in nature-based solutions unless the government underwrites its role in it. We must think about partnerships that are needed and what is the evaluation of the funding structure for the different partners.

Theodore Horbulyk, tools are well developed for evaluating investments on the risk, we have in some sense catalog on tools and approaches, it challenges us to use the right ones on the right way. Understanding that tools and approaches are there, guidance for governments to incorporate them, collectively we must think about how we build financial process in our work. It is necessary to take finances into considerations while the drought plan is written, from the beginning, the importance of thinking bringing them into the discussion.

Stephen Muwaya had very insightful comments and tackled the role of UNCCD. How to mobilize domestic resources, promote the business case for proactive drought management, commitment in the investment on the country level, shift from reactive to proactive, what is a role of a global level. Strong focus on domestic private sector innovative investments that facilitate the process, look environment in every situation. The most affected are the least developed countries that take loans that they cannot pay. Support is needed from the global level, to empower communities that are the most vulnerable, these resources are the most needed, but non-financial resources are equally important, capacity, technology, hardly any focus how non-financial resources, consider more effectively the gap in that aspect.

Abdu AlSharif noticed that the presentation focused on the national level, but drought does not only happen at the country level.



A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE FIRST DAY OF THE SEMINAR (FIRST DAY)

In closing remarks, **Gunilla Björklund** (chair) pointed out that this seminar is a milestone, set the tone for the next steps, thanked all for active participation, wonderful presentations, lively discussions, with the hope that the next day of the seminar will be also dynamic and productive. Thanked everyone for a job well done, and for very insightful comments.

■ Day 2 (July 01)

RECAP AND WELCOMING REMARKS

Gunilla Björklund (Chair) after a warm welcome and a wish for all participants to be as active as the previous day, and even more, gave the floor to **Gaius Eudoxie** (Vice-Chair) who highlighted that the previous day was a quite good footing, encouraged colleagues to have similar vibrant participation and as a moderator of the first group invited Mark to start the presentation on TG1, monitoring, and early warning.

TASK GROUP 1 (MONITORING AND EARLY WARNING)

What TG1 is doing for the IWG side are inventory and efforts, implementing drought monitoring and early warning systems, globally, identifying relevant case studies and available evidence, drought monitoring, and forecasting indicators.

Marc Svoboda gave exposure to the document Multiscale Approaches for Assessment and Monitoring-the Resilience of Vulnerable Populations and Ecosystems to Drought, for internal use, and not for further distribution, currently in the review process (mentioned that the IWG members



Caroline King and German Kust are also part of SPI team). Technical report, SPI Objective 2 (drought) report on drought, look on the resilience of various populations and ecosystems.

The goal is providing science-based evidence on the approaches for the assessment and monitoring of the resilience of vulnerable populations and ecosystems to drought, considering the effect of climate change on drought risk, based on a review of existing synthesis reports and, if necessary, referring to the primary literature. The SPI report addresses the assessment and monitoring of drought resilience at the national to local levels, a very much multi scalable effort. This report focuses on ecosystems as well as vulnerable populations, what is the ability of the system to bounce back after to exposure to the drought, capacity, and ability to buffer drought, a model they are currently working around on at least from the design point.

The drought is remarkably diverse, the team did a sort of inventory assessment peer and literature review, and analysis, in resilience. SPI considers sand and dust storms. Pathway to build drought resilience, drought is very diverse, the ways to tackle that and the ways to build resilience are very diverse it is not prescribed one size fits all, rather we can use various indicators for drought resilience for which we did inventory, to frame the problem and make that usable, and get that into policy, translate that into science, to give guidance to the countries or entities of subnational scale, which can result in better resilience. The final number of articles included in the inventory 256, but the number that can be used is 46, applied information. Based on that matrix was created, the table. Some guiding principles from this report, use of these Indicators need to be understood as a part of the overall puzzle to assess resilience, it is not a silver bullet, magic that solves all the issues. Indicators for social and ecosystem resilience to drought should be based on key criteria. The best resilience indicators are those for which responses are positive for all these questions: Validity, Precise Meaning, Practical, Affordable, and Simple, Reliability, Sensitivity, Clear Direction, Utility, Ownership...These would be ideal, but not everyone can be checked, again, it is not one size fits all, it is going to vary, each indicator has strengths and weaknesses, again it is not typically one size fits all. Many countries have worked internally to develop their own indicators, considering the local context, and some global indicators can be good for comparing between countries, but can't be used on local level/scale. A multiscale approach is needed. Want to provide guidance, what country can do to be more resilient, what process, where to begin, some of the steps, to visualize, into the graphic, which is not intimidating, logical way to look self-assessment,



planning, risk management. A typical process for the formulation of resilience indicators involves several steps, desk review, self-assessment, identification of key factors of resilience, the conduct of additional drought risk assessments and/or perception studies, application of selection criteria and selection of existing indicators, development of new indicators in line with criteria, enter data, assess resilience. Hopefully, this seems doable or translatable. The drought resilience assessment could be based on more specific indicators, Color-coded approach, to quickly shows for each segment look at various levels of resilience, color gradation, quickly identifies by looking at the graph shows in which direction help and support should go, color-coded representation of different levels of resilience, from exceptionally low to extremely high resilience, color gradations. It gives the summary information on the drought resilience, which is comparable over time and across different locations, even if the actual indicators used by countries could be different. Policy and planning (still developing from internal review) still formulating how multiscale monitoring and assessment approaches can be integrated into national to local scale drought planning and what are the current policy gaps. Information and data on the resilience of social and ecological systems need to inform modern drought risk management planning. It will be crucial to assess and target the resilience of vulnerable populations. How the enabling environment can be improved to effectively facilitate the transformation of the drought assessment and monitoring from hazard, impacts monitoring to vulnerability and resilience assessment and monitoring contributing to an adaptation regime moving from “reactive” to “proactive” and creating multiple benefits.

It is beneficial to have people crossing between the SPI and IWG. Key discussion themes presented at CRIC (earlier this year) are still valid for the final report and TG1 Interim report contribution is still valid for the final report. Focused on the need to account for, and rethink the notion that droughts are “always” slow-onset events. “Flash” (rapid onset) droughts are becoming a more frequent challenge and could serve as a better starting point for incentivizing and/or prioritizing action by short-term, close horizon policy-makers. Focus on the doctrine that droughts are slow, slow onset, what we have seen in the context of climate change, trough work, rapid on flash droughts, all these changes affect how drought evolve, s starting to see global rapid events, reconsider doctrine, add changes our planning horizon, diligent how we monitor and forecast drought, it is not just seasonal, but rather a sub-seasonal, seasonal, get that point out here. Again



not a prescribed process, not trying to force anything, drought is very complex and the methods to achieve resiliency are very complex too, we can't stop droughts from occurring, but we can build resilience to reduce the impacts of drought in the future.

Gaius Eudoxie (Vice-Chair) found providing guidance for various levels for monitoring early warning implementation especially interesting, welcomed the discussion, thanked **Marc Svoboda** for a great presentation and gave the floor to discussant **Fidel Perez**.

MODERATED DISCUSSION WITH DISCUSSANT (FIDEL PEREZ) AND THE AUDIENCE

Fidel Perez congratulated the group, for this level of output, it is well organized, technical, and scientific, he especially liked chapters 4 and 5. Fidel Perez hasn't seen the topic of drought monitoring and drought early warning system, as part of the content, maybe there is some document from earlier, where this was addressed or maybe TG1 went from the objective, review, and to discuss options drought monitoring and early warning system sustainable land management context, TG1 to clarify if this was achieved. Countries need forecasts, still, a big challenge, forecasting capabilities in countries. Where are we standing now in regional, subregional national levels, droughts, flash droughts, and ones with slow onset? What challenges do countries need to face, what components are needed, to do that, financing, or know-how, which type of technology can improve forecasting capacities?

Countries are still far away from operational effective drought monitoring systems. Concerning resilience assessments, the reports say on vulnerability indicators and raise some questions. Which level of effort will be usable for practitioners who are not scientists? Some of the countries are not done with vulnerability assessments. Consider removing the word measure, some indicators can be measured, but others can be estimated, not measured. Chapter 4 is short, questions good ones, but no answers, can the group elaborate more on this.

Mark Svoboda thanked **Fidel Perez** for thoughtful and constructive feedback, made some valid points, considers that the team will equally appreciate these comments. To ease his concerns on the



first topic, towards pillar 2, which is risk and vulnerability assessment, this report is not focused on early warning and monitoring, pillar 1. There is some work that previously has been done, on drought early warning inventory, that another consultant did, on early drought monitoring systems, and some case studies on that, and that is not covered by this presentation... hoping that this clears up the difference between this document and this SPI effort. The second is for the IWG TG1 effort on early monitoring and warning systems, again he agrees with everything Fidel Perez said. On the resilient side of it, that indeed was tackled, what is available specific to drought, which is far more limited than hazard resilience, multi-hazard resilience. What is available specifically for the drought, indicators, depending on if the country wants to adapt them or make new resilience indicators, and many have their own. And again, thanked for the thoughtful initial comments.

Yuriy Kolmaz thanked TG1, SPI, secretariat, and others, who were involved in making this exceptionally good and comprehensive document, policy recommendations. It will be useful to have concrete recommendations, proposals monitoring framework, a summary of indicators, for the parties to use these findings and recommendations in practice.

Abdu AlSharif thanked for an excellent report, wondered if this document covers all ecosystems and geographical balance, can use the indicator, for reporting in the future for strategic objective number 3.

Danijel Tsegai - Task group 1 conducted the survey on what exists on drought monitoring and early warning systems, collected cases from 15 countries, already presented, good cases, especially from the Caribbean, including all 3 pillars. Everything has been already published, before CRIC. What was presented for CRIC is still valid for the final report, in the interim report on drought monitoring and early warning systems is still relevant, the IWG can benefit from this SPI report because there are a lot of members who are part of IWG and SPI in parallel, there should be a good connection, connecting the dots. COP's recommendation was to elect members for the IWG from SPI, that there would be good cooperation and connection.

Marc Svoboda thanked **Yuriy Kolmaz** and **Abdu AlSharif** for their comments. It is not all covered by this presentation, there are several different recommendations on the policy and the short answer to both questions is yes, it is well taken, good points.



Theodore Horbulyk (figure 2) step by step process that countries can use, it might be useful to start talking about finances here, bringing in the discussion, moving through these steps, bring finance into the discussion. How much money is available where it comes from how we spend it, it is probably embedded in socio-political settings, let drew some linkages across these things. The second part is country investments in resilience or early warning systems. Should be thinking, if it is hard to find investments, whether they should be seen as competitive or are complementary activities. They are initially complementary, but as it goes further, they are not. Initially, early warning and monitoring systems can help to build resilience. How to make difficult decisions, hard choices, there may be a path where both should work in the early stages, but later, make steps toward building resilience. This all is good stuff, but linkages between presentations from the previous day and financing, all this information more even valuable to them.

Michael Brüntrup - criteria, indicators for measuring social resilience. With an east African eye, these categories, social capital, which come from the livelihood approach, whether they are specific and sufficient to understand typical east African population village is threatened by a drought. Very few examples, food security, physical capital, infrastructure, in east Africa, there are a lot of wells which are there but not maintained, roads that are in poor condition instability, banditry, political instability, social safety nets... Where is that indicator, has the impression that it is not yet targeted to the bottom problems of African poorer rural populations.

Mark Svoboda agreed with **Theodore Horbulyk**. That is why **Daniel Tsegai** wanted to expose this group to the parallel SPI work to see where the overlap is and integrate this into a more seamless and comprehensive effort.

German Kust, overall impression is quite positive. Mark and TG1 team produced many ideas completely ready to be reflected in the final report. It would be great to discuss this later in the synthesis group. If any SPI results could be used/useful in the IWG report with relevant reference it would be good, then.

Mark Svoboda thanked **German Kust**, completely agree and know that is a two-way street and SPI can take IWG input back to the SPI as well, hopefully it will benefit and strengthen both efforts when all is said and done!



Caroline King and Gaius Eudoxie emphasized the question, about the imbalance scientific literature, the scientific literature is limited to certain countries, academic disciplines, coverage unbalanced.

Sara Jade asked if TG1 has given any consideration to the regional approach of early warning and forecasting, (for example Caribbean groping, using one platform for early warning and forecasting). **Marc Svoboda** - drought is transboundary, have a huge spatial footprint, huge potential, temporal footprint as well, cooperation not only in the country between ministries but cooperation between countries, valid point for forecasting how we manage these resources, to think about regional aspect, we need to think about it.

Gaius Eudoxie, SPI provides support to TG2, in terms, how foreseen or plan to implement the type of support, a guideline to enable country parties this indicator, can work for them, how to get around, to ensure that country parties recognize that and show country parties options can be applied, recommend that TG 2 pay attention to SPI report.

Marc Svoboda explained that they had feedback at the beginning of the work from the country parties and they were very clear - Can we better, how do we use it, applied, implemented it, there is still work to be done, the goal was to provide guidance to step through such process if you have no clue, you are not a scientist, how you do this, that was objective and we are just, stretching the surface.

Gaius Eudoxie (Vice Chair)

Daniel Tsegai explained early warning systems on the regional level. New projects allow countries to learn and share from each other, wanted to highlight that when they did the survey they had an excellent submission from the Caribbean, and inspired by that have projects one southern African development communities 16 countries, drought monitoring on the regional level, and another, central Asia about 5 countries, recognize importance and use of early warning and monitoring systems important for countries sharing the experience, sharing the data.

Gaius Eudoxie (Vice-Chair) thanked for the inputs and interactive discussions and thanked Daniel for sharing, gave the floor to **Gunilla Björklund (Chair)**.



TASK GROUP 4 (POLICY AND GOVERNANCE INSTRUMENTS)

Michael Brüntrup thanked all the members of the group because they all contributed, shared tasks, and worked at different levels. “The broad objective of this task group “policies and governance” is to review and propose policy, advocacy, legal and other reforms, with a special focus on institutions and governance. This work could also include issues of communication, public awareness, education, capacity development and international cooperation.” Captured many of the aspects which are better elaborated by other groups, we can joint our forces in better understanding on drought impacts policies, stakeholders involved. What needs to be done :From drought impacts to policy fields and actors for drought risk management (so: what is at stake and who is and should be involved); Drought Risk management at different levels from sub-national over national and regional to global (so: what needs to and can be done); Conclusions for policies and institutions of a strengthened UNCCD drought mandate and/or agenda (so: what can UNCCD do as one but not the only player at the global level) there are other organizations that delegate responsibility for droughts. The first attempt at clustering options along with the increasing level of ambitions, to formulate options for the COP. Simple resume areas and levels of impact of drought, ecology, water services, poverty, food security, health, economy, power, industry, tourism, conflict, migrations. Gender and other specific social groups, most of them are local, power is regional. The impact is multisectoral, tried to indicate policy fields, which can be called upon drought risk management, DRM-related fields of policies, and implementation measures. Infrastructure, social security, Environment, meteorology, health, food security, agriculture, income and wealth, finance, tourism, security. Private households have a cross-scale approach to reduce the impact of drought, Policies and institutions at the global level have WMO, FAO, WHO, IFIS OCHA, WTO, UNFCCC, CBD...on the regional level we have, organizations are different in dealing task dealing with the economy, finance, trade, food security, in regional agreements we have At the national level, it is difficult to when it comes to the distribution of sectoral duties, what are decentralized administration rules exists and what sectoral policies exist, related to DRM. Informal rules in Africa are more important than government policies. Here marked as markets, split professional



association, business including financial institutions, we must include financial institutions as important factors, active role in underdeveloped countries, it is not necessary to coincide with national ideas. **Resume that although one slide but a lot of work is behind, Drought Risk management at different levels, Sub-national level** (Examples for successful DRM are: indicators of drought early warning , Solid vulnerability assessments, Drought resilient and climate-adaptive land-use practices in agriculture (including livestock) and forestry, Land tenure systems, Secure water tenure and fair distribution of water, Capital and asset building as well as diversification, Financial services, Determination of households in need of social protection and relief, Learning and continuous knowledge development on DRM, Advocacy, coordination of many of the issues), National level (Policy and legal options, Institutional approaches, Implementation measures, Coordination frameworks, Advocacy), Regional level (Earth system observation, Emergency (food) trade rules, other regulations and regional investments, International river commissions, Knowledge exchange, UNCCD), Global level (Policy and legal options, Functions of support of DRM, Coordination frameworks, Advocacy and education). Conclusions for policies and institutions of a strengthened UNCCD drought mandate Scope - Drought policies must be comprehensive and include many sectors, UNCCD must be able to guide processes in an adequately comprehensive sense, but in most other aspects is well advised to focus on environmental issues and nature-based solutions. New level of ambition, concept, what UNCCD can and should do - Mix and degree of implementation of measures, Degree of binding own and other governments and the international community, Financing. Any level of ambition can be achieved through - Legally binding options within UNCCD, Non-legally binding options within UNCCD, Negotiation of an instrument outside the UNCCD framework. Conclusions for policies and institutions of a strengthened UNCCD drought mandate - New institutional approaches – many legal options. Depending on the new selected scope and the level of ambition within each of the fields of DRM, existing institutional approaches to DRM under the UNCCD can and must be strengthened or new ones created. Clustered options in scope into 4 different levels, for a given level of ambitions, which elements and measures can be assembled under this.

Possible options to suggest to COP. Least ambitious: [advocacy] Foster and disseminate experiences, good practices and lessons learned by expanding the Drought Toolbox; [policy]



enlarging the UNCCD's drought initiative; [institutional/legal] encourage the development of national drought laws (for example water management and emergency response); [policy/institutional] pursuing a leading role for the UNCCD in the UN Environmental Management Group on Drought; [policy] encourage integration of drought issues in SDGs; [advocacy] lead the development of international processes that raise the profile of drought issues; [institutional] encourage the establishment of national authorities for coordinating drought response

Poorly ambitious: [policy/advocacy] Converting the drought toolbox into an interactive exchange communication tool; [institutional] develop and disseminate comprehensive DRM strategies for other international organisations; [policy/institutional] Reviewing national DRM policies; [policy/advocacy] Creating a competence centre under the UNCCD

Moderately ambitious: [policy] Support or organise advice for integrated funding strategies of parties (for example public-private partnerships or national financial strategies); [legal/institutional] support the development expansion of regional agreements that impact drought preparedness and response; [policy/advocacy] Evaluating DRM policy impacts; [policy] devise, underpin, coordinate data provision and other cooperation with the private sector; [institutional] Establishing a leading and accepted role for UNCCD in coordinating international organisation drought policies

Highly ambitious; [institutional] establishing acceptance of UNCCD evaluation international organisation drought policies; [legal/policy] establishing a binding agreement (amendment, annex or protocol) for parties to develop national drought plans; [policy/governance] Provide/arrange seed funding to develop national DRM policies; [institutional] establishing a binding protocol providing an integrated strategy guiding investment in multi-hazard protection, risk reduction and climate change adaptation; and directing parties' and UNCCD Secretariat action in addressing drought.

Introduce notions levels of ambitions, give open to discussion, our first attempt to get options, to make member states, what they discuss UNCCD can do over other organizations, full drought management comprehensive strategy for the UNCCD.



MODERATED DISCUSSION WITH DISCUSSANT (CAROLINE KING) AND THE AUDIENCE

Gunilla Björklund (Chair) tried to see to what extent they can link to each other, for organizations, there must be structure in between. There is already a call for agencies to cooperate more ever-existing need for coordination and cooperation. Structure coordination for drought.

Yuriy Kolmaz thanked Michael for preparing this document, wanted to share observations, about the mandate and scope of the convention. We must be careful when we are talking about mandate and scope, we had a lot of discussions about this issue, sensitive for different parties, we have definitions and regional implementation annexes, we should use language agreed by parties very carefully, to avoid confrontation and difficult discussions in the future.

Michael Brüntrup agrees that we must be careful, there are several options which tell about the binding agreement, beyond UNCCD solutions, that is the highest ambition, mentioned in task group.

Caroline King, the discussant, admires Michel's beautiful comprehensive presentations. Michael comes with several layers of options, although it is very diplomatic, we all want the most ambitious options and look at them can we put in front of the parties, should we refine them, supported by stocktaking, are we done enough, so we can clearly present what are the options that parties must discuss based on findings from our group.

Luka Perez thanked **Michael Brüntrup**, and **TG4**, extremely useful, very well structured, getting the point to identify options and elements which feed out the final report. Word ambition, not sure about the level of ambitions correspond to a high level of effectiveness to or to realism when looking to this list, we have to consider, certain options have to ask ourself, what are the problem trying to address, ... this requires more thinking, legitimate question what are the things, under the umbrella of the convention, and beyond the conventions, elements related to bringing together in a more coherent system different un agencies and beyond, issue of the mandate. Agrees with **Yuriy Kolmaz**, caution is required. Certain formulations, options, impossible to achieve, do not see it in



the wildest dreams, to give UNCCD stronger mandate to tell other agencies what to do, ambitious, and unpractical, just initial reaction. How to frame it take this analysis forward, to come up with matrix, impact assessment of various options, number of criteria, feasibility effective sustainability.

Gunilla Björklund (Chair), what are the linkages, and how will be develop during the process.

Theodore Horbulyk enjoyed listening and thinks it will help in the business, again, it is particularly good to lay all the options, what takes, who should be involved, what can be done, how to deal with policy changes, is the existing structure approach working, small or large changes? The parties the work helps what are the needs, trying a more ambitious, effective, form of collaborations, how to use best strengths of ... to relay the job done, whole another set of questions. If there have been previous discussions it does not prevent us from discussing them again.

Stephen Muwaya congratulated the group for providing the information they have, particularly, their options. Enable the different levels of action menu, which are presented under various options to provide us with several possibilities. Conventions are with a specific mandate and give little attention to proper direction to address the need for the shift from reactive to proactivity addressing drought, inadequate information, early warning, It is time to save millions of lives, a critical element. A good basis to address this, find solutions to these areas, if we are able, matters relating got drought. UNCCD with its mandate can effectively provide good technical guidance and support mobilization of the fund. The approach needs a policy instrument, to implement that policy we must evolve, fulfill its obligations. To respond to the vision of the many parties, requires more commitment, regional, global level...

Michael Brüntrup - we are not here to negotiate instead of COP members, we should think freely, although unrealistic in political terms, if effective, we know that the present state is not effective, we are on weak ground, maybe we have to take some time to think through this, there are many cross-cutting issues, drought maybe open the floor for other, what is realistic, we can't judge from negotiant perspective, underscores, that we can go beyond, interpretation is possible to stretch.

Luka Perez, interagency coordination deserve discussion as many other options.



Gunilla Björklund, cooperation and coordination are needed in long run, different issues need to be included.

Marc Svoboda enjoyed the discussion. Applauding the inclusion of the local aspect, drought risk management, huge increase in planning at the local individual level, utility water basin. Drought again, local context, drought is very devastating on a local level, economic level, the total impact of drought is masked when it is aggregated into a national scale, same times apply on planning. Like that all this is included, critical to go forward, drought is not just national effort. The intention should be to not bypass the national level, but rather coordinate and nest these activities!

Wise and useful words - **Gunilla Björklund (Chair)**

Gaius Eudoxie thanked Michael and TG4 for a detailed report, that covers all actual objectives of TOR, very clearly, covered the key objectives, as well coordination on different levels, it would be good to have a skim to show these options, from point of implement ability to help country parties to understand the usefulness of options and arguments of the use of these options.

SUMMARY AND THE WAY FORWARD: SECRETARIAT

Daniel Tsegai (Secretariat) all the reports, documents, and presentations will be available on MS Teams. Vulnerability impact assessments must go beyond national, the scaling aspect comes noticeably clear, regional platforms, on financing instrument, the economic risk of drought come noticeably clear. How we can act before a drought strike, numbers - the cost of inaction, must be emphasized, business model, private sector involvement also particularly important. Early warning and monitoring systems are need not only national but regional and global, including impact data, context-specific drought monitoring. During the CRIC and regional meetings, the conclusion was that the IWG should analyze options, who gains who loses, to make an informative decision, analyze all these options.



HIGHLIGHTS BY SYNTHESIS TEAM: MICHAEL BRÜNTRUP/GERMAN KUST/CAROLINE KING

German Kust, brief message for information purposes, group started to work, have already several meetings, discussed the outline of the finale report, basic principles, which will serve as the background of the report, and how to should we use materials prepared by task groups, concrete, evidence-based, at the same time if it is possible, final report for a COP, will be supported by a blue report, larger extended report, counting on the help of colleagues in this case. The second point, outline, format of the report, should follow tor, structure reflected TOR, context, stock take, partnership, options, recommendations. Inviting everybody to participate.

1. Introduction. The COPs and historical background, Relevant international efforts and, The UNCCD uniting/intermediate role.

2. IWG establishment and organization of its work. Three pillars and 4 (5) IWG task groups; Basic (guiding) principles and methodology (rev. Michael's draft): General approaches, UNCCD context, including LDN target and social issues, Differences & Varieties (scale, geographic and national context, ambitions, etc.) Gaps & Opportunities. Summary: widening holistic and integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and enhancing the resilience of communities and ecosystems (integrated drought management).

3. Brief analysis of submissions by Parties, international organizations, and stakeholders. State-of-art in (summarizing relevant sections from the TG reports): existing early warning, monitoring, and information delivery systems, vulnerability and impact assessment, risk mitigation actions, resources (financing and legal instruments). Economics of drought preparedness (possible separate section), including assessing costs of inaction against the benefits of action. Summary: good practices, gaps analysis, and challenges in table form according to the results of TGs.

4. Partnerships on drought preparedness and response. A brief analysis of submissions by Parties, international organizations, and stakeholders. Strengthening international and subregional cooperation (integrated excerpts from the TGs reports, probably structured by the specific group's



matters, and from the Interim report), promoting implementation and institutional coordination frameworks. Summary: good practices, gaps analysis, and challenges in table form according to the results of TGs.

5. The main section - Options for appropriate policy, advocacy, and implementation measures. The overall hierarchy (levels? – global, national...) and types (classification? – economic, scientific, institutional...; specified for sectoral and or biophysical targets and conditions, etc.) of options. Addressing gaps and challenges identified in sections 3 and 4 (revised table of recommendations earlier prepared by Caroline – provide a fragment and organized in accord with the proposals from TGs: (i) Implementing drought monitoring and early warning systems, (ii) Assessing impacts, vulnerability, and risk of drought, (iii) Drought risk mitigation and response/recover measures – Physical options, (iv) Drought risk mitigation and response measures – Policy options). Referring to the Annex with a wider list of proposed options with a possible detailed description of some of them. Basic (guiding) principles - how they can be applied for selecting options/set of options: national- and regional- specific, scaling in-out, eligibility/ineligibility, etc. (try to reflect a linkage between sections 2 and 5). Any good example (taken from existing ones).

6. Conclusion, the last section, revise the interim report and CRIC reflections and highlight about 10-15 items addressing more the IWG innovative approaches and findings over existing and developing international partnership

The final report should not be longer than 6 to 10 pages, and available annexes, but the blue paper could be much longer, even more than 50 pages.

Natali van Haren asked if a professional editor is engaged, an infographic artist, to make the blue paper digestible and popular to the wider population. Secretariat promised that it will be done.

Michael Brüntrup, this presentation has been prepared before task groups reports. One of the tasks will be to bring them together. The IWG should focus on strengthening existing legal & financial mechanisms rather than developing new ones. The IWG should explore options to develop a binding agreement [protocol] on the drought that reflects the different contexts of the countries. The synthesis team will come back to IWG with this discussion, will not be able to come up with options if do not touch mandate of UNCCD and other institutions, solution giving drought



a stronger voice on the international arena, how we can support the idea, increasing actors on the local level, if UNCCD can serve, or whether there are other options. Several incredibly open questions. It might be necessary to have a survey about what the IWG thinks about these issues or discussion.

Marc Svoboda, the intention is not to bypass the national level but coordinate level, local context to coordinate into the process, resources directed in all scales.

CLOSING SEGMENT

Miriam Medel, Chief, External relations, policy, and advocacy unit UNCCD, for two days, listened to illuminating and exciting deliberations. Reaching an important landmark in the process, the synthesis team, the brave group will digest for the partis to make decisions, very concise paper, document, translated, understandable for one who makes decisions but also who may not be experts on drought. The crucial point, to recruit the proper designer, editor to simplify this complex information debated here. Zero draft of the final report will come in July, expected report to COP in October. Now we have a date on the horizon, COP15 in May 2022. Waiting for final deliberations, the urgency to complete the work, and more relevant, crucial, on the broader level, collaboration, and teamwork, the secretariat is here to support the IWG. **Gunilla Björklund (IWG chair)** thanked her for assuring words, very appreciating. **Daniel Tsegai** (Secretariat) hightailed that the purpose of this task group seminar is achieved, thanked everyone for the hard work, chair and vice-chair and called on everyone to support the synthesis team. All documents are already on MS Teams. The next milestone is to have meeting in July, discussing elements from the zero of the final report. The seminar was recorded, and the report will be circulated (both available on MS Teams).



ANNEX II: MEETING AGENDA

JUNE 30/JULY 01, 2021

14:00 - 17:00 CET/ 08:00-11:00 EST

■ Day 1 (June 30)

- Welcoming remarks and adoption of the agenda – Chair/V. Chair (10')
- Objectives of the Task Group Seminars – Secretariat (10')
- Task Group 2 (Vulnerability Assessment): **Sara-Jade Govia** (15')
Moderated discussion with discussant (**Nathalie Van Haren**) and the audience (60')
- Task Group 3 (Financing Drought): **Luca Perez/Roger Pulwarty** (15')
Moderated discussion with discussant (**Andries Jordan**) and the audience (60')
- Closing for the Day - Chair/V. Chair (5')

■ Day 2 (July 01)

- Recap and welcoming remarks – Chair/V. Chair (5')
- Task Group 1 (Monitoring and Early Warning): **Mark Svoboda** (15')
Moderated discussion with discussant (**Fidel Perez**) and the audience (60')
- Task Group 4 (Policy and governance instruments): **Michael Brüntrup** (15')
Moderated discussion with discussant (**Caroline King**) and the audience (60')
- Summary and the way forward: Secretariat (10')
- Highlights by Synthesis Team: **Michael Brüntrup/German Kust/Caroline King** (10')
- Closing Remarks: **Miriam Medel**, Chief, External Relations, Policy & Advocacy unit (5')