



---

**Intergovernmental Working Group on Drought**  
**5<sup>th</sup> IWG Coordination Committee Meeting, 29 July 2020**  
**DISCUSSION/ DECISION POINTS**

## 1. Opening Remarks

**Gunilla Björklund** (Chair) welcomed the participants to the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the IWG Coordination Committee (IWG CC). She noted that the meeting was crucial to keep track of where we are with the interim draft. She thanked Caroline and Ted for compiling the zero-order draft of the interim report and noted to have received comments from the members. The chair welcomed Daniel to provide a summary of the updated timeline for the IWG.

**Daniel Tsegai** (UNCCD Secretariat) welcomed and presented an updated summary of timelines for the IWG. He noted that the next IWG meeting will be scheduled to the end of August 2020. He further noted that the CRIC meeting has been rescheduled to first quarter of 2021. With this rescheduling, a new deadline of 15<sup>th</sup> September has been set for the interim report, which can potentially be extended to end of October.

He had held a meeting with the UNCCD Executive Office, who has extended addition support in terms of hiring consultants for specific tasks e.g., on drought financing instruments, legal instruments etc. He will take this up with the Task Group leaders to identify any additional support, if required from the secretariat either through consultants or case studies. The support should be demand-driven.

He reminded and encouraged the IWG members to use the MS Teams facility for reviewing documents including the zero-order draft interim report.

### *Comments*

The IWG member appreciated the secretariat for assisting in contacts and offering case studies for the IWG.

The specific dates for the COP Bureau and CRIC meetings are still under discussion. Once it is confirmed, the secretariat will confirm to all the members.

Concern was raised that the report should be emphasized as a draft interim report subject to further modifications and sharing at this stage should be limited.

## 2. Presentation by Caroline and Ted on the Interim Report

The interim report was drafted to explain what the process looks like. The presentation reflected on the following issues:

- (i) Are we focusing on the right issues within the task groups (TGs)? Have the writing team (hereafter Team) correctly described the scope and content of the TGs. Based on the notes sent from the

TGs, the team has summarized the specific commitments to deliver and volume of work, the members are requested to check on this to inform the Team.

- (ii) What are the existing structure for IWG? Based on the Terms of References, the writing team identified three areas (information from submission reports, questionnaire to stakeholders & case studies during the CRIC meeting) to discuss with the TGs members regarding the purpose and role they play (either as cross cutting across TGs or for specific TGs) in structuring the IWG report.
- (iii) Examples of areas where the TGs must collaborate with other groups. Further, they highlighted Chapter 5, which brings together the information through synthesis, case studies and examples, it is not clear who will do this task?
- (iii) How should we consider the options? The Team requires greater clarity, on how the work will be structured going forwards, timelines and the processes to be followed. Question raised on where recommendations will be laid out, either in the Interim report, in the annex, or in the final COP report
- (iv) Developing an adequate stock-taking measures to justify options. Does each TG have adequate support or commissioning individual consultant, does each TG feel that they have adequate support and commitments to do their work?
- (v) Next steps: There is an opportunity to present an annex in the interim report which provides updates on the work done by the IWG between August and January 2021. However, this annex (INF) would only be available in English. What is the best process for synthesizing the comments? Where are those areas likely to be disagreements about emphasis or substance? How do we make sure that those adequately vetted and resolved by the TGs leaders? Finally, as the interim report will be shared widely, it will be good to seek feedback (open-ended or structured) from the readers.

### 3. Suggestions from the Members on the Interim Report

#### *Flow and structure of the interim report*

- The flow of the document is found to be complicated e.g. the ordering from TG 4 to TG 1 – the rationale for this order should be explained.
- The report should consider how policy makers would envision the state of play on all investments made in the field and what these investments were used for? What is the gap? What worked? What went wrong? And why? They would also like to know the current status of resources. How important are these resources? What does the country or region gain by protecting them? And how many people and their property (threatened / vulnerable) will be impacted in the event of a drought? If we do nothing, what will happen? If we act what are we saving.
- Suggestion to have a diagrammatic representation of the process and illustrating the interaction between the TGs which will simplify the understanding of the process.
- Another suggestion for each chapter to have an illustration and one general section for the report.
- Concern raised that there may be issues related to content, clarity, sub-heading but the report provides an opportunity to go back to the TGs and to continue what the TGs set out to do with some context and foundation based upon which the IWG can rework towards a final draft.
- An executive summary should also be drafted.
- A master file should be maintained and the format to manage documents should be communicated.

### ***Function & Capacity of the IWG***

- The members questioned the capacity of the group to devote time and energy for a case study rich output. How much to commit and how much to promise (timeline). Current way of working (virtually) is difficult. If Secretariat is willing to support with case studies, still the issue is how to validate the case studies?
- Support (through case studies or commissioned reports) from Secretariat was welcomed, however inputs from this process would still need to be validated by the TG members. How do we do this?
- Ambitiousness within the TGs may be an issue. We need to know the issue frame – what do we want more or see as being enough, when it comes to framework should be considered. The members queries that writing team taking over of the interim report seems to have stopped the flow of the TGs. Caution was raised that the objective of interim report was to provide CRIC and to the UNCCD parties an update on work done by IWG, how are we framing the discussion, structuring work, and key issues identified for discussion?
- The IWG report is a policy document to UNCCD member states, never imagined as a scientific document with detail case studies. The Chair attributed that the IWG is trying to balance between scientific and as policy document that could be the reason behind struggle in the TGs.
- Proposal to reactivate the TGs and for each TG to focus on their chapter with the current interim report draft used to draw discussions and develop inputs. A summary/revision of the report will then be prepared thereafter.
- TGs would need to work on the diagrams which can be in the form of Gantt charts or other illustration
- It is important to agree on timelines to know time available for consultation in the TGs, drafting of reports and adequate time to comment on the report.
- Request for secretariat support received from TG 2 for an additional survey sent to NFPs on impact assessment and synergies with climate change
- Efforts should be made to build synergies and dovetail the four IWG task group recommendations and consider how they all fit together – this won't go to the interim report but this should be considered.
- Recommendation made for the IWG to develop a workplan and commitment to fill out the workplan.
- TGs should reflect on the questions raised by Ted and Caroline in the presentation

### ***Revisiting our Ambition and objective of the interim report***

- The members emphasized over the need to discuss and agree on the level of ambition of the interim report was raised. The postponement of the CRIC presents an opportunity and gives the IWG more time to deliver.
- The IWG should reflect on where are we? What challenges and questions are we dealing with? What is the responsibility of secretariat? What is the IWG recommending – providing the evolution of the IWG and get feedback and give CRIC a sense that something is happening.
- Care should therefore be taken in presenting statements as agreed proposals or recommendations as the IWG is yet to reach this stage. Task groups are best situated to discuss internally and provide guidance to the writing team.
- Caution also raised on overcommitting by the IWG as there is only so much that can be delivered by next COP. The COP report can flag areas for followup by UNCCD or other partners.

- Insufficient work has been done on stocktaking to provide a clear picture of what is there, what is working and what is not working. Without this basic analysis the IWG will not be able to make practical proposals – this is particularly an issue for TG 3 and 4.
- For options, the IWG needs to go beyond the ideal case at all levels and undertake a gap analysis as there are many existing policies with varied success and failure. Options will be based on experiences that have been out there for the past 20 plus years

#### ***Redrafting the Outline interim report***

- Proposal to develop a 2<sup>nd</sup> report keeping the current version along the policy line. However, this was debated with a counterproposal to keep the current version as a starting point and reduce it into a more precise report. Agreement to streamline work rather than multiply deliverables.
- Reiteration that the IWG need to be clear on what we are doing, why and what are the key messages.
- The chair proposed Luca, Bob, Roger, and German to sketch out a shorter draft that builds on the current draft. Expression of availability to review and provide comments for a new iteration of the report.
- Suggestion to produce a 2-page summary of the paper with the aim to provide more substance in the next report. Reminder that the drafting of the report should not replace the work being done by the TGs
- Use of information from countries, NGOs and other organizations submissions should be enhanced
- Target a shorter report, key tasks, where we are, key messages to date, some of the options and reducing report to one of messaging rather than completeness.

***Synergy and collaboration*** - The report dominantly focuses on UNCCD but should also consider other parties. UNCCD and FAO are developing a GEF Enabling Activity to support the drought process which includes a component to support the IWG process.

***Alignment with Mandate from COP*** - The interim report should be reviewed assessing if it aligns with IWGs mandate given by COP. The IWG was constituted by COP to have experts and governmental representatives, to draw science driven policy recommendation.

#### **4. Next Steps**

- TGs to reconvene to discuss the interim report, secretariat to support TG leads in scheduling and setting up the meetings. The TGs will keep working until the end of October.
- Daniel to reach out to TG leads to identify additional support required from Secretariat.
- IWG members to provide comments to the draft interim report on MS Teams – link to be shared by Secretariat
- Coordinating committee to meet again at the end of August and IWG meeting held in September.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Participation

Gunilla Björklund, Gaius Eudoxie, Sara-Jade Govia, Caroline King-Okumu, Luca Perez, Roger S Pulwarty, Robert J Stefanski, Mark Svoboda, Abduvokgid Zakhadullaev, German Kust, Michael Brüntrup, Theodore Horbulyk, Roger S. Pulwarty, Nathalie van Haren, María de Estrada, [Issa Garba](#), [Abdu AlSharif](#)

**Secretariat:** Daniel Tsegai, Jeroen van Dalen, Norah Ngeny, Louise Baker, and Saravanan Subramanian.