

WORLD METEOROLOGICAL ORGANIZATION

EC-WG-CWE-3/Doc. 4A/ADD1
(26.03.10)

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL WORKING GROUP ON CLIMATE
AND RELATED WEATHER, WATER AND
ENVIRONMENTAL MATTERS
Third Session

Item: 4

Original: ENGLISH

GENEVA, Switzerland 27 March 2010

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE GFCS:
ADJUSTMENTS TO THE PROGRAMME STRUCTURE -
WORLD CLIMATE PROGRAMME**

SUMMARY OF E-DISCUSSIONS AS PREPARED BY Dr. Bruce Stewart

SUMMARY OF AGENDA ITEM 4A DISCUSSION:

1. Do we need any other information to address this Agenda Item?

Comments from members of the Working Group members included that:

- Information on the resources required to run a re-scoped WCP as proposed against the current resources utilised. If a new WCP is to require greater resources to administer, where do we anticipate these extra resources coming from?
- A clearer definition/description of the WCP, or perhaps more precisely, what does it mean to be part of WCP? The document could say that WCP covers a broad domain ranging from processing climate data to projecting future climate change. This reorganization is an attempt to group the sub-domains of WCP into different bundles that will be more effective as we move forward in the era of the GFCS.
- A clearer explanation of the mapping from the past systems into the future (proposed) system. For example, parts of WCDMP will go into CDAP and other parts into CMPP, but this is not made clear.
- Noting that it is the role of the HLTF to compile an implementation plan for the GFCS, some details of the interagency collaborations with timelines for appropriate monitoring and evaluation would be valuable information.
- Without wanting to overcharge the discussion, the question should be raised where WIS fits into the whole picture?

2. Do you think that GFCS covers the needs as envisaged in Climate Agenda and, if so, can GFCS replace the Climate Agenda?

Comments from members of the Working Group members included that:

- It is time to retire the Climate Agenda. The requirements anticipated by the GFCS (including the programmatic backup through the WCP (and the other WMO Programmes mentioned in Doc.4)) supersede the requirements of the original Climate Agenda whether or not the GFCS is a one for one replacement of the Climate Agenda.
- Part of the answer to this question will only emerge out of the discussion the WG has on questions 4 and 5 (below), including a question of what level of inter-agency collaboration is required and what is practically feasible under the currently proposed mechanisms.
- The GFCS covers substantially the issues in Climate Agenda. It may be recalled that Climate Agenda was designed to address the issues that were relevant at the time of its establishment and to coordinate technical components of generating climate information. These issues have assumed greater dimension with additional contemporary challenges posed by climate change. To a large extent, GFCS has integrated these current issues and those of Climate Agenda into a set of five major components for effective climate services. However, the issue of commitment of manpower and resources, should be strengthened in the implementation of GFCS. GFCS can effectively replace Climate Agenda if adequate support is provided by donors including the partners at the highest government levels.

3. Is it important that when we define a Programme (such as the WCP) we include appropriate mechanisms to monitor progress?

Comments from members of the Working Group members included that:

- A mechanism to monitor progress must be implemented and monitoring progress should be a business as usual activity. The application of basic quality management principles would assist in ensuring the success of such a mechanism. The adoption of new structures (OPACEs, OPACHEs) within some supporting TCs like CCI and CHy relying largely on Task Forces and/or Expert Teams with well identified objectives and deliverables, and deadlines, could be appropriate. The mechanism will among other things check gaps and lapses in any of the components of GFCS. The monitoring mechanism should also provide necessary feedback to ensure that GFCS is easily adaptable to changing socio-economic needs.
- Choosing the right parameters for determining progress and efficient mechanism in terms of balancing operational duties of the Secretariat in supporting WCP and reporting duties would be a desirable solution. If these two requirements cannot be met the existing reporting and monitoring taking place through EC plus the monitoring/evaluation done by some of the sub-programmes like WCRP should perhaps be considered for their adequacy. The monitoring would be conducted by the Secretariat Monitoring and Evaluation system and through the appropriate governance mechanism for the WCP (or the GFCS, and what this will be is subject to the recommendations of the Task Force and subsequent decisions at Congress.)
- It will be recalled that the High Level Taskforce is developing a work plan for the implementation of GFCS and the scope is much wider than WCP. Furthermore, when interagency/intergovernmental organizations are involved, a mechanism for effective coordination will be necessary. However, what is not clear is where this programme will reside. Will it be in WCP or GFCS?

4.15. Is the new structure appropriate and will it fulfil the needs of GFCS?

Comments from members of the Working Group members included that:

General Comments

- It is difficult to conclude that the new structure fulfils the needs of the GFCS in advance of the conclusions of the Taskforce. However, it is of course prudent to be prepared for what is likely to be needed. It is our role as an EC Working Group to help guide the WMO input to the work of the Task Force rather than to wait and see what the Task Force comes up with. The WGs contributions are based on a combination of our 30 years experience in the operation of the WCP, the design of the Climate Agenda and the development of international climate observation, research and services programs. External inputs have been incorporated through WCC-3 Conference Statement. We can allow for adjustments to be made when the recommendations of the High level Task Force are made available.
- We need not limit ourselves to a single option at the moment, and perhaps we should consider capturing the range of thoughts of CWE members and subsequently EC members at this stage. So it may be valuable to identify areas of little contention, and those where there may be several options to consider.
- The detailed design of the GFCS and the re-structuring of the WCP must be undertaken as an integrated process. And this applies irrespective of whether the eventual decision is to try to re-build the WCP as a genuine inter-agency program or narrow it down to serve essentially as the overarching label for what WMO itself does in climate.

- In a world which is now very different from when the WCP was originally established and in which almost every international agency is competing vigorously for political profile and resources for its 'climate ' activities , if anything called a 'World Climate Programme' lead by WMO is to have credibility in the outside world, its role will have to be able to be described very simply, it will have to have very broad inter-agency buy-in, it will have to be seen to be built on what already exists and ,most importantly , its relationship to any new initiative called a 'Global Framework for Climate Services' will have to be crystal clear and rigorously defensible.
- We should careful in crafting any future component if we need (and we need to do so) to change those of the present WCP. Not make it too cumbersome but just enough to make it capture the essence of the GFCS. The GFCS should not be made to accommodate present programmes but vice versa. The idea for a GFCS is fairly well articulated in 5.1 of Appendix 3 of the document.
- We require an audit of all past activities should be undertaken. This was achieved to a certain extent a few years back by Dr Golnaragi (before she joined WMO) and this document, which overviewed the WCP, should serve us as guide. The WCP had embarked on very basic applications (Food, health, urban planning, renewable energy, natural disaster mitigation, etc.). As we slowed our activities, others jumped in and competed to lead. The leadership claimed by other have not been successful totally because the expertise is with the climate community. GFCS should aim at revisiting those activities and adapt them to modern-day requirements.

Comments on proposal

- The proposal currently foresees the creation of 6 sub-programmes under WCP, a marked increase from effectively three (excluding WCIRP) Programmes currently. While a strengthening of WCP (including the Secretariat support structure behind it) is definitely necessary to cover the needs of GFCS, the rationale behind the delineation of the individual sub-programmes is not fully understood and may need further clarification. For example, the Climate Service Information System under GFCS is covered through two subprogrammes under WCP (“Climate Monitoring and Prediction Programme” and “Climate System Operations and Infrastructure”). Unless a reason for separate programmes would be made more explicit we would propose to combine both of them which could also avoid duplication of efforts in coordinating the work of two programmes
- The structure and orientation of the proposed new WCP as described in EC-WG-CWE-3/Doc.4, is appropriate for fulfilling the needs of the GFCS provided minor adjustments are made. The GFCS is the best candidate for replacing more efficiently the climate agenda, as it has been extensively discussed and more or less already endorsed at different levels (WCC-3, EC, WMO Programmes, WMO TCs).
- Continuation of the WCRP as the programme which will deliver the research component of the GFCS is very sensible.
- The assessment of the impacts of climate change and variability is an extremely (if not the most) important component or activity under the WCP. This was being addressed by the World Climate Impact Assessment and Response Strategies Programme (WCIRP) and it is proposed to abandon this programme. In the light of the UNFCCC and the Copenhagen agreement, and the need for enhancing the activity on adaptation, including the development of strategies and action plans, which should be based on the assessment of vulnerability and impacts of climate change, it seems appropriate to include the WCIRP in the new structure and define its relationship to UNFCCC. It should be noted that almost all NMHSs are involved in the preparation of National Communications, one of the main

elements of which is to assess the impacts of climate change on ecosystems, health, economy and development of recommendations and strategies for decision makers. (Reference Appendix 2, p. 4 paragraph 21).

- Dropping the WCIRP as a component of WCP is seen as desirable and rather uncontroversial as the Programme does not seem to have delivered obvious results within the organisational context it was set up. The WMO influence on this Programme has always been very small. However, we may need to manage this message carefully with some stakeholders who wish to see WCIRP re-launched as an active programme.
- Climate Adaptation and Risk Management Programme: this programme seems a leap forward compared to the current state as it defines itself from the user side in support of adaptation strategies and risk management. The contribution of those WMO programmes that have established links to some of the key sectors (agriculture, water resources, and DRR) is key to success. As the paper discusses under para 36 for other sectors strategic partnerships are required.
- The rationale for putting “climate monitoring” with “climate prediction” in the proposed CMPP rather than with “climate data and analysis” in the CDAP needs to be discussed. It might be argued that climate monitoring is an activity that is barely removed from climate analysis, if it is viewed as the updating of climate analysis in close to real time. Indeed, some might view climate monitoring using the observational record as occurring prior to analysis to determine the reasons behind the results revealed by monitoring. Part of the problem is that the word analysis has two meanings in the climate context – the process of producing gridded datasets and the process of understanding a time series of observations. But in any case, a comprehensive set of climate services should include services for the provision of the basic observations, provision of homogenized and quality controlled versions of the observations, and provision of analyses, in addition to the provision of monitoring information and predictions. Putting monitoring with prediction for the purpose of mapping a WCP component to the CSIS as in Table 1 is thus open to question. The demarcation between the two programmes should be where we are taking observations to generate the core climate information which would input into the value-added applications and services. If so, then both the words “Analysis” and “Monitoring” are unhelpful. It may make sense to more closely reflect the language of the GFCS in the proposed names of these two sub-programmes at this stage.
- Moving monitoring to the CDAP would leave prediction on its own, but research aspects are catered for by the WCRP, so what remains is the operational side. Could this aspect of prediction be moved into the CSOP?
- Is there a need for a CSOP? Climate services will be delivered on the existing infrastructure of WMO, currently managed through the WWW and subsequently through the cross-programmes of WIGOS and WIS. Indeed, at the moment, the definitions of RCCs and GPCs are held within the DPFS manual. There is a need for the WCP in some way to inform the basic infrastructure programmes of any specific needs of the GFCS but this can be incorporated within the ToRs of one of the other programmes, e.g. the CMPP (or whatever we decide to call it!)
- Is the GFCS envisaged to include services based on longer-term projections? If so, how is this to be catered for? The document makes no provision for this. Services could draw on projections made under the auspices of the WCRP (as used also for IPCC purposes) rather than the CSOP, so arrangements for projections cannot be subsumed under those for prediction.

- The Climate Knowledge and Partnership Programme (CKPP) could be dropped and instead essentially put as an aspect of the TOR in each of the other groups. This may assist in answering the question as to which group might be involved in trying to increase the Regional Basic Climate Network (RBCN). The CKPP does not appear to deliver capacity building hence its positioning in Table 1 is misleading. It could be seen as an overall task of the WCP rather than the responsibility of an individual sub-programme.
- The CARP looks a good concept, although more than any other programme its future role and governance will depend on the Task Force's recommendations as the Climate Users Interface Programme is the least mature of all the GFCS components.
- The new structure can serve as the bedrock for the implementation of GFCS provided the required linkages are streamlined and no gaps identified. It is also necessary to avoid duplications and overlapping functions in the programmes under GFCS.

Alternative proposal

- The EC WG CWE should be focussing on the very big picture of how to structure a credible WCP relative to the essential elements of the GFCS based on the lessons of history (including, of course, the experience with WCDMP, WCASP, CLIPS, WCP-Water, WCP-Food, WCP-Energy etc) and especially on the collective wisdom and individual recommendations that came out of the WCC-3. If we (the EC WG) stand back and don't provide the WMO GFCS Task Force Secretariat with the best possible strategic advice we can deliver, it is suggested we would really be failing in our responsibilities to WMO.
- It is thus suggested that we should not, at this stage, be debating the detail of how the WMO Secretariat might partition its activities into six (or more, or less) WCP components. It is proposed that the optimum model for WCP restructuring remains the structure that was envisaged in the original design of the GFCS as canvassed at, and broadly supported by, the Expert Segment of the WCC-3. The restructuring model proposed would consist of a broadly co-sponsored (WMO-UNESCO-UNEP-FAO-WHO-ICSU) WCP with just three major components (each of which would be the WMO-lead but co-sponsored subsets of the corresponding 'essential elements' of the GFCS) as follows:
 1. GCOS for observations (co-sponsored by at least WMO, UNESCO/IOC, UNEP, FAO and ICSU),
 2. WCRP for research (co-sponsored, as now, by WMO, IOC and ICSU but with strengthened links with IGBP, Diversitas etc), and
 3. A World Climate Services Programme (which would consist of the core WMO-lead but co-sponsored parts of the CSIS (Climate Services Information System) element of the GFCS).
- It is postulated that if WMO's traditional climate partners could be persuaded to join in such a science- and service- focussed WCP, it would go a long way towards delivering the scientific knowledge/ information elements of the much broader GFCS and would provide the foundation for a genuine UN-as-one-on-climate-knowledge approach to working with the diverse sectoral agencies in the design and implementation of their respective components of the proposed Climate User Interface Programme (CUIP) element of the GFCS.

6. Is the mechanism to deal with the objectives of WCP sufficient? If not, what should be the mechanism to ensure appropriate coordination within various components of WCP, to deliver its objectives?

Comments from members of the Working Group members included that:

- Each of the four components of WCP addressing an objective of WCP will keep the programme in focus. However, beyond these components of WCP, coordination will still be required, particularly in relating with GFCS. A coordination committee that will serve as focal point in the Secretariat to answer concerns of GFCS will be required.

7. What should the recommendations from EC-WG-CWE to EC-LXII be?

Some suggestions from members of the Working Group members included that:

- Reviewing of existing programmes, resource mobilization and reporting on the activities of GFCS and WCP must be well-defined.
- Both GCFS and WCP require well articulated implementation plans and coordination committees. These committees in line with their programmes could provide each other progress report and serve as clearing house for climate activities within and outside WMO.

More specific suggested edits are provided in Annex.

ANNEX

More specific comments:

Appendix 1

- It would also be helpful to add a paragraph specifically stating what new domains are being added to WCP or given a dramatically increased focus and another paragraph stating what old domains are no longer going to be addressed or at least significantly downplayed. If there is nothing new and nothing dropped, then say so clearly. That is important information.
- In addition, if some aspect is essentially not changed at all, say that clearly as well, e.g., if in 4.2 paragraph 23, if WCRP is essentially unchanged, please say so.
- item 4.3 lines 4-5 : WCDMP and WCASP are both components of WCP : the sentence should be modified as “ would particularly require a refocusing of the two service-oriented WCP components, i.e. WCDMP and WCASP”.

Appendix 2

- Para 1 of 1.1: it could be added that WCP was established following WCC-1
- Title of 2.2 and Para 7 of 2.2: instead of “various programmes” I would prefer “cross-cutting programmes”
- Para 7 of 2.2: I would delete “after the endorsement of the Climate Agenda” as it is no longer relevant
- Para 11 in 2.4: it would be useful to indicate briefly which concrete steps have already been taken in order to implement the climate knowledge base
- Para 13 in 2.5 : WCDMP and WCASP are both components of WCP : the sentence should be modified as “ would particularly require a refocusing of the two service-oriented WCP components, i.e. WCDMP and WCASP”.
- Para 16 in 3: add after (WCASP) “including CLIPS”
- Para 19 in 4.2: in case where the proposal of dropping WCIRP as a component of WCP is retained, I would suggest that some activities of this type remain part of the WCP, e.g. the impacts of ENSO, which is an activity already engaged within CCI. However, I am still considering that the impacts issues are a major component that should be considered within WCP, especially as far as vulnerability assessments and adaptation studies are concerned. About the impacts, a lot is done by organizations outside WMO, particularly within activities related to Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR): I am especially thinking to the insurance/reinsurance sector (e.g. Munich Re) or Universities (i.e. CRED). A formal cooperation with them within the GFCS would be quite useful if UNEP is definitely not intending to revive the WCIRP.
- Para 20/Table 1: an additional column could be added for indicating the supporting Technical Commissions.
- Table 1 is problematic in two respects. Firstly, the GFCS components are a mix of Programme/System names and generic functions. They should be either one or the other. The GFCS components should either be (following the WCC-3 Conference Statement for the first two) GCOS/WCRP/CSIS/CUIP/CB? Or they should be

Observations/Research/Information services/User interface/Capacity building. In the list of WMO Programmes providing observations, one sees the co-sponsored GCOS, but not the co-sponsored GOOS and GTOS. As GCOS encompasses all climate-relevant observing systems it is best not included along with the systems whose climate-relevant observations it encompasses, under the heading “WMO Programmes”. Naming the observational component of the GFCS as GCOS (again as reflected in the WCC-3 Conference Statement) is the simplest way to resolve this.

- A second problem with Table 1 is that it is rather linear, with a rather limited implied mapping of WCP components onto GFCS components. The same linearity is suggested by the arrow that appears in Fig 2.2 of the WMO Position Paper presented to the Taskforce. Observations, analysis and monitoring activities feed climate information services directly, without necessarily having to go through a research, modelling and prediction box – though research and modelling certainly have a part to play in improving observation, analysis and monitoring. In this regard the structure shown in Fig. 3 of the Concept Note on the GFCS produced for WCC-3 is much preferable. In this figure, the CSIS is supported by two interlinked pillars, labelled “Research and Modelling” and “Observations and Monitoring”, both of which feed directly into it. Why has this figure/structure apparently been dropped?
- In paragraph 20, “unarguably the most important” should be deleted. Observations are not part of the reorganized WCP (paragraph 24) and are absolutely essential to the functioning of the GFCS.
- In third column, Climate Adaptations should read without an s.
- Para 21 in 4.2: I do not like the proposed title “Climate System Operations and Infrastructure Programme (CSOP)” which I have difficulties to understand. I would much prefer something like “Climate-related Infrastructure and Services (CRIS)” or “Climate-related Operations and Infrastructure (CROI)”
- Para 22 of 4.2: As the Commission for Climatology (CCI) traditionally “advises and guides the activities of the WCP”, I would add here that at its recent 15th session, CCI adopted a new structure and a new workplan, having in mind to better align its activities with the proposed GFCS.
- Para 24 of 4.2: I can understand the reason why the reorganized WCP does not include the Observations, i.e. the existence of WIGOS which includes GCOS. However, I see some inconsistencies (that I have expressed several times) with the current structure of WCP and responsibilities at WMO Secretariat level, where WCDMP activities (climate data management, climate monitoring) of WCP (now CDAP and CMPP in the refocused WCP) have been assigned to the OBS Department (including e.g. Climate Watch activities, although the added value is clearly the climate prediction component). I think that all components of the new WCP except WCRP should be under CLW Department.
- Para 26: add “and extremes” to “Climate Analysis including climate indices”
- Para 27: I do not understand what is meant by “including scaling up options”. I think that the main issue related to CMPP topic is downscaling at scales relevant to impact/adaptation studies, which is not mentioned.
- Para 38: the last few words refer to “all the other programmes”. Should this read “all other components of the WCP and other relevant WMO programmes”?

- Para 39: “the JSC of WCRP and GCOS” should be changed to “the JSC of WCRP and the GCOS SC”. For greater clarity, spell out Scientific Committee in the case of WCRP and Steering Committee in the case of GCOS.
- Section 5: One could possibly mention at the end of 5 the declaration adopted jointly by CCI and WCRP JSC after the Technical Conference held just before CCI-XV, aiming at a better interaction, and better organized transfer from research to operations, especially to comprehensively address the rapidly emerging societal needs for climate services for adaptation and risk management.
- Table 3: I don't understand the meaning of the different number of crosses.

Some more work may be required in defining the necessary linkages between the WCP sub programmes.