



**World Meteorological Organization**



## **ASSOCIATED PROGRAMME ON FLOOD MANAGEMENT**



**ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**AND**

**MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

(Geneva, 31 May – 1 June 2007)



The Associated Programme on Flood Management (APFM) is a joint initiative of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the Global Water Partnership (GWP). It promotes the concept of Integrated Flood Management (IFM) as a new approach to flood management. The programme is financially supported by the Governments of Japan and the Netherlands.



The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations. It coordinates the activities of the meteorological and hydrological services of 187 countries and territories and such is the centre of knowledge about weather, climate and water.



The Global Water Partnership (GWP) is an international network open to all organizations involved in water resources management. It was created in 1996 to foster Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM).

---



## ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

(Geneva, 31 May – 1 June)

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>PART I</b>	<b>ADVISORY COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.	OPENING.....	1
2.	BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PHASE I .....	1
2.1	FLOOD MANAGEMENT POLICY SERIES PAPERS .....	1
2.2	IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOT PROJECTS .....	2
2.3	DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF LINKAGE.....	2
3.	REVIEW OF THE APFM PHASE II ACTIVITIES FOR THE YEAR 2006-2007 .....	3
3.1	IFM TOOLS .....	3
3.2	NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES .....	4
3.3	CAPACITY BUILDING.....	5
3.4	DATABASE AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION .....	5
3.5	LINKAGE TO OTHER ACTIVITIES .....	6
4.	ACTIVITY PLAN FOR 2007-2008 .....	6
4.1	IFM TOOLS .....	6
4.2	SUPPORT TO NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES .....	7
4.2.1	Central and Eastern Europe.....	8
4.2.2	Other regional activities .....	8
4.3	CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT .....	9
4.3.1	Development of training material .....	9
4.3.2	Training courses .....	9
4.4	IFM HELP DESK.....	9
4.5	MATTERS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN APFM AND GWP .....	11
<b>PART II</b>	<b>MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE .....</b>	<b>12</b>
5.	FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE FOR THE YEAR 2006 - 2007 .....	12
6.	ACTIVITY AND BUDGET PLAN FOR THE YEAR 2007-2008 .....	12
<b>ANNEXES.....</b>		<b>15</b>
	<i>ANNEX I LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....</i>	<i>15</i>
	<i>ANNEX II AGENDA FOR THE APFM ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING .....</i>	<i>17</i>
	<i>ANNEX III FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF 31 MARCH 2007.....</i>	<i>19</i>
	<i>ANNEX IV BUDGET PLAN AND BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 2007 TO 2008 .....</i>	<i>21</i>





## **PART I    ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **1.    OPENING**

The Advisory Committee meeting of the WMO/GWP Associated Programme on Flood Management (APFM) was held on Thursday 31 May 2007 at the Secretariat of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in Geneva, Switzerland. Director, Hydrology and Water Resources welcomed the participants on behalf of the Secretary General. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Torkil Jønch-Clausen. He particularly welcomed Mr. Armin Petrascheck, representing the Swiss Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN) for attending the meeting as an observer with a view to explore the possibility of activity supporting the programme.

Participants at the meeting included the members of the Advisory Committee, Technical Support Unit (TSU) of APFM and staff from the Hydrology and Water Resources Department of WMO. The list of participants is provided in Annex I. The agenda adopted at the meeting is given in Annex II.

### **2.    BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PHASE I**

This was the first meeting of the Advisory Committee of Phase II of APFM. In view of the fact that the Phase I of APFM covered part of the financial year under report (April 2006-March 2007), a brief overview of the achievement of the Phase I was provided.

#### **2.1    FLOOD MANAGEMENT POLICY SERIES PAPERS**

The Committee was informed that flood management policy series papers, focusing on the various aspects of IFM approach, were published during phase I and disseminated. While discussing the paper on “Economic Aspects of IFM”, it was suggested that a new funding mechanism is required if Integrated Flood Management (and also IWRM) approaches are to be successfully implemented on the ground. Since the development funding is still made on a sector by sector basis an integrated approach is difficult, if not impossible, to be adopted. Therefore, IWRM platforms should seek to modify the way financial allocations are made in development sector, particularly related to water, so as to promote integrated processes. The Committee appreciated the efforts made by TSU in the implementation of APFM so far and noted that the issue of financing IFM will be brought to the notice of TEC of GWP and would be reviewed from the financing point of view. The Committee noted that the first challenge of IWRM is to mainstream water issue in the national economy and linking of flood management and water resources management. The Committee also noted that the purpose of APFM is to create the two way mechanism, by integrating water resources management thinking into flood management as has been done in the policy series papers and also to incorporate flood management issues and principles into IWRM programmes. TSU explained difficulties in collaborating in all the activities of IWRM groups within limited resources and expects GWP to play a key role in this effort. It was felt that additional efforts would be required to break through the status quo.



## **2.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOT PROJECTS**

The committee was informed that the Strategy for Flood Management for Lake Victoria Basin was developed in collaboration with Kenya Government successfully. APFM has been supporting JICA in Nyando basin (part of the Lake Victoria basin) to incorporate IFM approaches in the study being undertaken by them in support of the implementation of the strategy. However, it was pointed out that the strategy is yet to be included in the Kenya Water Plan, which was facilitated by GWP. Lack of linkages between IWRM and IFM at the country level was pointed out. Efforts will be required to incorporate flood aspects in Kenya Water Plan since Kenya has been suffering from both floods and droughts. It was informed that World Bank which is also presently working on the flood management issues in the Lake Victoria Basin focuses largely on the community approach. Efforts are underway to streamline this project towards an integrated approach. The Committee reiterated that the need for an integrated approach where the multipurpose use of reservoir for both floods and droughts is given full consideration. It referred to the fact that Elbe river basin had suffered from floods in 2002 and from droughts in 2003, which made policy makers recognize the importance of balanced approach of water issues for both floods and droughts. The Committee appreciated the continuous support from APFM to the government of Kenya and that the outcomes of all the pilot projects, which were successfully being implemented, addressing various aspects of IFM.

## **2.3 DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF LINKAGE**

The Committee was informed about the progress of APFM website and the statistics of visitors. It was informed that all the publications of APFM including policy series papers, case studies and pilot projects and various databases concerning flood management are posted on the website. The Committee was informed that two countries, South Korea and Seychelles have extensively made use of APFM outputs downloaded from the website. The Government of South Korea made use of APFM publications, as key discussion documents in the International Conference on Sustainable Flood Management in South Korea. The Committee appreciated the contents of databases and noted that such databases serve important and useful purpose for those looking for information on the website. TSU explained the difficulties of gathering data on flood-prone areas and the proposed collaborative efforts being sought with Global Risk Identification Program (GRIP). The Committee appreciated the continuous efforts to expand the contents of data base by TSU.

The Committee noted the development of APFM website and that it is attracting many visitors as proved by hit numbers. The Committee appreciated the popularity of APFM website, the ease with which it can be easily accessed through Google and that it can play a central role in dissemination efforts.

The Committee was informed of the linkages of GWP website and ToolBox to APFM website. It was informed that IFM Tools, as and when ready, will be introduced and incorporated in the GWP ToolBox.



The Committee appreciated the achievement of Phase I, which it assessed as quite successful. The Committee noted that APFM in phase I had achieved its objectives and it expects that its outputs would form the basis for the success of Phase II. Japan and the Netherlands who supported phase I were also satisfied with the results. Japan has expressed its satisfaction through its willingness to further support the APFM in its Phase II also. Although the Netherlands had not continued its financial support for Phase II, the reason is not the dissatisfaction with the results of Phase I, but only the change of priority area for financial support being provided by the Netherlands. Switzerland also appreciated the success of Phase I and as a result expressed its willingness to support the activities during Phase II.

### **3. REVIEW OF THE APFM PHASE II ACTIVITIES FOR THE YEAR 2006-2007**

#### **3.1 IFM TOOLS**

The Committee was informed about the provision of IFM Tools, which will support the implementation of IFM in the field. TSU explained that the seven distinct areas were identified for IFM Tools; IFM Planning, Social Aspects, Environmental Aspects, Economic Aspects, Legal and Institutional Aspects, Hydraulic and Hydrological Aspects and Engineering Aspects. The requirement of tools for social, environmental, economic and legal and institutional aspects were identified during the process of compilation of policy series papers. Tools for IFM planning, Hydraulic and Hydrological aspects and Engineering aspects are also considered important to support the integrated approach to flood management. However, the later three categories of tools would not be developed in great detail, and would be confined to only a few, those that may be required to make integrated approach possible. The tools are meant as guiding documents referring to the maximum extent to the existing literature and at the same time providing the integrated perspective. TSU has prepared an initial list of tools after discussions at the AC meeting last year and rearranged them.

TSU explained that the list presented is not a comprehensive list of tools, as it is constrained by the resources available at the disposal of APFM. However, it identifies the priority areas. The Committee noted the importance of linkage with GWP ToolBox to promote the relation between IFM and IWRM. The consistency of language used in IFM Tools and GWP ToolBox is important for the users to cross refer the contents. TSU explained that the basin planning management tool explicitly explains the linkage of IFM and IWRM clearly referring to the related GWP Tools. Similar connections would be maintained while developing other tools.

The Committee noted that the challenge of this programme is to provide tools that would help main stream flood management with national economic development planning.

On the issue of climate change, TSU explained that the efforts have been made to provide a balanced view on the subject in the publications brought out so far. It was felt that since several other factors, such as land use planning and development, affect flood processes too much emphasis on climate change is likely to



divert the attention away from other critical issues and focus too much on climate change. The issue has been brought out as an important component in the Concept paper and other relevant tools.

The Committee was informed that the tools are divided into three categories according to the details to which they have been dealt with: introductory notes, detailed notes and detailed guidance materials. A tool for flash flood management will be prepared separately to provide special focus on this issue to explain how community approach should be adopted to deal with this type of floods. The tool for flash flood management will focus on community preparedness and response and enabling mechanism for such activities, utilizing the experiences of pilot project in Central Eastern Europe.

It was clarified that the tool for “Flood monitoring and analysis” will focus on providing warning at community level utilizing the experiences in CEE and Central America. “Flood hazard mapping” will integrate all related issues such as modelling, flood risk maps for planning and regulation, climate change, and urban development. This and “Manual on flood forecasting and warning” are being developed as part of the activity of Hydrology and Water Resources Department duly incorporating IFM perspective. TSU explained that tool on “design consideration for structural measures” will show how structural measures affect the natural regimes of the river, and what changes could be made in the process of design. The Committee noted that the importance of trans-boundary issue in the flood management has been introduced in the supplementary paper on Legal and Institutional Aspects of IFM, and further detail investigation will be undertaken in a separate tool in the collaboration with TUHH and IWLRI.

The Committee was informed that the tools do not undergo a formal review process. Instead they will be published electronically and would continue to be living documents, regularly updated, based on feedback received. The Committee welcomed the compiling process for the tools and appreciated the overall approach adopted in development of IFM tools.

### **3.2 NATIONAL AND REGIONAL SUPPORT ACTIVITIES**

The Committee appreciated the continuous supports of WMO in implementing the strategy for Flood Management in Kenya. TSU noted that for further integration of IWRM plans and IFM issues, involvement of GWP network in Kenya will be crucial.

TSU explained that the outputs from the pilot project in Central and Eastern Europe undertaken in Poland, Slovakia and Romania will be disseminated to other countries in the region through a regional work shop which is planned to be organized in collaboration with GWP network. The Committee appreciated the active collaboration with GWP network in the region.

TSU explained that Government of South Korea organized an international conference to develop new flood policy where APFM provided the basic technical inputs. But it seems that the coordination mechanism among the various organizations required for working together towards common objectives, is yet to be



developed. Japan noted that River Bureau of Ministry of Land Infrastructure and Transport, Japan has close working relations with Ministry of Construction and Transport, Korea. The joint forum of two Ministries can play a key role in facilitation of flood management policy formulation. TSU explained that the Government of Seychelles with support from APFM, has started a dialogue among the various ministries concerned with floods. The Committee recommended that since small islands have many common issues, such as tourism and impacts of climate change, it is useful to invite representatives from other small island countries to share their views and experiences while disseminating the experiences from the Seychelles.

The Committee was informed that the activity in South Korea would be financially supported by the country from its own resources, the activity in Seychelles is being undertaken using financial resources at the disposal of APFM and would be subsequently funded through external donors' support for further development and implementation. The Committee appreciated such demand driven activities in South Korea and Seychelles.

The Committee was informed that since the initial orientation by APFM in December 2005, the IFM process in Guatemala has not shown any progress due to the lack of the institutional coordination.

### **3.3 CAPACITY BUILDING**

The Committee was informed of the capacity building activities undertaken during the year through compilation of training material, development of education material for educators and children and extended vocational training through Cap-Net. The Committee welcomed the linkage of APFM and Cap-Net. TSU explained that in collaboration with ICHARM APFM provided inputs into two JICA trainings organized during the year. The Committee was informed that the target of JICA training course is mainly for developing countries and the training is undertaken in Japan or in the countries, if it is related to the projects. JICA has also established training centres for flood management in China and Philippines. The Committee was also informed about the two e-learning courses of TUHH which would be adapted by APFM. One is designed for participants of a Summer School organized by TUHH and other is for flood management practitioners. APFM will incorporate IFM components in these e-learning courses and adapt them for the developing countries.

### **3.4 DATABASE AND DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION**

The Committee was informed of the progress made in the development of different databases. The Committee encouraged TSU to continue to enrich and update them. The committee appreciated the efforts made for dissemination of the publications to the institutions and universities that work in academic area related to flood management and water resources management. The committee appreciated the efforts made by TSU in disseminating the concept and linking it with other development processes through participation in selected workshops and conferences.



### **3.5 LINKAGE TO OTHER ACTIVITIES**

The Committee was informed that APFM is feeding into the activities of International Flood Initiative. In order to streamline the philosophy of IFM into IFI activities, APFM will have a workshop with ICHARM in August 2007 to promote the collaborative activities in the field of capacity building and development of tools, etc. The Committee was also informed that the collaborative efforts with JICE have been invigorated based on the MoU concluded in March 2007. In addition to the close working relation with Cap-Net, efforts are being made to explore the possibility of collaboration with the INBO particularly in reference to the IFM adoption in trans-boundary river basins.

Mr. Katsuhito Miyake, the chairman of Working Group on Hydrology of Typhoon Committee, made a Presentation on “WMO/ESCAP Typhoon Committee (TC) and activities under TC framework in relation to managing disasters” and introduced, “Disaster Impact Calculator” developed by ESCAP using the ECLAC Methodology. The Committee appreciated the presentation and noted that it is important to take into account such efforts in APFM activities and utilize the outputs available and where useful to IFM.

## **4. ACTIVITY PLAN FOR 2007-2008**

### **4.1 IFM TOOLS**

The Advisory Committee was presented with the list of IFM tools planned to be prepared in APFM Phase II and particularly those planned during the year. Members of the Committee reaffirmed their support to the idea of developing these tools, and their importance in guiding implementation of IFM in the field. It was pointed out by TSU that the process of development adopted for different tools is pragmatic and flexible. In contrast to the procedure adopted for the development of “Flood Management Policy Series”, no uniform formal process of peer-reviewing the tools is made (notwithstanding the option of providing peer-review for selected tools, where this is deemed necessary). It was stressed that the IFM tools should be based on existing practices and documentation wherever possible. The tools should provide guidance on what role each particular tool plays in IFM implementation and should inspire the reader to look at the bigger picture. The current pace of developing some 3-4 tools per year was seen as the most practical way of ensuring that tools development takes place while maintaining various other activities under the programme. In view of the resource constraints the Committee welcomed this general approach.

Categorization of tools presented by TSU was discussed and it was recommended to make a few adjustments to this categorization, among others, to create a specific category of tools for “National Planning” that would take account of how IFM relates to the National IWRM planning process, the National Action Plans for Adaptation to Climate Change (NAPA), and National Poverty Reduction Plans. It was recalled that the IFM Concept had been developed also with a view to the challenges faced by flood managers in factoring climate change. While it was stressed that NAPAs should incorporate the IFM approach and Climate Change uncertainties should be included into all relevant tools, it was cautioned that the Climate Change debate



should not dominate the IFM development agenda, as IFM is adaptive by its very nature. Further it was recommended to rename the category “Engineering tools” to “Operational tools”.

In order to keep the expectations towards the development of those tools on realistic levels, TSU was cautioned to learn from experience with the development of the IWRM Toolbox of GWP. It was recommended *not* to use the term “IFM ToolBox” for the effort undertaken. In order to ensure that the user is able to locate the desired tools, multiple entry points or meta-search terms should be incorporated. Mechanism for adequate access to the tools should be presented along with the concept of HelpDesk during the next AC-MC meeting.

The Japanese delegation suggested that the draft versions of the tools should be made available at the early stages of the development process so that the outputs could benefit from the experience of Japanese institutions like JICE, MLIT and others. FOEN in Switzerland would also like to provide technical expertise in developing some of these tools. This offer was welcomed by all participants and it was proposed to employ a two tire process. The first involving the core partners, especially Japan and Switzerland with whom the tools would be shared at the early stages of development, and the second when the tools are in good shape, they would be made available on the APFM webpage as living documents, inviting comments or additions.

Five tools were proposed for development in the next financial period 2007-2008. These are:

- Land use planning
- Urban flood management
- Community based organization in flood management
- Flood reservoir operations and managed flows
- Flood hazard mapping.

While appreciating the selection of IFM tools, Committee recognized the planned Manual on Flood Hazard Mapping as a timely development. Members were informed that the tool would be developed based on existing materials and initiatives. It could be clarified that the Manual is planned to include methods that are applicable to the realities in developing countries. Members were informed that an effort would be made to utilize clearly defined terminology in that field as this is a gap in current literature. TSU was encouraged to utilize existing terminology databases at EU level to build upon.

#### **4.2 SUPPORT TO NATIONAL AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES**

The national and regional activities chosen for the budget period 2007-2008 were presented to the Committee. TSU explained that a demand-driven approach had been employed over the past year where the request was not solicited, but emanating on its own. This was useful in order to ensure ownership on the side of the project beneficiary. TSU was encouraged to strengthen efforts in developing field demonstration



projects. While recognising the need to assist countries, it was recalled that resource constraints will necessitate the raising of additional third party funds for such activities.

It was concluded that a strategy would be developed under the planned IFM HelpDesk that would allow to have a process in place that would cascade the IFM approach first into countries that have reached at least minimum standards of good governance and institutional capacity before engaging too strongly those countries that lack these basic requirements for efforts to be successful. The fact was recognized that many countries are lacking the ability to adequately articulate their needs for flood management and the TSU should respond through providing platforms by, for example, organising workshops where those needs could be formulated.

TSU was encouraged to continue to utilize available national and regional chapters of GWP in its development and outreach processes. In particular it was encouraged to invite donor organizations on a regular basis to workshops, seminars and other meetings in the context of IFM projects in the regions. TSU was also cautioned that while pilot projects under the APFM were always undertaken with a view to upscale the outcomes, caution would be required to ensure the replicability of outcomes in different climatic, topographic and socio-economic settings.

Members of the Committee recognized the crucial role that APFM plays in transferring good practices in flood management. It was stressed that this role was crucial not only in “North-South” collaborative efforts, but also to tap the vast potential of “North-North” and “South-South” cooperation on the platform of the APFM.

#### 4.2.1 Central and Eastern Europe

TSU explained the planned activities, to upscale the experiences of the pilot project in Poland, Slovakia and Romania to the Member countries of GWP of CEE countries. The representative of GWP welcomed the activity and noted that this model of collaboration with GWP of CEE and GWPO, through supplement funding was welcome and could be replicated through other joint activities. It was stressed that many of the participating countries are meanwhile part of the EU and that this would need to be taken into account in future planning. It was also stressed that GWP of CEE unites under its roof both EU Member States and other European countries like Ukraine and Moldova who may also need technical and financial support in flood management.

#### 4.2.2 Other regional activities

##### *Moscow*

The activities envisioned with Moscow State University within the Framework of ECWATEC 2008 were presented to the Committee. The Committee recognized the potential of this collaboration for outreach into



the Russian-speaking community. TSU was encouraged to explore the possibility of involving Mr Wadim Sokolow of GWP CACENA in the outreach processes in the region and towards the ECWATEC Conference.

### *Seychelles*

As concerns the activities undertaken Seychelles, the Committee highlighted the opportunities presented in dealing with Small Island Developing States (SIDS), and encouraged the TSU that once a project would role out on the Seychelles, learning could be transferred to other SIDSs like those in the Caribbean the Pacific and Indian Ocean region.

## **4.3 CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT**

### 4.3.1 Development of training material

The approach taken in developing training materials for various age groups in a portfolio of materials and activities was endorsed by the Committee, as was the decision to maximize the capacity under these activities through partnerships. The collaborative efforts undertaken with Cap-Net, Project WET and TUHH were endorsed by the Committee. To build on the strengths and resources of the partners to achieve the objectives was considered as the most effective way of achieving the multi-disciplinary approach. The activity with TUHH in developing an e-learning platform for IFM was welcomed. The Committee stressed that e-learning is becoming a popular learning tool particularly for students. TSU explained that the target group for the e-learning would be primarily flood management practitioners.

### 4.3.2 Training courses

The planned training courses with Cap-Net and JICA were introduced to the Committee, namely in Bolivia, Bangladesh, India and French-speaking West Africa (with Cap-Net) and “River and Dam Engineering III” and “Flood Hazard Mapping” together with JICA in Japan and the IFM training on Nyando River Basin. The Committee appreciated the proposed choice of training courses and their regional coverage.

## **4.4 IFM HELP DESK**

The Concept of the IFM HelpDesk was presented to the Committee and was discussed at length. Members recognized the necessity of such mechanism for countries in need of guidance and support in IFM implementation and expressed their appreciation of the efforts undertaken to develop the idea, and intended objectives of the HelpDesk. The concept of providing two distinguished functions for “Self-help” and “Get help” was much appreciated in order to provide targeted guidance while serving a filter for requests.

Concerning the Questions & Answers (Q&A) section it was stressed that it might be necessary to distinguish between:



- an interactive Q&A section where users can pose questions on IFM and receive answers from TSU or as required the decentralized support base or even from a worldwide group of participants under the Virtual Forum, and
- a passive FAQ section about IFM where the most common concepts and pitfalls for understanding IFM are clarified.

Regarding the IFM Virtual Forum the Committee recalled various experiences of running such forum unsuccessfully at WWF3 and pointed at some good experiences that TSU should explore before rolling out the forum. It was informed that TSU had taken a cautious approach in order to better get it right first time.

Inputs were provided by Members of the Committee on experiences of other institutions in forming helpdesks, such as OASIS Project, at Longborough University and at FAO (IPTRID). It was mentioned that in some of those cases lack of demand-side development led to fading of interest of partners. TSU should take account of this risk in its planning and actively engage with developers of those projects to derive the best possible institutional learning from such experiences. Another valuable learning from those experiences was that keeping the “Decentralized support base” to a small group of selected partners rather than expanding to unsustainable sizes.

TSU informed that the full functionality of the HelpDesk is targeted at 2010, after which the HelpDesk would continue to function under the regular activities of WMO. Committee appreciated this long-term planning and commitment that would provide sustainability to the implementation of the HelpDesk.

It was clarified that while being based on a decentralized network of supporting institutions, the coordination of the HelpDesk function and the physical location of the HelpDesk would be vested within the HWR Department in WMO. Internal arrangements to ensure a continued availability of staff for carrying out those functions would be along with a clear and easy way of approaching the HelpDesk from the users. Further once the HelpDesk is reaching its full functionality strong efforts should be made to communicate the availability of its services to the targeted users.

The commitment of WMO to take up a certain number of requests under the HelpDesk under its core budget was highly appreciated, while recognizing that extra-budgetary resources would also be required for which financial partners would be approached. It was expected that once the HelpDesk would be operational and in the position to show some successes in helping countries it would not be difficult to find donors to support its operation.

While it was much appreciated that the HelpDesk would provide help in formulating project proposals, it was agreed that the HelpDesk should not officially include a function of finding financial partners for project proposals developed under the HelpDesk, with a view to ensure the integrity of its functioning. Such function should not be advertised to potential project beneficiaries (not withstanding the option of the TSU recommending specific proposals to potential donors as it deems appropriate).



#### **4.5 MATTERS CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN APFM AND GWP**

The Committee was informed that GWP had reviewed its relationship with its Associated Programmes (APs). The review concluded that only two out of the five APs are functioning according to their intended purposes, namely APFM and Cap-Net. At the same time GWP is receiving various proposals for new APs and is subjected to criticism for not granting AP status to those. Therefore, GWP is in the process of phasing out the AP arrangements. It was stressed that the reasons for phasing out the AP arrangement were external to the performance of the APFM and that the good relationship and experience in implementing the APFM should be preserved and further strengthened under a new arrangement, possibly an MoU between GWPO and WMO.

It was felt that the branding of the term “APFM” needs to be preserved, and therefore a change of the acronym is not in the interest of the program. In this regard it was opined that it could be enough to drop the “WMO/GWP” from the name of the APFM and indicate the fact that there are linkages through a separate statement to this effect. GWPO would discuss internally if the term “Associated Programme” in the name of the APFM could be retained as an exception, as it is the only AP that incorporated the term “Associated Programme” in its name. The intended MoU would provide a basis for a more structured and activity-based relationship and would be undertaken for a period of 3 years. An example of a GWP MoU was provided for reference in WMO. In this context it was proposed to align this arrangement with the remaining Phase II under the APFM.



## **PART II MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**

The Management Committee meeting was held on Friday 1 June 2007. The meeting was chaired by Mr. Torkil Jønch-Clausen.

### **5. FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE FOR THE YEAR 2006 - 2007**

The Committee was presented with the financial statement clearly providing the income and expenditure for the year 2006-2007. The Committee was also informed that besides the income from Japan, WMO has provided 200,000 CHF for the activities of APFM as kind contribution in the form of staff working for APFM. Additionally, one intern is working for APFM to support its activities. Japan expressed its satisfaction with the financial performance and the outcomes of the activities. The Committee approved the financial statement for the year 2006-2007, as given in Annex III.

### **6. ACTIVITY AND BUDGET PLAN FOR THE YEAR 2007-2008**

The Committee was presented with the Budget Plan of the activities for the year 2007-2008. It was pointed out that preliminary discussions have been held with the Swiss Federal Office of the Environment (FOEN), who has expressed their willingness to participate and support the programme to an extent of CHF 100,000 for the current calendar year. However, a detail of activities to which the amount is to be earmarked is yet to be worked out. As such, the contribution from WMO and Switzerland were shown in the same column as the breakdown of the contribution from Switzerland was yet to be decided. The Committee recommended that the contribution of WMO in terms of working time of staff should be indicated separately to clarify what will be their monetary cost.

Representative from Switzerland, Mr Petrascheck, informed that the proposed contribution to APFM for this period was already approved and modalities have to be finalised through an agreement between WMO and FOEN clearly specifying the allocation of resources. He expressed the intention to allocate the contribution of Switzerland to three items of APFM budget plan, which is 30,000 CHF for IFM Tools, 35,000 CHF for Capacity building, and 20,000 CHF for HelpDesk. 15,000 CHF will be reserved for future adjustment. TSU explained that most of the tools are being developed by TSU consultants and as such the large part of expenditure on IFM Tools is the provision of APFM Consultant fee which currently is attributed to APFM Trust Fund in the budget plan. Being part of IFM Tools development process, it could also be shared by Switzerland. Specification of activities will be agreed to by WMO and Switzerland later. The Committee was also informed that the discussions between WMO and Switzerland would have to be undertaken in October 2007 to prepare the budget proposal for the next period (2008-2009). It is expected that Switzerland may contribute up to 200,000 CHF for 2008-09. The decision on the subject would be made by Swiss authorities by March 2008.



Japan confirmed its contribution of 38,500,000 JPY for the year 2007-2008 and welcomed the participation of Switzerland in the programme. The Committee was informed that Japan is committed to support APFM continuously during Phase II, but can only make agreement for the contribution on a yearly basis.

The Committee was informed that support to national and regional activities will be one of the key functions of HelpDesk, for which provision is made under item “3.2 National and regional support activities”. However, the current provision in APFM budget for this activity is limited. The support activities will be undertaken depending on the availability of external financial support for the country or from internal funding by the country. TSU noted that the funds for the initiation of national and regional projects are required in APFM Trust Fund to start the process. The Committee expressed its expectation that more requests for support will be received from countries during next financial period and recognized the requirement of funds for supporting the national and regional support activities. Since the process of setting up of HelpDesk is under way, the provision of funds for this activity will be enhanced during next financial period. Currently, only operational costs of maintaining web site and the information system and databases, is provided in the budget plan.

The Committee noted the importance of using the experiences gained from the field activities through the HelpDesk. The Committee also recognised that the methodologies developed in one place can not always be applicable in another place and as such a regional perspective is imperative. TSU explained that the development process of IFM tools, ensures that regional flavour is reflected in the outputs. Activities and experiences of related regional activities/projects are incorporated in the development of the tools. Cooperation with Typhoon Committee is one of such efforts.

The Committee approved the APFM Budget Plan and Activity Plan subject to the above discussions and suggestions. The APFM budget plan for 2007-2008, revised on the basis of above recommendation is at Annex IV.

The committee was informed that apart from Swiss authorities, TSU had contacted Spain for the funding of Guatemala project, which will be available through basin organization in Spain. TSU also explained that World Bank will be invited to support the programme after the structure of HelpDesk is finalised. The Committee expressed its satisfaction for the efforts being made to find new financial partners. Japan recommended inviting South Korea as one of the donors since South Korea is interested in contributing to such development activities. TSU appreciated the suggestion. The Committee noted that it is beneficial to involve GWP partners in the regions to the activities to utilize their knowledge and connection to funding agencies.

Japan desired that the products and outputs of the yearly agreement should be made available in presentable form by the end of March to prepare for the administrative requirements of JICE in April. TSU explained that the Annual Report gets delayed since the financial statement requires a financial closure of the accounts



which are available only after March. However, it was confirmed that the Annual Report (without the financial statement) would be made available by the end of March.

GWP representative informed that APFM is viewed very positively by the Steering Committee (SC) of GWP. However, the SC has taken the decision to discontinue with the concept of Associated Programmes. The Committee members recommended that the name and logo of the APFM should not be changed. It requested the representative of GWP to convey the message of the Committee to the SC of GWP. The Committee noted that the detail discussions about the relation between GWP and APFM will be made separately.

The Committee noted that it is important to invite other partners who can provide financial support as is being done in Kenya. Development aid agency such as JICA is one of such organizations that can take up activities to the outreach process.

-----



## ANNEXES

### ANNEX I

#### APFM ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND APFM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (GENEVA, 31 MAY - 1 JUNE 2007)

#### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

##### Advisory Committee and Management Committee

Mr Torkil Jønch-Clausen (Chair)  
Director, DHI Water and Environment  
Agm Alle 11  
D-2970 HORSHOLM  
Denmark

(Tel: +45 45 16 92 15)  
(Fax: +45 45 16 92 92)  
(E-mail: [tjc@dhi.dk](mailto:tjc@dhi.dk))  
([torkilj@hotmail.com](mailto:torkilj@hotmail.com))

Mr Katsuhito Miyake  
Water Resources Environmental Technology Center of  
Japan (WEC)  
NK Bldg, 2-14-2 Kojimachi Chiyoda-ku  
TOKIO 102 0083  
Japan

(Tel: +81 3 32639925)  
(Fax: +03 3263 9922)  
(Email: [k-miyake@wec.or.jp](mailto:k-miyake@wec.or.jp))

Mr Katsumi Wakigawa  
Deputy Director, Intelligence and Research  
Administration Division  
Water Resource Division  
Japan Institute of Construction Engineering  
Nissay Toranomom Bldg.,  
3-12-1, Toranomom,  
Minato-ku  
TOKYO, 105-0001  
Japan

(Tel: +81-3-4519-5006)  
(Fax: +81-3-4519-5016)  
(Email: [k.wakigawa@jice.or.jp](mailto:k.wakigawa@jice.or.jp))

Mr Armin Petrascheck (\*)  
Representing the Swiss Federal Office for the  
Environment (FOEN)  
Goldwandstrasse 6  
5408 Ennetbaden  
Switzerland

(Mobile: +41-763413004)  
(E-mail: [apetrascheck@bluewin.ch](mailto:apetrascheck@bluewin.ch))

---

(\*) Observer to the Management Committee.



**Advisory Committee**

Mr Alan Hall  
Global Water Partnership  
Coordinator, Framework for Action Unit  
Drottningatan 33  
SE-111 51 STOCKHOLM  
Sweden

(Tel: +46 8 562 51 912)  
(Fax: +46 8 562 51 901)  
(E-mail: [Alan.Hall@gwpforum.org](mailto:Alan.Hall@gwpforum.org))

Mr Jan Kubat  
Czech Hydrometeorological Institute  
Na Sabatce 17  
CZ – 14306 PRAGUE 4  
Czech Republic

(Tel: +420 244032300)  
(Fax: +420 244032342)  
(E-mail: [kubat@chmi.cz](mailto:kubat@chmi.cz))

Mr Bruce Stewart  
Assistant Director  
Bureau of Meteorology  
GPO Box 1289K  
MELBOURNE VIC 3001  
Australia

(Tel: +613 966 946 05)  
(Fax: +613 669 47 25)  
+613 669 45 48)  
(E-mail: [b.stewart@bom.gov.au](mailto:b.stewart@bom.gov.au))

**Technical Support Unit of APFM**

Mr Avinash Tyagi

Mr Hisaya Sawano

Mr Joachim Saalmueller

Mr Toru Nagata

Ms Rebecca Nabiryo

**Other Participants from HWR Department**

Mr Tommaso Abrate

Mr Gabriel Arduino

Mr Claudio Caponi

Mr Wolfgang Grabs

Mr Datius Rutashobya

Mr Mohamed Tawfik

**ANNEX II**

**Agenda for the APFM Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**31 MAY 2007, ROOM 6 JURA**  
**WMO Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland**

09:00-09:15	Welcome, self introduction and adoption of agenda
09:15-12:00	Review of the APFM activities of the year 2006/2007
12:00-13:30	Lunch
13:30-17:30	<p>APFM activities in Phase II</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IFM Tools</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Inter relationship with other programmes and initiatives</li> </ul> <p>APFM activities of the year 2007/2008</p> <p>Matters concerning the relationship of APFM and GWP</p> <p>Any other items with the permission of the Chair</p>
17:30-18:30	Cocktail at WMO Restaurant

**AGENDA FOR THE APFM MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**1 JUNE 2007, ROOM 6 JURA**  
**WMO Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland**

8:00- 12:30	<p>Financial performance of the year 2006/2007</p> <p>Budget and action plan for the year 2007/2008</p> <p>Any other items with the permission of the Chair</p>
-------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



**ANNEX III****FINANCIAL STATEMENT AS OF 31 MARCH 2007**

**APFM (Phase II) TRUST FUND FINANCIAL STATEMENT**  
(as of 31 March 2007)

**Income and Expenditure from July 2006 to March 2007**

		CHF
1-1.	Opening balance	0 (a)
1-2.	Income	
	Contributions (Including last installment made at 3rd April 2007)	408,110
	Interest	2,765
	<b>Total Income</b>	<b>410,875 (b)</b>
1-3.	Expenditure (including support costs)	
	Actual Expenditure (Liquidated)	196,382
	Unliquidated (Future Obligation)	106,204
	Requisition (Future Obligation)	20,573
	<b>Total Expenditure</b>	<b>323,159 (c)</b>
1-4.	Carry forward from this period	(a) + (b) - (c) <b>87,716 (d)</b>

*Certified correct*

*Tomiji Mizutani*  
*Chief, Budget Office*  
*WMO*



**ANNEX IV****BUDGET PLAN FOR THE YEAR 2007 TO 2008 (Revised)****APFM Budget Plan for 2007-2008 (Revised)**

**1. Income (CHF) 906,716**

a) Carry-over from 06/07 period	87,716	
b) Expected Contribution from Japan	410,000	38'500'000 JPY
c) Expected Contribution from Swiss*	*100,000	
d) Expected Contribution from WMO	309,000	
<b>Total</b>	<b>906,716</b>	

Contribution from Japan (2006-2007, 38,500,000 JPY) with interest: 410,875 CHF

\* Yet to be confirmed

Details of expected contribution from WMO are as below

a) WMO contribution by personnel	200,000
b) WMO contribution by logistics	49,000
c) WMO contribution by activities	60,000
<b>Total</b>	<b>309,000</b>

**2. Expenditure (CHF)****a) From April 2007 to March 2008**

			Legend	APFM Trust Fund		Contribution from		Total Budget for each category
				Sub total	Total	WMO	Swiss*	
<b>1</b>	<b>Flood management policy series and IFM Tools</b>				<b>60,000</b>	<b>125,000</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>215,000</b>
	APFM Consultant/HWR Staff			50,000		70,000	30,000	
	<b>1.1</b>	<b>Tools to develop IFM strategy in the field</b>		10,000				
		a	Land use planning					
		b	Urban flood management					
		c	Community based organization in flood management					
		d	Flood reservoir operations and managed flows					
		e	Manual on flood hazard mapping			55,000		
<b>2</b>	<b>Capacity building</b>				<b>145,000</b>	<b>50,000</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>230,000</b>
	APFM Consultant/HWR staff			60,000		50,000		
	<b>2.1</b>	<b>Training materials</b>		20,000				
		Joint activities with Project WET, Joint activities with CapNet						
	<b>2.2</b>	<b>IFM Training</b>		65,000			35,000	
		Traing course (Cochabamba, India, West Africa) with CapNet, JICA Training in Kenya, JICA/ICHARM						



<b>3</b>	<b>HelpDesk services (Support national and regional activities)</b>			<b>57,500</b>	<b>25,000</b>	<b>35,000</b>	<b>117,500</b>
	APFM Consultant/HWR staff		39,000		20,000		
	<b>3.1</b>	<b>Outreach of pilot project Phase I</b>					
	a	Central and Eastern Europe	Regional workshop			20,000	
	b	Kenya		7,500			
	<b>3.2</b>	<b>National and regional support activities</b>	Seychelles, Korea and other anticipated requests	5,000		5,000	
	<b>3.3</b>	<b>APFM website</b>	Maintainance of the website, databases, virtual forum, HelpDesk services, etc.	6,000			
	<b>3.4</b>	<b>Contingency</b>				15,000	
<b>4</b>	<b>Dissemination of information</b>			<b>66,000</b>	<b>24,000</b>		<b>90,000</b>
	APFM Consultant/HWR staff		39,000		20,000		
	<b>4.1</b>	<b>Dissemination of materials</b>	Postage			4,000	
	<b>4.2</b>	<b>Participation in the conferences</b>	ISFD4 (Canada, support cost), Asia Pacific Water Summit, ECWATECH (Moscow), Ecohydrological process and sustainable flood plain management (Poland)	27,000			
<b>5</b>	<b>APFM secretariat and project administration</b>			<b>74,935</b>	<b>30,000</b>		<b>104,935</b>
	<b>5.1</b>	<b>APFM secretariat</b>				30,000	
	a	Secretariat and administration		38,000			
	<b>5.2</b>	<b>APFM project administration</b>					
	a	AC/MC Meeting		4,000			
	b	WMO administrative cost		32,935			
<b>Sub Total</b>				<b>403,435</b>	<b>254,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>757,435</b>



## b) From April 2008 to June 2008

				APFM Trust Fund		Contribution from		Total Budget
				Sub total	Total	WMO	Swiss*	
<b>6</b>	<b>APFM secretariat and project administration</b>				<b>94,281</b>	<b>55,000</b>		<b>149,281</b>
	APFM Consultant/HWR Staff			68,000		40,000		
<b>4.1</b>	<b>APFM secretariat</b>					15,000		
	a	Secretariat and administration		12,000				
<b>4.2</b>	<b>APFM project administration</b>							
	a	AC/MC Meeting		6,000				
	a	Contingencies		2,113				
	b	WMO administrative cost		6,168				
<b>Sub Total</b>					<b>94,281</b>	<b>55,000</b>		<b>149,281</b>

<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>497,716</b>	<b>309,000</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>906,716</b>
--------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------