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## REPORT

## THE SEVENTH SESSION OF THE PARTNER ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PAC-7)

## Reading, 17 and 18 October 2017

**INTRODUCTION**

The Seventh Session of the Partner Advisory Committee (PAC) was held in Reading, UK, on 17 and 18 October 2017. The meeting was hosted by European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecast (ECMWF), and was attended by 22 representatives of 13 partner organizations and 4 organizations as observers ([List of Participants](http://www.gfcs-climate.org/sites/default/files/List%20of%20Participants%20PAC-7.pdf)).

1. **OPENING OF THE SESSION**
   1. At the opening, the Chair of the PAC highlighted the main achievements of the PAC in 2017 which included the development of the White Paper on the *Contribution of the Global Framework for Climate Services (GFCS) to Transforming our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (Agenda 2030)*; the organization of side events at major global and international events; contribution to the Mid-Term Review of the GFCS and GFCS presence at COP 22.
   2. Mr Jean-Noël Thépaut, representing the ECMWF, provided the history of the link between ECMWF and the PAC. He highlighted the importance of this linkage, particularly now that the ECMWF, through the Copernicus Climate Change Services (C3S), was involved in climate services. C3S will contribute data, products and services which will support global efforts towards development and application of climate services.
   3. Mr Jens Sunde, Chair of IBCS, highlighted the fact that the Priority Needs for the Operationalization of the GFCS for the period 2016 to 2018 should be the real guide for implementation. For achieving the goals of the Priority Needs the *Deep Approach* consisting of specific activities at national level in the six PAC countries and the *Wide Approach* hinging on the implementation of the Climate Services Information System (CSIS) through the Fast Track approach should be maximized. For approaches, the role and contributions of PAC members is critical.

**2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

[The Agenda](http://www.gfcs-climate.org/sites/default/files/PAC-7-d02-1-Agenda_en_Approved.pdf) was approved with amendments proposed by the meeting.

**3. UPDATE ON GFCS**

Partners shared experiences and lessons drawn from implementation of the GFCS Adaptation Programme in Malawi and the United Republic of Tanzania. Specifically, partners involved in implementation (IFRC, WFP, WHO and WMO) highlighted the fact that the project provided an opportunity to learn a great deal from practice. Despite some progress made the following was noted:

* The project had started from the wrong assumptions in terms of the readiness of the national institutions and partners to engage in the co-design and co-development of climate services;
* There are basic requirements for effective implementation of climate services which were not in place on both the National Meteorological and Hydrological Services (NMHSs) and the users. Addressing the basic requirements is a process that needs more time and systematic support;
* Achieving effective climate services, based on co-design and co-development principles, will require some behavioural change on which more efforts are needed;
* As climate services are implemented there is a need to consider private sector engagement. This will require the development of guiding principles for private sector engagement.

**3.2 GFCS HelpDesk**

3.2.1 The PAC was provided with updates on the GFCS HelpDesk initiative led by the GFCS Office. The PAC reiterated that consideration should be given to the following key issues in the implementation of the HelpDesk:

* Where is the demand and greatest need for the HelpDesk?
* What is the proposed added value of the HelpDesk?
* What type of platform will it be?
* Who will be the HelpDesk Experts?

3.2.2 The PAC supported the idea that the HelpDesk could provide guidance on setting up climate services through “Use cases”. The PAC also reflected on information flow, particularly how it shares information and requested the following:

**Action Points**

* The development of a One Pager on the GFCS HelpDesk providing a clear summary of the intended objectives of the HelpDesk
* The provision of short activity and guidance updates in between PAC meetings

**3.3 Summary of the Priority Needs for the Operationalization of the GFCS (2016-2018)**

3.3.1 The PAC reviewed on-going activities in the priority areas as pillars that are being implemented by partners. To enhance understanding of the current landscape of activities that relate to the Priority Needs for the Operationalization of the GFCS (2016-2018) the PAC requested:

**Action Points**

* The development of a one page matrix with progress at global, regional and local levels with regards to activities implemented or under implementation that relate to the Priority Needs document;
* The development of a plan on how to roll out the Priority Needs for the Operationalization of the GFCS (2016-2018).

**4. OUTCOMES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW**

4.1 The PAC commented on the methodology of the review and raised the following issues:

* The extent to which the review covered the pillars of the GFCS;
* The data collection was focused on NMHSs;
* The survey issued by the review team was not easy to fill in resulting in some PAC members not being able to provide responses;
* The low response rate to the survey (60%);
* Limited evaluation of where we stand with implementation. In other words what achievements have been facilitated or enabled by the GFCS. In this regard, identification of common goals/targets or metrics might improve the quality of evaluations;
* Lack of global context by the reviewers. Global agendas such as the Paris Agreement, the Sendai Framework and the Agenda 2030 represent opportunities for the GFCS to engage and support global process. This was not reflected in the review.

4.2 Based on the discussion of the Mid-Term review, the PAC requested the following:

**Action Points**

* An evaluation of implementation of the GFCS;
* Review of how other Frameworks have progressed, including their governance structures.

4.3 PAC members noted that they would have liked to have access to the draft report to comment so that the end product would address the issues identified as shortcomings of the report.

4.4 The PAC deplored the fact that the review team was not available to present the document as it would have provided an opportunity to discuss with the review team important elements of the report.

4.5 The specific position of the PAC on the recommendations of the Mid-Term Review and its recommendations for the consideration of the Management Committee are provided in Annex 1.

**5. OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION**

5.1. The PAC was provided with information about a Call on Climate Services for Africa launched by the European Commission for 2019 under the Human Dynamics of Climate Change. The call could accommodate four to five proposals of between four to seven million Euros for a period of four to five years. To access funds, proposals would need to include the use of relevant climate data such as the data coming from the Copernicus. Proposals have to be multidisciplinary and their development would need to include consultations for appropriate user engagement.

5.2. For 2018 the European Commission has launched a call on Climate Change Impacts on Human Health in Europe, which also offers an opportunity for partners working on climate and health issues to engage.

5.3 PAC considered its participation at the 23 Session of the Conference of the Parties (COP 23), Bonn, November 2017. The GFCS will organize a side event with focus on Small Island Developing States and Least Developed States to which PAC members were encouraged to participate. In this regard, the meeting requested that the Concept Note for the event be recirculated and the list of organizations that will participate be finalized. PAC members were urged to share information about the events they would be organizing/taking part in and to promote to GFCS, where possible.

**6. IMPROVING COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION SHARING**

With a view to improve communication and information sharing, the PAC requested regular calls on specific issues.

**Action Point**

* GFCS Office to organize regular call on specific issues between PAC meetings to keep partners updated and engaged.

**7. ROTATION OF CHAIRS**

The PAC agreed that a call for nominations of the Vice-Chair should be made. The new Vice-Chair could take up the position from the next meeting of the PAC.

**Action Point**

* PAC members encouraged to volunteer to take the position of Vice-Chair by sending an expression of interest to the GFCS Office by email.

**8. DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE PAC**

The PAC agreed that it should have it next meeting in March/April. To this effect, offers to host the meetings are welcomed. In the absence of offers, the meeting will take place in Geneva.

**Action Point**

* PAC members wishing to host the next meeting of the GFCS to express interest to the GFCS Office.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mid-Term Review recommendations** | **PAC comments and recommendations** |
| **1. Identity of the GFCS** | |
| 1.1. Strengthen the identity of the GFCS as a partnership.    Is the GFCS a framework, network, partnership, WMO program, or constellation of initiatives? Presently, there is no consensus. This lack of a shared meaning or identity of the GFCS contributes to uncertain roles, responsibilities, and support for the GFCS. We recommend that the GFCS take action to strengthen its original framing as a partnership. A partnership implies active engagement by all parties involved and distributes ownership and stewardship in accordance to terms of the partnership. A partnership framing can be demonstrated, in part, in the following ways:  • Enable greater partner organization contributions to the GFCS governance.  • Clarify the roles and responsibilities of GFCS stakeholders in their Terms of Reference, including the IBCS and PAC members, GFCS Office, and joint office.  • Focus GFCS activities on the gaps that draw from and benefit partners and member states, and that would otherwise remain unaddressed without GFCS support. | GFCS should focus its role as an enabler to help connect pillars and supporting the capabilities of the missions of partners. A partnership is recognized as important to the achievement of the Framework goals, but the GFCS Framework should not be limited to be reframed as only a partnership. Its identity as a Framework should be preserved.  In its identity, the NMHSs should feature as a central focal point for climate services. The role of user communities and sectors in the development and delivery of climate services reflects the unique nature of the GFCS Framework.  National level should reflect the five priority sectors within the identity of the GFCS.  Metrics and targets on quality and availability of climate services are needed to allow the GFCS to track progress in the provision of climate services to address societal needs. |
| 1.2. Focus on identifying priorities, knowledge translation & connecting users and providers.  The landscape of climate services has evolved since the GFCS began in earnest in 2012. Given the substantial growth of organizations now involved in climate services, the GFCS can add value to a range of organizations across global, regional, and national scales by identifying priorities, knowledge translation, and connecting users and providers. These activities could include:  • Assessments of climate service activities, including who is doing what, where, and how.  • Development of best practices and guidance for climate services.  • Creation of new spaces for user and provider interactions that, in part, bring together the five pillars (e.g. emphasize and advance the notion of the UIP). | GFCS should assist to develop a compendium or collection of available good practices and methodologies to guide and inform the development of services, particularly in developing countries.  The WCC3 identified five major challenges and the recommendations made by the IBCS Management Committee should consider if the 5 are still valid, highlighting gaps around capacity and service quality have not been adequately reflected. For example, the response capacity to climate risks in developing countries is reflective of the capacity of climate services available to LDCs. Capacity building is insufficiently reflected and should remain as a priority for GFCS. Additionally, the quality of climate services remain a major challenge, as reflected by the concerns of users. GFCS should conduct further studies under the Research Pillar. |
| **2. Governance of the GFCS** | |
| 2.1. Establish a task team to reform GFCS governance in ways that emphasize a partnership.  There is a growing dissatisfaction with the GFCS governance structure. It is seen as duplicative with the WMO Congress, expensive, not sufficiently inclusive of partners, and better fit for a funding reality that did not come to pass as expected. A dialogue around governance reform is desperately needed across all GFCS participants. We recommend instituting a task team consisting of WMO, partner shareholders, and other key individuals to explore a new version to or replacement of the IBCS. The task team could explore ways to enhance partnerships, and create more active participation among partners that is low cost and less bureaucratic. While no perfect governance model exists for the GFCS to emulate, the Expert Panel in Polar Monitoring Observations and the International Land Coalition, among others, can be studied for inspiration on lighter, more flexible, and responsive governance approaches. | Recommends a task force composed of partners and members to be formed with a limited time remit and focused terms of reference, to prepare recommendations for amended governance structure of GFCS by mid-2018 for consideration by WMO Congress.  • TOR to be prepared.  • Considerations should be made to account for regional representation, reflecting on expanding the role and reach of the PAC; other models of partner-centric governance structures; opportunities to increase the dynamic exchange between governance mechanisms.  The considerations of the taskforce should be fully informed by and harmonized with the proposed changes in WMO technical bodies and mechanisms; help reduce duplications in structures created; and seek opportunities to inform WMO of the opportunities for improved structures and services for consideration in the reform decisions. |
| 2.2. Increase investment in the GFCS Office.  The GFCS plays important roles in the advancement of climate services globally. Many of the recommendations offered here will require stewardship by the GFCS Office. However, there is currently a lack of human resources for operations coordinated in the GFCS Office, including communication, M&E, and the convening of meetings. Increased investment in the GFCS could help meet milestones articulated in the Implementation Plan, support governance of the GFCS, and, more importantly, steward the GFCS partnership in ways that lead to amplified benefits in future years. | Recommends reconsidering this recommendation, following the review proposed in 2.1 which can consider governance, management and financing matters, which could serve to justify further investments. Further investments may be justified and may be required, but efforts should be made to limit bureaucratic structures, and encourage where possible strengthening partnerships which can deliver on GFCS goals. Further recommendations in section 4 for greater investment in M&E should be accounted for, under the expected roles and functions of the GFCSO. |
| **3. Key Activities of GFCS Implementation** | |
| 3.1. Focus on sharing lessons learned and knowledge exchange.  The world of climate services is fragmented and diffuse. The GFCS is well positioned to play a key role in synthesizing and sharing lessons from activities staged across the GFCS network. This includes developing standard approaches for climate services that integrates the full value chain, from technical specifications for operational systems and associated data and products to engagement with diverse partners on the co-design, co-production, and delivery of climate services. Further, the GFCS can work with WMO technical commissions to standardize national and regional processes around climate services. In addition to this effort, we recommend the following activities as potential initiatives the GFCS could lead to foster learning:  • Synthesize current knowledge on climate services in a state-of-the-science report, which could be periodically authored and include input from member states and partners.  • Systematically review and synthesize the GFCS projects to catalogue the benefits, challenges, and lessons learned to share with the broader community.  • Map the existing project investments to identify opportunities for collaboration and leveraging and to minimize the duplication of efforts.  • Develop guidance on working with or alongside private sector companies.  • Develop theory and practice around stakeholder engagement, with a focus on connecting the five pillars and stakeholders in UIP activities. | Suggests supporting as core function of GFCS, not only considering availability, but also the skill of available products.    Any state of the science report produced by GFCS be synchronized with the IPCC, and requires reflection on the resources and process requirements of how this product would be developed. For example engaging other partners who may be able to support such efforts.    Mapping of efforts is useful but should be kept light, and is currently insufficient but difficult to develop and maintain actively.  The value chain of climate services is under recognized, and case studies are recommended to illustrate how climate services support decision-making.  Support and coordination by WMO is inadequate – due to limited Human resources.  The opportunities and roles of existing or new partners and mechanisms should be explored to conduct these activities (e.g. IPCC, CSP, Technical Commission task teams, EC Activities).    More thought required on the level of technical service engagement needed of the regional mechanisms. |
| 3.2. Articulate more clearly the purpose and mechanisms of the UIP.  The UIP plays a central role in the GFCS vision of climate services. It is the mechanism by which users and producers of climate services interact, and interactions are one of the key tenets for effective climate services promoted by the GFCS. Furthermore, the UIP is distinctly the construct of GFCS and the only pillar to have specific GFCS milestones. However, the UIP’s purpose and how it works is not well understood by many climate services producers and users. Clarifying the purpose and mechanisms of the UIP is needed, and can be done in part in the following ways:  • Clarify the contributions of the pillars to the entire value chain and articulate concretely how the UIP binds them together.  • Provide guidance on the skills and activities that lead to effective UIP activities.  • Focus GFCS activities on developing the UIP.  • Ensure that the organizational and operational targets of the UIP named in the Implementation Plan are met. | Supports the proposal of the PAC for an informal consultation to clarify the UIP.  The UIP should be better utilized by the other pillars to inform the requirements and needs across all priorities of GFCS.  Suggests reflecting equality of activity across the five pillars, and not only the UIP, considering where support is needed in light of some pillars being under or sufficiently served.  Noting the possible role of mechanisms such as GOOS whose engagement would strengthen the OBS pillar. |
| 3.3. Reduce the role of GFCS Office in project management.  There are divergent opinions on the net effect of GFCS projects. At national and regional scales, the implementation of GFCS projects have generated benefits that relate to supporting national meteorological services, building partnerships, raising awareness of climate services, and helping change practices among climate service implementers, including the WMO. Yet there are development and operational challenges to projects that fall outside the WMO and GFCS Office core strengths, while placing burdens on the limited time and resources of GFCS staff. Moreover, contributions to the Trust Fund have not materialized as expected. Given available resources and the competitive advantages of the WMO member states and partner organizations, the GFCS at the global level should reduce its role in overseeing project management of GFCS projects. | Partners are actively managing projects and have regional offices and mechanisms to assist with project management.  While the GFCS Office could reduce its direct involvement in project management, there is a need for it to act as a portfolio manager so as to ensure that gaps and needs for implementation are identified and brought to those investing in climate services as well as enabling coordination of activities.  Recognized a lack of background for this recommendation.    Examine how to improve efficiency in GFCSO project management, with the concern that we are unaware of the potential consequences of reducing project management. |
| 3.4. Advance national climate service activities by supporting NFCS.  The NFCS have helped establish partnerships, create user and provider engagement opportunities, and identify climate service priorities. This activity appears to have a high return on GFCS investment. There also appears high demand for more NFCS, at least within Africa. The GFCS and regional coordinator offices should continue to support NFCS. An important next step after the establishment of the NFCS in a particular country is to raise funds to support the activities articulated in the NFCS. | This recommendation should be considered in a context specific manner as NFCS may take diverse form.  PAC suggests NFCS should be evaluated to understand their value  In some countries NFCS may be appropriate and an important mechanism to coordinate investments and policies with other sectors, but in others existing mechanisms which serve and support the activities of the GFCS such as NCOFs, may render an NFCS unnecessary, in some regions such as small islands a regional framework may be more appropriate; and linkages to national adaptation platforms.  Better collection and management of climate data is important for the provisions of services. |
| 3.5. Invest in more regional offices.  The GFCS regional office in West Africa has played an important role in supporting GFCS activities in 12 African countries. We see value in expanding this concept to other regions. Multiple regional coordination offices would serve the entire community. Their activities would be defined by the region, including the support of NFCS where needed, and they would collaborate to share experience and lessons learned. Regional coordination offices would bridge GFCS boundaries. They link geographic scales by communicating national and regional knowledge to global levels, and vice versa. They connect users and producers of information by convening workshops and developing UIP engagements. They also bridge financial and human capitals between donors and implementers by creating synergies in ongoing efforts and identifying funding opportunities and research priorities. These regional offices would create more balanced GFCS geographic representation. | Suggest recognizing the role of WMO regional associations as a cost effective mechanism to support regional coordination. |
| **4. Processes for Learning and Knowledge Sharing** | |
| 4.1. Strengthen GFCS communications across multiple scales.  This is a need for consistent and sustained GFCS communication with the broader climate service community. GFCS communications can be strengthened in several ways. First, augmenting resources and expertise to communicate widely on GFCS activities would increase brand exposure, raise awareness of GFCS and the value of climate services, help mobilize resource, and reach a wider audience. Second, the communication strategy, in combination with the UIP, is seen as a main potential source of added value to climate service, although the UIP remains an underdeveloped pillar. The communication strategy thus requires clarifying what should be communicated, by whom, and how. An M&E plan will aid this clarification. Third, there is a need to move beyond the passive communication mechanisms, like the GFCS webpage (and the proposed Help Desk) to develop new and innovative ways to engage global, regional, and national communities. | Suggests reinforcing the visibility of the GFCS, and not only communicating across scales. |
| 4.2. Expedite developing and implementing an M&E process with unambiguous goals.  It is very likely that many of the successes and activities that could be attributed to the GFCS are going unnoticed because there is no formal recording process or metrics to track. An M&E plan has been developed that identifies metrics and a process for monitoring that will be helpful to the entire climate service community. Moreover, an M&E process can facilitate recording lessons learned, allow for better communication of key messages, identify changing priorities, and inform GFCS the management decisions. The GFCS Office is tasked to coordinate the development of M&E indicators, with support from the Task Team-M&E. The implementation of a GFCS M&E will require added human and financial resources and should be given immediate attention. Additionally, the language used to state future targets should be unambiguous so that reviews can be conducted with a minimum of conflict over how the meanings of the targets are interpreted. |  |
| 4.3. Explore opportunities to engage in more of the human dimensions of climate services.  The GFCS network appears to be dominated mainly by those in the physical sciences. However, many components of climate services require social science expertise, including understanding climate service needs, communication, evaluation, stakeholder engagement, and knowledge brokering. If future GFCS activities focus on identifying priorities, knowledge translation, and connecting users and providers – as argued in this Review – the efficacy of these activities will be enhanced by supporting and drawing from more social science expertise. This can be achieved by expanding partnerships with universities and encouraging the hiring or training of personnel at regional levels. Additionally, many of the partner organizations possess social science professionals, and the GFCS can tap more heavily into this expertise. This element is where the partner organizations can play a leading role. | Comments reflected under UIP. |
| 4.4. Promote sustained two-way engagement with major global agendas.  The GFCS was conceived to promote awareness of climate services as a means to increase activities and inform agendas. In light of the Paris Agreement and other related international efforts, there is an enhanced opportunity to integrate climate into national priorities of risk reduction and satisfy international commitments. The GFCS needs to continue to work to increase awareness of its role in supporting other major global agendas. For climate services to be recognized more in implementation, a better sense of the priorities, needs, and good practices are necessary. This demands more than white papers and exemplars; it demands that the GFCS engage with and monitor what is happening in these other global agendas and actively trying to inform them and leverage them to attract funding. At the same time, the GFCS can learn from and better link to global agendas to better ensure that GFCS activities align with global agendas central to GFCS activities and mission. | Recognizes the essential nature of linking to the Paris, SDG and Sendai policy agendas to demonstrate value of the GFCS. |

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_