Report of DRR breakout discussion
1. How C services provided

- NGOs don’t have access. Climate scientists not invited to meetings on climate topics.
- Dedicated products: e.g., IRI-IFRC website, helpdesk, bulletins.
- Nat Met Services to user: WFP overlays data with econ data etc for logistics & preparedness.
- Directly from Met Service to community with training on reading gauges
- Through regional climate centres: cross-border hazards like river floods. Info goes to RC societies.
- Climate Outlook Forums.
- Regional blocks like African Union and ECOWAS are also taking a coordination role but not comprehensive.
2. Improvements needed

• Regional centres have no systematic feedback. E.g., ACMAD participating in Niger EW for drought with other regional centres, each one gives own information (diff types) and info synthesized by national government. Need greater discussion with users on interpretation.

• Ensure level of info matches level of action to be undertaken. E.g., in Senegal, info goes from met services, through RC volunteers to community. So level of info matches.

• Framework for providing weather info could be same as for providing climate info. In quickly approaching hazards met office sometimes takes over dissemination of info; if more time it goes through DRM office.
  • Both types of info are relevant for DRR.
  • Climate info also needs to go to others beyond preparedness actors.
3. Recommendations

- Governments to establish a gateway for weather and climate information services.
- Build on existing institutions develop a framework for communication of climate services to community level.
- Improve implementation of WMO standards so that one reliable source. E.g. Mali got 10 forecasts, took no action.
- Need MOU with partners even if information is free. Will facilitate monitoring.
4. Case studies (a)

• Training users to understand climate info, through workshops on EW-Early Action. Last 7 years and improved over years. Involves educating service providers, mapping the users, and getting end users to understand gamut of services at national level. Now there’s pilot project in Senegal using the services.

• Bangladesh project targets most vulnerable. Food for training of women on climate services, interpretation and strategies to mitigate. 30,000 households were raised above flood level. Others implemented EWS.
4. Case studies (b)

- Climate Outlook Forums: Strengthening efforts to provide standardized info.
- Chad pastoralists project on bringing together traditional and scientific knowledge. Want to replicate in Niger and Mali, later extend to rest of Sahel. Caveat: Done in Mozambique and it was very difficult: people have lost traditional knowledge as they’ve moved. Also it is specific to each district so very hard to transfer info from one place to another. So: possible project would be validation of traditional indicators.
5. Criteria

- Must reach the most vulnerable (/most at risk/most underserved).
- Integrating user perspective.
- Proving service provisions are cost effective.
- Indicators for all different levels, timescales.

Local:
- Make sure weather and climate info users have access to info and know how to use it for decision making.
- Consortium approach should be encouraged.
5. Criteria

National

- Build capacity at national level to communicate, linking with national coordination mechanism, using formalized agreements. Indicator would be coordination of multiple-level trainings.
- Create opportunities for cross-fertilization such as secondments in climate info providers and info users.
- Strengthen all partners and ensure all partners linked in. Build on existing national structures and coordination clusters.
- Monitoring: regular feedback mechanism that assesses what was communicated, how communicated, what action taken, and based on standard indicators. System brings info up and down.
- Proving service provisions are cost effective.
- Long term system will not depend on external funding. Private and/or national funding need to take ownership.
5. Criteria

Regional

• Build on COF in context of regional institutions to communicate climate info.
• Provisions to support the info providers to deliver tailored climate services.
• Proving service provisions are cost effective.