

Date: 18 May 2015

## 1. Basic information

<b>Number and name of the activity</b>	Activity 2.1 & 2.2: <b>Guidelines for Drought Management Plans &amp; National Consultation Dialogues</b>
<b>Activity leader</b> (name, organization, email)	Elena Fatulova, elena.fatulova@gmail.com
<b>Duration of the activity</b>	October 2013 – April 2015
<b>Participating partners</b> (name, organization, email)	Slovak Hydrometeorological Institute, Slovakia Soil Science and Conservation Research Institute, Slovakia National GWPs – Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine
<b>Chairman of the CWP</b>	Elena Fatulova/Peter Roncak/Tomas Orfanus

## 2. Contribution to Challenges

Your activity belongs to:

- Operational mode (e.g. next year drought, ongoing multiple-year drought)
- Strategic mode (e.g. future drought, prepared for global change)

Please explain (max 500 characters).

Activity 2.1 and Activity 2.2 belongs to the strategic mode - preparation for future droughts. The main objective is to take the initiative to change the drought policy by moving from crisis management to drought risk reduction management. The approach is based on mitigating measures reducing the associated drought impacts on economy, environment and society. The administrative tool for implementation of such proactive drought policy is Drought Management Plan which should be prepared in advance and regularly updated.

What is your activity addressing?

- Which of the seven steps described in the Guidelines for Drought Management Plans (act. 2.1)
- monitoring, forecasting / prediction, impacts, vulnerability, measures, management, risk management

Activity is focused on complexity of drought management process including all elements (monitoring, forecasting / prediction, impacts, vulnerability, measures, management, risk management) which are linked with integrated water management process.

Shortly describe main challenges which you have addressed with your Activity at the international, regional (especially CEE), national level? How has your Activity contributed to these challenges? (Max 1000 characters)

The main challenge of the activity was contribution to improvement of the development and implementation of drought policy based on proactive drought risk reduction in the countries of CEE region. The future challenge is to develop such a drought policy at the river basin level, but first the steps must be taken on the national level, taking into account the future vision. Harmonisation of the national approaches based on joint Guidelines can contribute to these challenges.

## 3. Contribution to Objectives (max 1000 characters)

Were the Activity objectives achieved (see Activity List)? Describe how you have achieved these in qualitative and, if possible, quantitative terms. Are there any, which were not achieved?

Activity objectives were achieved in time by providing the planned outputs:

- Results of the questionnaire survey summarised in the Report from Activity 1.2 – Review of the current status of the implementation of DM plans and measures within RBMP according to EU WFD (supportive activity),

- Slovak case study report (supportive activity),
- Questionnaire on national experiences (as an additional input for the Guidelines; supportive activity)
- Country reports from NCDs (supportive activity),
- Guidelines for Drought Management Plans (final output).

#### **4. Description of the implementation process and methodologies applied (max 1000 characters)**

*Describe and explain what actions have been taken to address the challenge(s) mentioned in point 2.*

*What were the key implementation issues of your Activity?*

- describe all phases of implementation
- actions taken, instruments used
- information and methodologies applied
- etc.

*Have you encountered some problems during the implementation phase? If so, how were they overcome? What problems could not be solved?*

Development of the Guidelines was based on the exiting guidance documents and relevant policy papers relating to drought management adopted on global, EU, regional and national level. Also results from other activities of IDMP CEE (mainly activity 1.2 and 1.3) and outputs of demonstration projects were taken into account and incorporated into the Guidelines. Execution of the activity was divided into two phases.

##### First phase

During the first phase the Slovak case study was implemented with the aim to provide a practical example how to develop the key components of the DMP. Based on the Slovak case study the first draft of the Guidelines for DMPs was developed and sent to the national GWPs for comments.

##### Second phase

During the second phase the final version of the Guidelines was developed based on comments and national experiences received from the involved CEE countries. The national experiences were collected during the second National Consultation Dialogues (NCDs) organised in 9 countries.

#### **5. Outputs (max 3000 characters)**

*What are the main outputs of your activity? Please shortly describe each of them (how are they going to be used?)*

The main outputs of the activity are:

- Guidelines for Drought Management Plans (DMPs);
- National experiences relating to key elements of DMPs collected during two rounds of the National consultation dialogues (NCDs).

Guidelines were developed as a practical guide providing support for production of DMPs. The Guidelines are primarily addressed to the public bodies and competent authorities responsible for drought planning. They are intended primarily to the national level, but presented approach can significantly contribute also to development of DMPs on the river basin scale. It is recommended to start on the national level by analysis of current drought management policy with the aim to identify the main gaps and uncertainties (following the Guidelines) and design an action plan for inevitable changes of the national drought management policy. Activities on the regional level should be focused on harmonization of methods used for development of the main elements of Drought Management Plans (e.g. indicator system, classification of drought stages, thresholds, early warnings). The research programs should be focused on the identified weaknesses of the planning process – drought risk assessment (single-risk assessment and multi-risk assessment), climate change aspects and connected quantitative issues (e.g. e-flows, water accounts in line with the methodologies developed on the EU level within Common Implementation Strategy for implementation of Water Framework Directive).

National experiences collected during the NCDs (mainly in the 2<sup>nd</sup> round) present a valuable source of information usable as a basis for the development of the national DMPs. Collected information from individual countries were separated into six sections representing the key elements of DMPs:

Annex I: Examples of the national methodologies for assessment of historical drought;

Annex II: Examples of drought national drought indicator systems and evaluation methodologies;  
Annex III: Examples of the national drought classification, thresholds and early warning systems;  
Annex IV: Examples of national organizational structures to deal with drought;  
Annex V: Examples of national program of measures for preventing and mitigating drought;  
Annex VI: Examples of the national research programme supporting drought management.  
Collected information should be used as a basis for harmonization of the national approaches and methods needed for development of DMPs on the river basin level.

## **6. Added value (max 1000 characters)**

*Is there any "added value" generated by your Activity? What new (science, practical experience, guidelines or others) was developed by IDMP CEE and how your work is related to earlier knowledge (research, practice) and experiences of the past?*

Added value generated by the activity 2.1&2.2 can be assessed on the basis of comparison of the status identified during the activity 1.2 Review of current of the implementation of DM plans and measures within RBMP according to EU WFD. The questionnaire survey (December 2013) showed that the current status of development of DMPs is not satisfactory. The following main reasons were identified:

- lack of methodology for DMPs development,
- lack of political will to solve the problem – drought was not considered as a relevant issue,
- organizational arrangements have not been established in majority of the CCE countries,
- insufficient coordination and communication among sectors and institutions,
- drought monitoring not sufficient for DMP development (mainly monitoring of impacts is missing),
- drought indicator systems and thresholds for drought stages classification were not established,
- data availability problem,
- insufficient legislation.

Guidelines provide detailed methodology for DMPs development describing the basic steps for each DMP elements and thus removed one of the main obstacles (lack of methodology). NCDs opened communication among sectors and institutions and encouraged efforts to establish the necessary organizational structures for drought management (Drought Committee). During the NCDs drought was considered as a relevant issue by all participants (ministries representatives included). Recommendations how to achieve the progress in the area of preparation of background data (monitoring, data availability, drought indicators and thresholds) were provided in the Guidelines. Detailed analysis of legislation showed that existing EU water directives (Water Framework Directive) are flexible enough enabling development of DMPs as a part of River Basin Management Plans.

Weaknesses identified in Activity 1.2 Review	Achievements during Activity 2.1 & 2.2
Current status of DMP - not satisfactory	Guidelines – main tool for improvement of DMP
Lack of methodology	Methodology for DMP tailored for region completed
Drought - not considered as a relevant issue	All participants attended NCDs confirmed drought as a relevant issue (included representatives from ministries)
Organizational arrangements – not established/not clear	All countries indicated preparedness of existing organization structures to deal with drought
Insufficient coordination and communication among sectors and institutions	Two rounds of NCDs started communication among sectors and institutions in 10 CEE countries
Drought monitoring not sufficient	Recommendations for drought monitoring given (impact?)
Drought indicators and thresholds	CEE countries provided drought national indicator system; thresholds are still rare
Data availability	Recommendations for data collection provided
Insufficient legislation	WFD – legal basis for DMP development

	Valuable source of national experiences created during NCDs – basis for IDMP CEE continuation
--	---

## 7. Lessons learnt and transferability (max 2000 characters)

*This section considers how your experience can be used elsewhere.*

*What are the most important lessons from this Activity that might be useful for other countries and policy level in the preparation and/or implementation of Drought Management Plans?*

Guidelines were specifically developed for the EU countries. The guiding principles, on which the Guidelines are built, were derived from the EU legislation, EU drought strategy and another water policy documents. However Guidelines are based on WMO/GWP Guidelines containing the generic instructions for development of drought risk reduction management. Therefore Guidelines are usable also for the countries outside the EU territory trying to develop proactive drought policy.

## 8. Proposals for follow-up (max 2000 characters)

*In case resources become available in what aspects would you like to continue your activity? Some concrete proposals for the follow-up projects?*

Based on identified weaknesses in the process of development of preparedness plans for reduction of drought risk (DMPs) the concrete proposals for follow-up project were given:

1. To launch the initiatives focused on **harmonization** of methods used for development of the main elements of DMP:
  - assessment of historical drought events,
  - drought indicator system in connection with drought monitoring,
  - thresholds for classification of drought stages,
  - early warning system,
2. To develop **guidelines** for the weakest elements of planning process:
  - risk assessment (single and multiply risks assessment),
  - climate change assessment
3. To initiate **demonstration projects** focused on quantitative water management issues (e.g. e-flows, water accounts).

## 9. Annexes

*Milestone reports, tables, other data, etc.*

Guidelines for Drought Management plans