Council Study

Day 2 Recap - Key Comments

Note: Not presented due to time ran out. This will be included in meeting notes for review

On Day 1 Recap

• LNMC does not agree with modelling progress until concerns on the modeling approach addressed
• TNMC
  – suggested for Secretariat to prepare an action plan related to concerns on modeling approach raised during 11th TACT
  – TNMC does not impose to other MCs its practice of not providing data for basins that are not direct tributaries to the Mekong River
• VNMC
  – National Modeller will be available soon
  – Modeling approach should simulate sediment transport in Delta
  – Proposed Discussion with CS how MD Study results can be used
  – Comment on non-availability of data in selected subbasins should be clearly attributed to TNMC
• CNMC – need results from Council Study and Mekong Delta Study to be produced independently
On Day 1 Recap

• TNMC on baseline
  – Use terminology “reference condition” instead of “baseline
  – Improve technical note to include additional options

• LNMC
  – Expressed preference to model natural flow conditions

On Day 1 Recap

• Chair reminded RTWG to refer to the following documents:
  – ToR of RTWG
  – Inception Report
  – What has been agreed in the past RTWG meetings
  – RTWG to facilitate the technical process and minimize raising issues to JC when possible
Climate Change

- Approved the proposed three climate change scenarios
- Appreciate the level of engagement of MCs in evaluating climate change scenarios

Socio-Economic Assessment

- Appreciate proposed engagement of MCs in the Scoping Mission
- Challenges on data
  - Methodology that does require collection of new data
  - Review assumptions
  - Socio-economic database and SIM/VA available
  - Mission is not design to do additional work on MRC IF (no duplication of work)
Bioresource Assessment – Overall

Progress

• Inception Report used as basis for implementation – version 27 October 2015
  – Reflect changes in the implementation arrangement from the July 2015 version
  – FP leading BioRA instead of EP
  
• TNMC Concerns
  – In the process of engaging NMCs especially in selecting locations for assessment
  – Dissemination of progress and interim results – putting in Web Site not adequate
  
• LNMC Concern
  – BioRA should be led by EP and not FP
  – Cause of misunderstanding is in the version of the Inception Report being used.
  – Earlier documents produced (ToR of the Council Study) also shows earlier version of the implementation arrangement
  – Action Item: Update these older documents (ToR) to be consistent with the Inception Report

Bioresource Assessment – Overall

Progress (2)

• CNMC
  – Progress is more important

• VNMC
  – Not important who is leading what

• TNMC
  – Share view of CNMC and VNMC
  – Secretariat knows better where resources area

• Secretariat: Change in management of BioRA Team
  – Capacity and work load of EP
  – EP is already leading domestic/industrial and thematic team and was also leading socio-economic
Bioresource Assessment – DRIFT

• Ecological Health Monitoring is a tool for a different purpose than DRIFT
  – EHM is for monitoring
  – DRIFT is for assessment (and can use data from EHM)

• DRIFT Testing
  – Good idea but timing should be considered
  – Testing is suggested to be conducted after the DSS (without Delta) is completed in December 2015 (testing cannot be done without it)

• DRIFT Expiration
  – DRIFT for LMB is ongoing
  – Intentionally allow versions to expire to prevent old versions of the DRIFT – LMB to proliferate
  – When it is completed and stable, expiration will be removed

• Independent Review
  – Possible and has been done before
  – Initial list of people to review has been provided
  – When resource is limited: better to invest on testing (by MCs) than independent review

• Time series data transformation
  – DRIFT has tools to transform data

Bioresource Assessment – DRIFT

• TNMC
  – Testing (to some extent) has been addressed in the past (with Hans G.)
  – Support Dr. Cate’s presentation. MCs know about DRIFT via its earlier version used in IBFM by EP and WUP
  – Several technical reports produces in IBFM
  – Requires more information about DRIFT since TNMC would like to work more with it
Bioresource Assessment – DRIFT

• VNMC
  – Acknowledge the tool for CA especially use of response curves
  – independent review suggested
  – Appears to be suitable to large basins – would appreciate publications

• CNMC
  – Appreciate new tool/model from last RTWG and continue to do so
  – DRIFT will provide good results
  – Suggest DRIFT understanding to be extended to MCs
    • How DSF/WUP-FIN integrated to DRIFT
  – Supports DRIFT use

Bioresource Assessment – DRIFT

• LNMC
  – Appreciates new tool and not rejecting it
  – Suggest to test the new tool before application
Bioresource Assessment – Field Trip
• No Comments

Bioresource Assessment – Indicators and Focus Areas
• TNMC
  – No difficulty in technical issue but concern is in the engagement of MCs in making conclusions
    • Proposed field trip and selection of focus areas
    • Some “premature” conclusions on the modeling
  – Dissemination of results (how/when)
• LNMC
  – No feedback on the technical progress
  – Suggestion on improved coordination with MCs and capacity building
Status and Trends

- No Comments

DSS Setup

- No data collection. Will use existing information
Baseline Update from Chair

• Change term from “baseline” to “reference period”
• Details will be provided in a working paper