Objectives

- Further develop/establish a reliable scientific evidence of positive and negative environmental, social, and economic impacts of water resources development
- Integrate results into the MRC knowledge base to enhance the BDP process
- Promote capacity and ensure technology transfer to Member Countries
Assessment Framework

Progress to Date

- Important progress milestones have been achieved since the 3\textsuperscript{rd} RTWG in November 2014 – the start of the Implementation Phase
Specific Implementation Accomplishments (1)

• Consolidated and Individual Team Work Plans and Staffing Plans Completed
• International/Regional Consultants Successfully Recruited
• Modeling Approach Approved by TACT

Specific Implementation Accomplishments (2)

• Development Scenarios Approved During the 4th RTWG Meeting (10 March 2015)
• Completed Field Visit (Part 1 – Delta and Tonle Sap) in March 2015 by the Biological Resource Expert Team
• Scoping of macro-economic assessment initiated through a consultant
Specific Implementation Accomplishments (3)

- Participated in meetings with various stakeholders and partners
- Launching and continuous update of the Council Study Web Site

Council Study Web Site
Challenges Now and Ahead

- Uncertainty in Scope
- Compressed Implementation Schedule
- Funding Gap
- Management and Coordination Challenge

Uncertainty in scope

- Types and number of development and climate change scenarios to assess
- Calibration and validation of the models (in particular WUP-FIN models)
- Number of physical, environmental, social, and economic indicators to assess
- Specific data availability and extent of data gap filling
- And many others
Compressed implementation schedule

- One year instead of two years (to compensate for delays in completing planning phase)
- Not compatible with the objective to adopt an open, transparent, collaborative, and participatory process among MRC Programmes and between the Secretariat and MCs
- Not compatible with Programme work loads
- May compromise product quality if time is not sufficient for adequate QA/review

Funding Issue

- Funding to cover the estimated total budget needed has not been all secured

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Amount (USD Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Budget (Original from Inception Report)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Estimated Budget</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised In-Kind (Staff Time) Contribution</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised External Funding Required (from DP)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secured Funding to Date (from Finland, Australia, Luxembourg, Germany, ISH)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Gap</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Funding from Identified Sources (Switzerland, US, EU, Belgium, and Finland)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding with funding source unidentified</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Management and Coordination Challenge

• Inherently complex due to the following:
  – multisectoral technical scope
  – large team (all Programmes, large number of consultants, 4 MCs, and stakeholders)
  – compressed implementation schedule
  – funding issues

• Made even more complex due to lingering questions on approach

4th RTWG Meeting Recommendation

• MRC to propose to JC to extend the schedule of the Council Study
Benefits of Extending Overall Schedule

• Reduces workload pressure on Programmes
• Relieves the need to secure the total budget for the Council Study now (spread over a longer period)
• Provides more time for QA/Review and for participatory and collaborative process

Proposed Revised Schedule: Six-Month Extension

Note: Duration of extension is based on technical inputs of the CS Teams
Lingering Question on implementation arrangement

• Current (As per TOR and Inception Report): Management under OCEO with all Programmes involved and with “equal” ownership and accountability

VS

• Question/Suggestion (from one MC): Management under the Planning Division with possibility of restructuring teams

Lingering Question on technical scope of the scenario assessments

• Current (As per TOR and Inception Report): Both Thematic and Cumulative Assessments

VS

• Question/Suggestion (From one MC): Only Cumulative Assessments
Cumulative vs. Thematic Assessments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cumulative Assessments</th>
<th>Thematic Assessments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assess combined impacts of development stressors</td>
<td>Understand impacts of thematic-specific development stressors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007 Early Development Scenario</td>
<td>Sensitivity of impacts of thematic-specific deviations in the 2040 Planned scenario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Definite Future Scenario</td>
<td>Examples:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2040 Planned Scenario (With and Without Climate Change)</td>
<td>Impact of different levels of irrigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of navigation/hydropower dam combined infrastructure investments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of alternative joint management and operation of the full cascade of mainstream dams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Many others...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Joint Committee may wish to take note of the progress made by the Council Study and provide the following:

(1) Decision on the proposed extension of the Council Study schedule as per recommendation of the RTWG

(2) Guidance and if possible closure on the implementation arrangement

(3) Guidance and if possible closure on the technical scope of the scenario assessments