



*Human Health sub-working group meeting
August 13th, 2014*

Present:

Jane
Masaharu
Cecile
Stephan
Anne-Marie

As cecile mentioned add pro and cons

WTA /CTA -> no agreement, but not so relevant

Curve: Parameters might be more relevant than the curve function.

Very influential but there is no evidence -> needs consensus

Jane: s-curve problem of neighbouring is exaggeration

Cecile: it is more a question of the slope.

Stephan is more a question of water transfers

Cecile: parsimony: use simple line

Jane: straight line is including future generation therefore should be included

Cecile: depletion should be addressed in another indicator.

-> Linear function but limited? 0-1 WTA? (capped) -> most parsimony

Jane: wants to include impacts on ground water depletion include as futur impacts -> climate change includes future impacts

Cecile-> more resource availability not human health

Stephan-> groundwater depletion is a resource perspective

Jane -> final goal is to have DALY? If yes it might be fine

AMB: This indicator does not have to be a midpoint, this is a parameter in the endpoint modeling of CF

Jane: we just need to be clear what is included and what is not

Stephan: Question of scaling is 70% WTA 1 or at 150%? -> 70% is only 0.5?

-> could accomodate some overuse; but rather not

Cecile : include an additional factor.

Summary: linear with min and max limits, between 0 and 1

Concerns:

Jane: overuse to be included

Masaharu: other function than linear might be better, but can agree

Next step: Agree on min/max point for WTA or CTA (value at which scarcity = 0 or = 1)

-> include some uncertainty range in the threshold

Ground water vs. Surface water:

Differences are visible on the maps Anne-Marie showed but:

Not necessarily relevant to separate them since human users can always use the other if one is less present. Parcimony would call for treating water as „one resource“

Continue discussion next time; Tuesday September 30, 8-10 AM EDT