



## Minutes from « stress » meeting – February 18th, 2014

Present :

Anne-Marie, Stephan, Cecile, Masaharu, Inga, Alain, Jane, Markus

Introduction :

The goal of this meeting is not to discuss the goal and scope and the midpoint/endpoint discussion, as this will be taken to the entire group next week. The goal of this meeting is to explore the pseudo-midpoint stress indicator possibility.

- Based on slides sent by Stephan : One indicator not proportionally correlated with the end-point but capturing as much as possible of the two end-points, accounting maybe for the vulnerability of human populations and of ecosystems, but this is still very preliminary.
- Jane : I would say that I agree with Manuele's email that we should not include weighting within our midpoint.
- Discussion about the fact that it would be hidden end-point modelling
- Not trying to link this midpoint to any endpoint, in the kick-off, we acknowledge that this would be a pseudo-midpoint disconnected from the endpoints
- AMB : Do we want something only based on consumption to availability ? It does not make sense for ecosystem potential impacts, then it is only a human stress indicator
- Most of the users are looking for something that is easy and that they can understand
- Low confidence in ecosystem impacts modelling at endpoint
- AMB : It is not about having a stress index proportional to endpoint results, but think about what is a stress. The water needs are not only for human but also for ecosystems. How about a ratio of water needs for humans and for ecosystems divided by (renewable) water availability ?
- Cecile : Equivalent to considering ecosystem as an additional user
- Markus : it is different to do end-point modeling then to say that ecosystems also need water, I think this is a good approach.
- Stephan : At the end we should learn from the end-point modeling which are the most influent aspects and integrate them in the midpoint. Including the ecosystem demand would be the best way to integrate ecosystem within the stress index
- AMB : The question would be do we go to simply a consumption to availability ratio or do we add a vulnerability parameter

- Jane : the water stress index is more related to resources area of protection than ecosystem quality and human health
- AMB : What exactly would we be quantifying if we model the resource area of protection ?
- Jane : Issue of human health impacts related to the depletion of fossil aquifers in the US related to exports, future generations will be affected too... It is false to say that the use of water in these regions has no impact on HH
- AMB : so Jane you are saying that if we include a HDI or an adaptation capacity at the mid point level, this would hide this impact ?
- Jane : yes
- → Jane to propose an indicator that includes aquifer depletion impacts by next meeting
- Alain : the indicator needs to be simple, not too many parameters
- SP and AMB : an indicator can be simple to use and to communicate on the meaning and the concept, the calculations behind does not necessarily need to be simple. Yes simplicity but not at all costs. It is more about parcimonie.
- SP : we need an indicator that is :
  - Easy to apply
  - Easy to understand
  - Not necessarily proportional to endpoint
  - robust
- Discussion on how we could assess ecosystems water needs. This is to be looked into and discussed with the ecosystem sub-working group.
- Next meeting to be schedule following the general meeting next week.