Day 3 — What Are We Going to Build?

Saturday, 17 October 2026

Prague, Czech Republic

The third day moves from investigation design to action.

Day 1 asks:

What do we actually know?

Day 2 asks:

How would we actually investigate it?

Day 3 asks:

What are we going to build?

By the beginning of Day 3, the conference should already have produced:

- clearly defined knowledge gaps;
- regional priorities;
- candidate territories;
- investigation designs;
- technology opportunities;
- local implementation needs;
- possible pilot studies;
- and emerging groups of people interested in working together.

The purpose of the final day is to determine which of these ideas can become **real projects**.

09:00–09:30

Morning Synthesis

What emerged during the first two days?

The organisers will present a short synthesis of:

- unresolved questions;
- candidate Case Labs;
- proposed pilots;

- weaknesses identified in the Specification;
- missing datasets;
- technology-validation opportunities;
- local implementation requirements;
- and potential project partnerships.

This is not a summary of everything discussed.

The purpose is to identify a limited number of directions that are sufficiently concrete to continue.

Some ideas may already have:

- a territory;
- a local organisation;
- a technical question;
- a technology provider;
- an investigation method;
- or a potential funder.

Others may still consist only of a clearly defined problem.

Both can be useful starting points.

09:30–11:30

Project Studios

Participants divide into focused Project Studios.

Each Studio works on **one concrete problem**.

The exact Studios will be determined by what emerges during Days 1 and 2.

Possible directions include:

War Pollution Information System

Environmental Assessment after Humanitarian Demining

Ukraine — Field Investigation and Recovery

Vietnam — Long-Term Wartime Contamination

Sudan — Environmental Baseline under Severe Data Scarcity

Freshwater & Sediment Investigation

War-Damaged Industrial Sites

Post-Conflict Agricultural Land Recovery

Comparative Conflict-Environment Research

Additional Studios may be created if a strong case or partnership develops during the conference.

What is a Project Studio?

A Project Studio is not a brainstorming session about whether cooperation would be desirable.

It attempts to answer a much more practical question:

What would have to happen for this work to begin?

Each Studio should work through the same basic structure.

1. Problem

What exactly are we trying to understand, change or restore?

The problem should be specific enough to support action.

Not:

War pollution in Africa.

But, for example:

Reconstruction of an environmental baseline for a river system in a conflict-affected region where conventional monitoring has collapsed.

2. Territory

Where would the work take place?

A real project needs a geographical context.

This may be:

- one industrial site;
- one agricultural area;
- one river;
- one reservoir;
- one region;

- one port;
- one historical contamination site;
- or one defined information-system dataset.

3. Existing Evidence

What already exists?

Possible sources include:

- previous studies;
- local records;
- satellite data;
- historical imagery;
- monitoring;
- mine-action information;
- laboratory results;
- maps;
- health records;
- local observations;
- and unpublished material.

The purpose is to avoid designing a project as if nothing were already known.

4. Critical Unknowns

What information prevents the next responsible decision?

The objective is not to create an unlimited research agenda.

The Studio should identify the few uncertainties that materially affect what can happen next.

5. Investigation

What should actually be done?

Possible components include:

- remote sensing;
- GIS;
- field access;
- geophysics;
- soil sampling;
- water monitoring;
- laboratory analysis;
- historical reconstruction;
- community evidence;

- risk assessment;
- modelling;
- or technology validation.

6. Local Project Anchor

Every territory-based project requires a credible organisation connected with that territory.

The local project anchor may be:

- an engineering organisation;
- a local company;
- an environmental organisation;
- a utility;
- an investment institution;
- a public institution;
- a business federation;
- a community organisation;
- or another organisation capable of taking responsibility locally.

Its role should not be reduced to providing access or logistics.

The local partner should participate in **project design, implementation and ownership of the result**.

7. Technical and Technology Partners

Which capabilities are missing locally?

Possible partners may include:

- GIS organisations;
- Earth Observation companies;
- laboratories;
- mine-action operators;
- water specialists;
- environmental consultants;
- engineering companies;
- universities or research institutes;
- remediation specialists;
- infrastructure operators;
- or technology developers.

Partners should be included because the project needs their capability — not simply to create a large consortium.

8. Implementation Capacity

Who can actually do the work?

A credible project should consider:

- field staff;
- equipment;
- laboratories;
- transport;
- permits;
- local suppliers;
- safety;
- data management;
- maintenance;
- and long-term operations.

An investigation that cannot be implemented locally is not yet an investigation plan.

9. Pilot

Many projects should begin small.

The Project Studio should ask:

What is the smallest useful pilot that would reduce uncertainty?

A pilot may consist of:

- one satellite analysis;
- one drone survey;
- one sampling campaign;
- one monitoring station;
- one information-system module;
- one technology test;
- one small remediation trial;
- or one comparative investigation.

A good pilot should produce information that changes the next decision.

10. Financing

Not every project requires commercial finance.

Possible routes may include:

- foundations;
- research programmes;
- development agencies;
- environmental funds;

- corporate participation;
- impact investment;
- development finance institutions;
- local investment organisations;
- or combinations of these.

The purpose on Day 3 is not to complete a funding application.

It is to identify **which financing model corresponds to the type of project being proposed**.

11. Next 90 Days

Every Project Studio should finish with one practical question:

What can happen during the first 90 days after Prague?

Possible actions include:

- exchange of data;
- identification of a pilot territory;
- a technical meeting;
- preparation of a joint concept note;
- translation or revision of part of the Specification;
- contact with local institutions;
- initial remote analysis;
- laboratory planning;
- a funding discussion;
- or preparation of a field visit.

The next step should be small enough to happen.

11:30–12:00

Coffee Break

Project teams may continue working informally or use the break for direct discussions with potential partners.

12:00–13:00

Funders & Implementation Dialogue

The conference will invite representatives of:

- foundations;
- development institutions;
- investment organisations;
- infrastructure and environmental funds;
- private companies;
- banks and development-finance organisations;
- and other potential implementation partners.

This is **not a conventional pitching session**.

Project groups are not expected to present polished proposals or pretend that all uncertainties have already been resolved.

Instead, each selected project direction will be discussed around one question:

What would need to become true for this project to become implementable or fundable?

Possible issues may include:

- stronger local ownership;
- better baseline information;
- a smaller initial pilot;
- proof that a technology works;
- clearer project governance;
- a defined implementation organisation;
- stronger evidence of environmental or social benefit;
- improved economics;
- or a different project scale.

The objective is to improve the project **before** a formal application or investment proposal is prepared.

13:00–14:00

Lunch

Participants can continue bilateral and project discussions during lunch.

14:00–15:15

Project Studio Results

Each Project Studio presents a concise working result.

This should not be a conventional conference presentation.

A Studio should answer:

What is the problem?

Where is the territory?

What do we already know?

What is the critical uncertainty?

What should be done first?

Who needs to be involved?

Who is the local project anchor?

What pilot is proposed?

What should happen during the next 90 days?

A Studio does not need to claim that a project is ready.

A very useful conclusion may be:

We cannot responsibly design the project until these three missing pieces of evidence are obtained.

That is a real result.

15:15–15:45

Coffee Break

15:45–16:45

What Changes After Prague?

This session returns from individual projects to the broader P&D programme.

Participants will consider what the three-day work implies for:

The Specification

Which elements need to be:

- revised;
- added;
- removed;
- clarified;
- regionalised;
- or tested further?

Critical Reviews

Which knowledge gaps became more important?

Which assumptions proved weak?

Which areas require new review or evidence?

Information Systems

Which data relationships became necessary?

What should be added to the War Pollution Information System?

Which organisations could contribute data, GIS architecture, analytical tools or regional information?

Regional Cooperation

Which regions now have:

- a credible local partner;
- a possible project;
- a technology need;
- or a route toward further investigation?

Future Case Labs

Which problems should be developed into full working cases after the conference?

16:45–17:30

Final Working Session

What Happens Next?

The conference ends with concrete next steps.

The organisers will identify:

- project groups that intend to continue;
- people responsible for initial coordination;
- pilot concepts;
- planned follow-up meetings;
- data or documents to be exchanged;
- Specification revisions;
- information-system work;
- and other immediate actions.

Where appropriate, project teams may agree on an initial follow-up date.

The purpose is simple:

do not allow promising cooperation to disappear when everyone leaves Prague.

What Day 3 Should Produce

A successful Day 3 does not need to produce ten fully financed international projects.

That would be unrealistic.

It should produce something much more valuable:

clearly defined project opportunities;

credible local project anchors;

small pilots that can actually begin;

combinations of organisations that did not exist before;

a better understanding of what makes projects implementable;

and concrete next steps.

Some Project Studios may advance rapidly.

Others may stop because critical evidence or local capacity is missing.

That is also useful.

A project that should not yet begin is better identified in Prague than after considerable time and money have already been spent.

A Different Type of Conference Outcome

Conventional conferences often conclude with:

- presentations completed;
- certificates issued;
- photographs taken;
- and participants returning home.

P&D aims for a different ending.

The question is not:

How many presentations were delivered?

It is:

What exists on Saturday evening that did not exist on Thursday morning?

Perhaps:

- a new partnership;
- a pilot territory;
- a shared dataset;
- a revised method;
- a project concept;
- a local implementation team;
- a technology test;
- a new information-system component;
- or simply a much better question.

Those are the outcomes that matter.

Closing

P&D does not assume that three days in Prague can solve the environmental consequences of war.

The objective is more practical.

To bring together people who possess different parts of the capability required to make progress.

To identify where current knowledge fails.

To design better investigations.

To connect those investigations with local implementation.

And, where possible, to begin the projects that should happen next.

Day 1 — What do we actually know?

https://pdconference.org/

Day 2 — How would we actually investigate it?

Day 3 — What are we going to build?

The conference ends. The work should not.