

Fifth Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management

**Follow-up Event in Asia
to the UN World Conference on Disaster
Reduction (WCDR) 2005**

18-20 May 2005

Hanoi, Vietnam



In collaboration with the
Government of Vietnam

Supported by
The Government of Australia



Australian Government
AusAID

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

It is my pleasure to present to you the report of the 5th Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (RCC5) organized in collaboration with the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, held in Hanoi from 18-20 May 2005, attended by 32 delegates from 18 member countries and 35 observers from international and regional organizations, UN Agencies, multilateral and bilateral donors and ADPC partners.

The RCC Meetings have become an important platform to enhance the visibility of disaster reduction and demonstrate the support and political commitment of political leaders of the member countries to the subject. This was evident in reading of a message from the President of Vietnam, the inauguration of the RCC5 by the Honorable Deputy Prime Minister of the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, H.E. Mr. Vu Khoan, the active participation of the Honorable Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, and the Chairman of the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control and the large attendance from national organizations. The opening of the RCC 5 held concurrently with the 49th annual celebration of the traditional national day for disaster reduction in Vietnam, and the special session showcasing Vietnam's disaster management achievements provided participants with the opportunity to learn from the long and rich experience of the country in storm and flood control and management of other disaster risks.

The fifth RCC meeting marks a watershed for the RCC mechanism, with the adoption of the "Hanoi Statement on Mainstreaming Disaster Reduction into Development (MDRD) and Enhancing Regional Cooperation," which exhorts all member countries to take up mainstreaming as a key priority for action consistent with the Hyogo Framework for Action. The RCC MDRD program, received great momentum and now provides an important framework to take action through Priority Implementation Projects by member countries. ADPC is conscious of the expectations placed on it as a facilitator of the Program and has taken up this responsibility conscientiously. The Program has already received welcome support from AusAID, UN ISDR and GTZ to develop guidelines and initiate Priority Implementation Projects and we are confident of member countries and donors providing increased support to implement in the coming years.

RCC 5 also served as an important follow up event in Asia to the UN World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) 2005. The invaluable deliberations amongst the participants served to guide national action on implementation of the globally adopted Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA) and state expectations from RCC members about action by regional and international entities in support of the member country initiatives on HFA..

Following the tradition of the 3rd, 4th and 5th RCC Meetings in Delhi, Dhakha and Hanoi, I am pleased to inform you that the Government of the People's Republic of China has confirmed its invitation to host the next (6th) RCC Meeting in the month of October/November 2006.

In this our 20th Anniversary year, we at ADPC look forward to collaborating in the implementation of the RCC MDRD Program and to meeting you again at the RCC Meeting, later this year.

Sincerely,

Dr. Suvit Yodmani

Executive Director, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

TABLE OF CONTENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
HANOI RCC5 STATEMENT ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT (MDRD) IN ASIAN COUNTRIES	v
ACRONYMS	x
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
II. THE OPENING CEREMONY.....	2
III. SESSION I: SHOWCASING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN VIETNAM	5
IV. SESSION II: INTRODUCTION AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA.....	11
V. SESSION III: LESSONS LEARNED FROM RECENT DISASTERS AND PROGRAMS	13
VI. SESSION IV: SPECIAL SESSION TO REVIEW THE PROGRESS ON THE RCC PROGRAM ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT IN ASIA	21
VII. SESSION V: SPECIAL CONSULTATIVE SESSION FOR THE ASIAN REGION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION (HFA) ADOPTED AT THE 2ND WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER REDUCTION	50
VII: SESSION VI: EVALUATION OF THE MEETING AND ACTIONS FOR THE COMING YEAR	56
IX. CLOSING CEREMONY	59
X. ANNEXES.....	64
ANNEX A: DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS.....	64
ANNEX B: LIST OF RCC MEMBERS (AS OF MAY 2005).....	67
ANNEX C: MEETING PROGRAM OF THE 5 TH MEETING OF THE ADPC REGIONAL CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT	69
ANNEX D: ADDRESSES AT THE JOINT OPENING CEREMONY OF THE VIETNAM DAY FOR DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND OF THE 5 TH RCC MEETING.....	74
ANNEX E: FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS ARISING FROM ALL PREVIOUS RCC MEETINGS	84
ANNEX F: ADPC PLANS TO SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION.....	96

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The 5th Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management was held in Hanoi, Vietnam from the 18-20th May 2005, in collaboration with the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Altogether, 32 representatives from 18 RCC Member Countries comprising heads of National Disaster Management Offices from Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor Leste and Vietnam, and the Ambassador from Thailand and senior officials from Embassies of Bangladesh, China, Iran, Korea, Lao PDR, Malaysia and Myanmar, participated at the meeting. In addition, 47 observers consisting representatives from regional organizations, UN Agencies, and bilateral and multilateral funding agencies: ADRC, AusAID, (CDMP-Bangladesh), EWC, FAO, DIPECHO, GTZ GmbH, MFESB, MRC, PDC, the ProVention Consortium, Sida, SOPAC, UNDP, UNESCAP, UNESCO, UN-ISDR, UN-OCHA, WB, counselors from the embassies in Hanoi from Australia, Denmark, France, the Netherlands and the European Delegation to Vietnam, senior officials from the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and ADPC partners in Vietnam i.e. Care, IFRC, ISTED, Oxfam BG, Save the Children (UK), UNDP Viet Nam, USAID and VNRC, attended the meeting.

The opening day of RCC5 was held concurrently with the 49th celebration ceremony for the Traditional Day for Disaster Reduction in Vietnam. The joint opening ceremony was held at 09:00am on Wednesday, 18th May 2005.

The Honourable Deputy President of the People's Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Mr. Vu Khoan inaugurated the meeting and in his address highlighted the need for international co-operation in order to effectively prevent and mitigate the damage caused by the increasing occurrence of global disasters. He also paid tribute to the efforts of the government and contribution of the people in the important and decided role in the disaster control strategy of Vietnam and expressed his aspirations for increased international support for disaster reduction in Vietnam.

Key note addresses were delivered by Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Honorable Minister of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Honorable Chairman of the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control, Dr. Subinay Nandy, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative in Vietnam, Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, Director, Department of Disaster Management and Flood and Storm Control, Mr. Nguyen Trong Nhu, representative from the Ministry of Defense, a representative from the local authorities and agencies, Professor Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman of ADPC Board of Trustees and Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC. The ceremony was attended by an audience of 250 people comprising of Ambassadors and counselors from embassies in Hanoi, senior officials from UN agencies, representatives of other international organizations and agencies, NGOs, delegates from RCC member countries, senior officials from the Ministries of Fisheries, Environment and Natural Resources, Planning and Investment, Finance, Industry, Transportation, Construction, Labor, Invalid and Social Affairs, Health, Science and Technology, Trade, Foreign Affairs, Public Security, Post and Telecommunications, and Provincial Departments of Dyke Management and Flood and Storm Control of the Socialist

Republic of the Government of Vietnam, its national media and other relevant agencies and government departments.

The Meeting consisted of seven substantive sessions. The first three sessions on the first day included presentations by the host country Vietnam on their national plans for water related disasters, the National Disaster Management Partnership, Safer Living Clusters in the Mekong Delta and Community-based Disaster Risk Management initiatives in Vietnam; introduced to the participants ADPC's follow up actions for the last four RCC Meetings; followed by presentations by RCC Member Countries and regional organizations on lessons learned from recent disasters. The second day and the morning of the third day comprised of the special session on the progress of the RCC Initiative on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development (MDMR) Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia, including the showcasing of MDMR in RCC Member Countries, a dialogue with ADPC Partners and the Donor Community and discussions on how to move the program forward. This was followed by a Special Consultative Session for the Asian Region on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), an outcome of the UN-ISDR 2nd World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in Kobe 2005 and an evaluation of the meeting and actions for the coming year.

RECOMMENDATIONS/OUTCOMES OF THE 5TH RCC MEETING

Key Outcomes

Key outcomes of the Meeting included:

- the Hanoi RCC5 Statement on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development (MDRD) in Asian Countries,
- the identification of areas of high priority for mainstreaming disaster risk management into national development planning process and into the specific sectors,
- the identification of actions that would be taken to support the RCC Members in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA),
- the recognition of the importance in continuing dialogues with the donor, community, engaging with the media, facilitating a forum with national representative from the planning, finance ministries and parliamentarians, and
- the recognition of the RCC-MDRD program as an important activity through which the HFA could be implemented in the RCC Member Countries.

The RCC Project on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development in Asian Countries

The integration of disaster risk management into development policy, planning and implementation has become an increasing area of priority for all actors at national, regional and international levels from governments, UN, development and humanitarian agencies, as well as the donor community. The challenges identified in mainstreaming DRM to be addressed include:

- establishing and strengthening the legal basis for comprehensive disaster risk management activities;
- expanding the coverage of initiatives to cover the whole country, and
- identifying common national strategies, especially when dealing with both multi-lateral organizations and bilateral institutions to facilitate dialogue and unity between the different stakeholders in terms of focus and the priorities.

The way forward to address these issues include the replication of best practices through the presence of political will by establishing national platforms for disaster reduction to be headed by person of position and authority and founded on a sound legal basis, and the willingness and commitment by the local government units, NGOs, private sector as well as the community in sharing the burden of addressing the financial requirement of disaster management.

Expectations of Support on the Implementations of the Hyogo Framework for Action by the RCC Member Countries

The RCC Members and delegates called for the UN-ISDR, the IATF, the UN Agencies, ADPC, the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) and the donor community:

- i) to play a greater role beyond supporting and monitoring;
- ii) to provide guidance on program in key areas such as mainstreaming DRM in Development;
- iii) to encourage the implementation on the HFA within a regional context with regional HFA projects/activities/programs for every sub-region within Asia;
- iv) to conduct Capacity Building programs for HFA implementation;
- v) that the ISDR-Asia Partnership role as catalyst be improved;
- vi) that the regional advisors from OCHA/ UNDP/ ISDR who have started working together at their regional offices in Bangkok, and the Deputy Resident Representatives of UNDP from each of the Asian countries, who have met recently, should consider the HFA implementation as one of many forms for regional collaborative action though working closely with all of the partners of the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP); and
- vii) that assistance be provided to enhance the exchange of information, communications systems and capacity of communication and technology transfer between RCC member countries including funding and resource mobilization for these activities.

These organizations were urged to meet and discuss the ways in which they can provide comprehensive support to the countries in their implementation of the HFA, possibly in the form of unsolicited proposals and south-south exchange mechanisms.

It was also recommended that the RCC be used as a forum to provide an update on the implementation and that the 10-year framework should be broken down into 2-year milestones of accomplishments to facilitate a workable implementation of the HFA for each of the countries. This would serve as a useful forum for the ISDR to monitor the progress of HFA implementation.

Hanoi RCC5 Statement on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development (MDRD) in Asian Countries

Hanoi, 20 May 2005

We, the delegates from RCC member countries, viz., Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Jordan, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Timor L'este and Vietnam, having met in Hanoi, Vietnam from 18th to 20th May 2005 for the 5th Meeting of the Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (RCC) organized by the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC), co-hosted by the Government of Vietnam.

Recognizing that the devastation in the region caused by the 26 December 2004 tsunami once again demonstrated that natural disasters result in serious economic and social setbacks to the development and poverty reduction initiatives of developing countries in Asia, cause damage to housing, schools, hospitals, government buildings, roads, bridges and agricultural crops and livelihoods; and divert scarce resources programmed for development to relief and rehabilitation efforts;

Recognizing that assessment of disaster risk impacts is yet to be an integral part of project design and development decisions and that development activities may sometimes induce new risks;

Realizing that disaster risk management (DRM) is not a stand-alone sector but an essential concern that operates at all levels and across all sectors; and that significant action is required to mainstream disaster risk management (DRM) in the process of development policy, planning and implementation; and a proactive approach is required by decision makers and planners in planning agencies and Ministries of all levels of Government, the donor community; UN and development agencies;

Recalling that the Regional Consultative Committee (RCC) on Disaster Management comprising heads of National Disaster Management Offices (NDMOs) of 25 Asian countries was established in 2000 at the initiative of Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC), to focus attention on identifying priority needs of member countries for disaster reduction and on learning lessons from experience and; that RCC had at its first two meetings identified integration disaster reduction into development as a priority area of action; and

Affirming the decisions of the 3rd and 4th RCC meeting to launch a Regional Program of the RCC on Advocacy and Capacity Building for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia (MDRD);

Recognizing that RCC member countries are developing comprehensive multi-hazard disaster management strategies and implementing innovative initiatives; which provide valuable lessons for further action on MDRD.

Affirming the adoption by the global community at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) in January 2005 of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) 2005 – 2015: "Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters whose first priority for

action calls for "Integrating Risk Reduction into Development Policies and Plans at all levels of Government, including poverty reduction strategies and sectors and multi-sectoral policies and plans" (Para 15.1(i)(b) of HFA).

Welcoming that the MDRD Program of the RCC has been registered in January 2005 with the UN Commission on Sustainable Development (CSD) as a WCDR Partnership;

Welcoming the active presence as observers in RCC Meetings of International Financial Institutions (namely, World Bank and Asian Development Bank); UN Agencies (namely UNDP, UN-ESCAP, FAO, UNESCO, UNISDR, UN-OCHA, WHO); RCC Partners (ADRC, EWC ICIMOD, MRC, PDC, the ProVention Consortium) and bilateral Donor Agencies (namely AusAID, DANIDA, EU, ECHO, GTZ, Dutch Netherlands, OFDA/USAID, and SIDA),

This 5th Meeting of the RCC calls upon every RCC member country to Mainstream Disaster Risk Management into Development over the coming decade, to include amongst others:

Mainstreaming DRM into National Development Policy, Planning and Implementation,

- National Development Plan and National Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs);
- In-Country Assessments and the Multi-year Program Framework of International Development Agencies (ADB, EU, World Bank and Bilateral Donors); the UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) Process;
- Developing and Implementing the National Disaster Risk Reduction Plan with inputs from all Relevant Ministries and Agencies;
- Institutionalizing of Community-Based Disaster Risk Management in Government Policy and programs at National, Provincial and District levels.

Mainstreaming DRM in priority sectors such as:

Agriculture - Promoting programs of contingency crop planning; crop diversification; supplementary income generation from off-farm and non-farm activities; and effective insurance and credit schemes to compensate for crop damage and loss to livelihood;

Urban Planning and Infrastructure - Introducing Disaster Risk Impact Assessments into the construction of new roads and bridges; and by promoting the use of hazard risk information in land-use planning and zoning programs;

Housing - Promoting the increased use of hazard-resilient designs in rural housing in hazard-prone areas; utilization of national building codes; and the compliance and enforcement of local building laws in urban hazard-prone areas;

Financial Services – Incorporating flexible repayment schedules into micro-finance schemes; and encouraging financial services and local capital markets to finance DRM measures;

Education - Introducing DRM modules into the school curriculum; promoting hazard resilient construction of new schools; and introducing features into schools for their use as emergency shelters;

Health - Vulnerability assessment of hospitals in hazard-prone areas; promoting hazard resilient construction of new hospitals; and implementing of disaster preparedness plans for hospitals; and

Environment and Natural Resources - Including Disaster Risk Impact Assessment into Environmental Impact Assessments for new development projects; linking with the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) under the UN Framework Convention for Climate Change, and action on other environmental hazards and links between environmental degradation and disaster risks.

Agree that the national and local level mainstreaming in sectors will not be limited to the priority sectors or themes listed above but will involve a greater number of sectors, agencies and themes; and **emphasize** that the mainstreaming of enhanced disaster resilience be done in post-disaster recovery programs of all disaster prone sectors;

Welcoming the willingness of member countries to implement Priority Implementation Projects (PIPs) on MDRD in ongoing development programs funded from national budgets and ongoing external funding; and **recognizing** that the process of implementation will be an active learning experience to understand how mainstreaming can be achieved;

Recognizing the need to document and share information on good practices and initiatives undertaken by RCC member countries so that others who are only now starting may benefit and therefore **calls** on Governments and technical support agencies to highlight and make visible existing good practice in implementing disaster resilience and safety in development programs in various sectors by suitably documenting experiences, key success factors and lessons learned.

Recognizing the role of National Platforms to facilitate increased stakeholder participation as a basis/ to serve as a base for mainstreaming, **calls** on all RCC Members to:

- Consider the establishment of National Platforms where none exist and
- Strengthen existing mechanisms through the inclusion of all relevant stakeholders; and
- Encourage the expansion of the activity of existing mechanisms to address the implementation of the HFA

and **calls** on the technical support agencies to:

assist these mechanism to improve their coordination in the sharing of information and improving their effectiveness within the context of disaster risk reduction at the national level.

Recognizing the responsibility of the RCC as a mechanism, offers to serve as a useful forum and reporting mechanism through which the progress of the implementation of

the HFA can be monitored by ISDR, and advocates that the 10-year HFA framework should be broken down into 2-year milestones of accomplishments to facilitate a workable implementation of the HFA for each of the RCC Member Countries.

Highlights the need for action by development partners (UN Agencies, Donors, International Financial Institutions and others) to:

- Enhance links between development and humanitarian assistance programs and budgets of their agencies;
- Incorporate disaster impact assessments into their project appraisal and review processes and;
- Include comprehensive assessments of disaster risk in their country assessments and country assistance strategies; and
- Adopt Policy Recommendations of the UNDP, ISDR and ProVention documents on integrating disaster reduction into development compatible with the local situation and conditions.

Requests ADPC in its capacity as secretariat of the RCC mechanism to continue to be the support agency of the RCC MDRD program through following actions:

- Developing a set of Guidelines documents for mainstreaming DRM, and
- Supporting implementation of PIPs in member countries and developing a set of milestones to track the progress of the program.
- **Appreciates** the support of the Government of Australia and expressions of interest by other countries and UN Agencies to support implementation of its MDRD program by:
 - providing funding for PIPs and meetings;
 - supporting development and publication of Guidelines; and
 - providing active linkage with the regional and national capacity building and technical assistance initiatives of various development partners.

Calls on other agencies and donors and countries to partner with the RCC and its member countries in the implementation of its MDRD program.

On Enhancing Regional Cooperation in Disaster Management in Asia

Further affirming the Bangkok RCC-2 Statement on future directions of ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Regional Cooperation in Disaster Management, approved in the 2nd RCC meeting in November 2001.

Appreciates the overall benefits of the RCC mechanism and calls for ensuring sustainability of the RCC mechanism

Welcoming the progress made in implementing these agreed directions as reported at the 5th RCC meeting in the "Follow-up Actions on Recommendations of Previous RCC Meetings 1-4" (Document 20)

Recognizing the progress made on Mainstreaming DRM into development as reflected in part A of this Statement

Recognizing the significant work done in new regional programs by ASEAN and MRC since 2001 through their ASEAN Regional Program for Disaster Management (ARPDM) and Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP).

Appreciating enhanced cooperation and dialogue between the RCC, its member countries and ADPC with ASEAN, MRC, ICIMOD, SAARC and SOPAC,

Calls upon further enhancing of regional networking on disaster risk, preparedness and relief, emergency response and risk reduction in close cooperation with donors, regional and international organizations.

Acknowledge with great appreciation the gracious hosting and warm hospitality extended by the Government of Vietnam for the 5th RCC Meeting.

ACRONYMS

AC	ADPC Advisory Council
ACDM	ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management
ADB	Asian Development Bank
ADPC	Asian Disaster Preparedness Center
ADRC	Asian Disaster Reduction Center, Kobe, Japan
AEGDM	ASEAN Experts Group on Disaster Management
ARPDM	ASEAN Regional Program on Disaster Management
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
AUDMP	Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program of ADPC
AusAID	Australian Agency for International Development
BoT	Board of Trustees of ADPC
BRCS	Bangladesh Red Crescent Society
BUDMP	Bangladesh Urban Disaster Mitigation Program
CBDRM	Community Based Disaster Risk Management
CDMP	Comprehensive Disaster Management Program of Bangladesh
CDRM	Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management
CEGIS	Center for Environmental and Geographic Information Service
CFAB	Climate Forecasting Applications in Bangladesh
DANIDA	Danish International Development Agency
DDMC	District Disaster Management Committee, Bangladesh
DDPM	Department for Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, Thailand
DFID	Department for International Development, United Kingdom
DM	Disaster Management
DND	Department of National Defence, Philippines
DRI	Disaster Risk Index
DRM	Disaster Risk Management
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Office
ECLAC	Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
EWC	East West Center
FMMP	Flood Management and Mitigation Programme
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOB	Government of Bangladesh
ICIMOD	International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, Kathmandu
IDNDR	International Decade for Natural Disaster Reduction
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IMDMCC	Inter-Ministerial Disaster Management Coordination Committee
ISET	International Studies and Environmental Technologies, France
ISDR	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (also UN-ISDR)
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LDAP	Local Disaster Action Plan (in Bangladesh)

LUDMP	Lao Urban Disaster Mitigation Program
MDRD	Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development
MFESB	Melbourne Fire and Emergency Services Board, Melbourne, Australia
MMIRS	Metropolitan Manila Impact Reduction Study
MRC	Mekong River Commission
NCDM	National Committee for Disaster Management, Cambodia
NDCC	National Disaster Coordinating Council, the Philippines
NDM	National Disaster Management
NDMC	National Disaster Management Center
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NIDM	National Institute for Disaster Management, India
OFDA	Office of the US Foreign Disaster Assistance of USAID
RCC	Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management
RCC1	First Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (Bangkok, Thailand, November 20 - 22, 2000)
RCC2	Second Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (Bangkok, Thailand October 31 - November 2, 2001)
RCC3	Third Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (Delhi, India, October 29-31, 2001)
RCC4	Fourth Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (Dhaka, Bangladesh, March 29-31, 2004)
RCC5	Fifth Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (Hanoi, Viet Nam, May 18-20, 2005)
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SIDA	Swedish International Development Agency
SMRC	SAARC Specialised Meteorological Centre, Dhaka
TDRM	Total Disaster Risk Management
TUDMP	Thailand Urban Disaster Mitigation Program
UDRM	Urban Disaster Risk Management Team at ADPC
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNDP-BCPR	United Nations Development Program – Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery
UN-ESCAP	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for the Asia-Pacific
UN-Habitat	United Nations Human Settlements Program
UN-ISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WB	World Bank
WCDR	World Conference for Disaster Reduction
WFP	World Food Program
WHO	World Health Organization
WV	World Vision

I. INTRODUCTION

CONTEXT

The Fifth Meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management (RCC5) was held in Hanoi, Vietnam from 18-20 May 2005, in collaboration with the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. Altogether, 79 representatives from 18 RCC Member Countries comprising heads of National Disaster Management Offices, senior officials from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and Embassies in Vietnam, and observers from regional organizations, UN Agencies, and bilateral and multilateral funding agencies and ADPC partners attended the meeting (ANNEX A).

THE RCC

ADPC is an independent, non-profit regional foundation, promoting risk reduction and capacity building in disaster management. The ADPC Board of Trustees (BoT), the international Advisory Council (AC) and the RCC form a three-tiered governance structure of the foundation.

The RCC was established in March 2000 and comprises BoT and AC members working in key government positions in national disaster management systems of countries throughout the Asia-Pacific region. Membership is by invitation of the Chairman of the BoT, with the 30 present members representing 25 countries and territories (ANNEX B).

The first four meetings of the RCC were held in November 2000 and October 2001 in Bangkok, in October 2002 in New Delhi, in collaboration with the Government of India and in March 2004 in Dhaka, in collaboration with the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

The role of the RCC is to provide a consultative mechanism for:

- Development of action strategies for disaster reduction in the region;
- Promotion of cooperative programs on a regional and sub-regional basis; and
- Guidance to the work of ADPC and its future directions.

OBJECTIVES OF THE MEETING

The objectives of the 5th RCC Meeting were to:

- seek inputs from the RCC members and observers on the RCC Project on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development;
- seek inputs from the RCC members on their expectations on the implementation of the HFA, on the draft benchmark indicators to monitor its implementation and their expectations on the provision of support on HFA implementation by ADPC, the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP), UN Agencies and the donor community;
- gain an insight into the current challenges faced and lessons learned of recent disaster in RCC member countries and regional and sub-regional bodies in Asia;
- learn from experiences of Disaster Management in Vietnam; and

- seek inputs from the RCC members on the RCC Meeting and actions or the coming year.

The detailed meeting program is given in ANNEX C of this report.

II. THE OPENING CEREMONY

The opening day of RCC5 was held concurrently with the 49th celebration ceremony for the traditional national day for disaster reduction in Vietnam and was organized by the Disaster Management Center (DMC) of the Department of Dyke Management and Flood and Storm Control (DDMFSC) under the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development. The joint opening ceremony was held at 09:00 am on Wednesday, 18th May 2005 at the Thang Long Ballroom of the Melia Hanoi, hotel. The chief guest was the Honorable Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, H.E. Mr. Vu Khoan.

Keynote addresses were delivered by Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Honorable Minister of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Honorable Chairman of the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control, Dr. Subinay Nandy, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative in Vietnam, Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, Director, Department of Disaster Management and Flood and Storm Control, Mr. Nguyen Trong Nhu, representative from the Ministry of Defense, Professor Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman of ADPC Board of Trustees and Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC.

The ceremony was attended by an audience of 250 people comprising of Ambassadors and counselors from embassies in Hanoi, senior officials from UN agencies, representatives of other international organizations and agencies, NGOs, delegates from RCC member countries, senior officials from the Ministries of Fisheries, Environment and Natural Resources, Planning and Investment, Finance, Industry, Transportation, Construction, Labor, Invalid and Social Affairs, Health, Science and Technology, Trade, Foreign Affairs, Public Security, Post and Telecommunications, and Provincial Departments of Dyke Management and Flood and Storm Control of the Socialist Republic of the Government of Vietnam, its national media and other relevant agencies and government departments.

The ceremony commenced with the introduction of the speakers which was given by Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, Director, Department of Dyke Management and Flood and Storm Control, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

In the opening address, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Chairman of the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control, delivered a Letter by the President of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam and stated that it was an honor for Vietnam to host the 5th Meeting of the RCC. Mr. Ngo recalled the circumstances under which President Ho Chi Minh formulated the decree to establish the Central Committee for Dyke Protection in 1946 and the attention that he paid to securing the lives of the Vietnamese people. Tribute was also paid to the efforts of the Government of Vietnam and the people in their efforts to mobilize human and economic resources to establish a structural system for water and disaster management and flood and storm control. While noting the important and results that Vietnam had achieved in disaster management, he

observed that natural hazards were often unpredictable. Thus, this necessitated the development of close international cooperation and mutual support to cope with disasters effectively, through the improved disaster management, operation capacity, the transfer of technologies and the application of appropriate disaster preparedness and response matters. The RCC Meeting provided a platform for this purpose and he wished the Meeting a great success.

H.E. Professor Dr. Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman of ADPCs Board of Trustees, expressed ADPC's honor at the presence of the Deputy Prime Minister at the opening ceremony to inaugurate both the 5th RCC Meeting and the 49th celebration ceremony for the Traditional Day for Disaster Reduction in Vietnam. He noted that it provided much evidence of the commitment of the country to confidently deal with the disaster risk that it faces and thanked the Government of Vietnam for their support, collaboration, warm hospitality and excellent arrangements. Professor Krasae highlighted that the Asian Tsunami had served as a reminder that developmental processes and poverty reduction priorities of nations and communities suffer serious social and economic setbacks when ever disasters strike and likewise the cumulative impacts of slow onset and prolonged disasters such as drought. The effects of these natural hazards impact on vital development facilities such as housing, schools, hospitals, buildings, roads, bridges, agricultural production and livelihoods and the scarce resources that are programmed for development are diverted for relief and rehabilitation efforts. New developments that had not considered disaster risks in their project design were also a cause of new risk and thus development activity and disaster risk reduction were therefore two sides of the same coin.

He emphasized that disaster risk management was not a stand alone sector but an essential concern that should operate at all levels and across all sectors and that mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development process was a necessary part of making development more risk resilient, requiring action by decision makers of national ministries, donors and development agencies. Noting his own experiences as a medical doctor, Professor Krasae commended four principles to move disaster risk management programs forward, namely, that they should be technically sound, socially acceptable, financially feasible and fully participatory. Professor Krasae paid tribute to Colonel Brian Ward, the first director of ADPC and conveyed the BoTs support of the direction that the RCC had set itself.

The 5th RCC Meeting and the 49th celebration ceremony for the Traditional Day for Disaster Reduction in Vietnam were jointly inaugurated by the Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, H.E. Mr. Vu Khoan. In his inaugural address, Mr. Khoan, representing the Government of Vietnam, noted that Vietnam was influenced by many types of disasters and the historic realization of the impacts of natural hazards had led to the construction of the first dyke lines during the 11th Century Ly dynasty. This was followed by the signing of the decree that established the Central Committee for Dyke Protection, the forerunner of the present Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control, by President Ho Chi Minh on May the 22nd 1946, less than a year after the founding of an independent Vietnamese Republic. He highlighted the importance of flood and storm control in all the stages of development in Vietnam and informed the audience of the many strategies and measures that were being

undertaken by the Vietnamese Government. Mr. Khaon also acknowledged the contributions made by the Vietnamese people in their important and decided role in the national disaster control strategy as well as that of the international community. He noted the dangers presented by the increased occurrence and severity of natural hazards and the difficult loss experienced by the Indian Ocean countries due to the 2004 Asian Tsunami. In conclusion, Mr. Khoan emphasized that international cooperation at all levels was needed to effectively prevent and mitigate damages caused by natural hazards, and thus Vietnam was honored to host the 5th RCC Meeting.

In his statement, Mr. Subinay Nandy, Deputy Resident Representative of the United Nations Development Program in Vietnam congratulated the Government of Vietnam for hosting this important event as it demonstrated the Government's commitment to protect human lives and property, its willingness to share disaster management experience, and its support to enhancing regional cooperation. He commended the impressive results that had been derived from Vietnam's long history in coping with natural hazards which had led to a significant reduction of the death toll. He noted, however, that economic losses caused by natural hazards were on the increase, its serious threat to health, education and livelihood opportunities, the increased vulnerability caused by the rapid urbanization process, and stated that many challenges remained for Vietnam.

Mr. Nandy elaborated on the lessons learned by UNDP in its 15 years of partnership for disaster management capacity building in Vietnam. These were i) that reducing vulnerabilities to natural hazards is essential for poverty reduction and achieving the Millennium Development Goals, ii) the importance of enhanced information and learning systems, iii) that an appropriate institutional framework is crucial for multi-hazard risk management and vulnerability reduction; and iv) finally, disaster reduction is not possible without people's understanding of hazards and their participation in reducing vulnerabilities and risks. He concluded by quoting the United Nations Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan who said "Disasters are the problem that we can and must reduce" and hoped that the discussion over three day meeting would lead to new initiatives at national and regional levels for safer lives and more sustainable livelihoods for the people who were most at risk in the RCC Member countries.

The Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, H.E. Mr. Cao Duc Phat, expressed his Ministries commitment in their efforts to promote close cooperation with relevant ministry agencies and the local authorities in order to achieve the goals issued by the Prime Minister on natural disaster preparedness, response, search and rescue in April 2005. Mr. Phat recognized that the millions of lives and dongs lost in Vietnam over the decade were partly due to inappropriate human interventions to the natural environment. The sharing of experiences, support of scientific and technological advances and closer cooperation between countries and the international community were cited as key areas which would led to a more active role in disaster preparedness, response and mitigation.

In his address, Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director of ADPC expressed his gratitude to the Government of Vietnam for hosting the 5th RCC Meeting and acknowledged with appreciation the generous support of the Government of Australia to the RCC. Deep

appreciation was also expressed to H.E. Deputy Prime Minister of Vietnam for his gracious presence, demonstrating the leadership and commitment of the highest levels of the Government of Vietnam to protecting its people from floods and storms and building a disaster resilient nation. Dr. Yodmani announced that the charter establishing ADPC as an international organization had been signed in February 2005, affirming the role of the RCC. An overview was given of the RCC, the RCC-MDRD program and its links with the globally adopted Hyogo Framework for Action, the theme of the 5th RCC “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia”, the close cooperation between ADPC and the provincial and district Governments of Vietnam in the Lower Mekong River; and ADPC’s partnership with the Government of Vietnam in building and operating a Tsunami Early Warning System for the Greater Mekong Region.

The closing remarks were made by Mr. Tinh who also proposed a vote of thanks.

A copy each of same key speeches at the opening ceremony is given in Annex D of this report.

III. SESSION I: SHOWCASING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN VIETNAM

The first session of the meeting was chaired by Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC and facilitated by Mr. N.M.S.I. Arambepola, Director and Team Leader, Urban Disaster Risk Management, ADPC. This session aimed to showcase the disaster management experiences of Vietnam including recent innovations in institutional arrangements and initiatives and to share lessons learned.

VIETNAM NATIONAL PLAN FOR WATER RELATED DISASTERS 2001-2020

The session commenced with a presentation by Mr. Nguyen Huu Phuc, Chief, Division of Master Planning and Erosion Control, Department of Dyke Management and Flood Control, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD), Vietnam on the “Disaster Management in Vietnam: Lessons Learned and Achievements”. Mr. Phuc began with a brief overview of Vietnam, its natural topography, rainfall distribution, types of natural hazards that afflicts the country, a record of disaster events over the last decade and human and economic losses that could be equated to the different types of natural hazards. He provided details on the disaster preparedness strategies that had been developed for the different regions in Vietnam including structural and non-structural measures. For the Red River Delta and Northern Central Vietnam the strategy employed was radical flood prevention and non-structural mitigation; active preparedness, mitigation and adaptation for Middle and Southern Central Vietnam; and “Living with Floods” in Southern Vietnam.

The lessons learned and success achieved included zero damage caused by typhoon Muifa in November 2004 through appropriate policy and close direction by the Government, good coordination of relevant agencies and sector and the active participation and support by the general public; the construction of Hoa Binh, Tuyen Quang and Son La reservoirs and the continuing strengthening of the dyke systems in the North; the construction of

emergency storage and the resettlement of vulnerable communities to residential clusters in the Central region through the involvement of villagers in the preparation of commune flood hazards maps and emergency evaluation plans including commune staff flood responds; the provision of boats and the building of safe settlements and boat shelters, establishment of child care centers in the south, the mobilization of national relief and support through contributions by the citizens of Vietnam, the integration of disaster management activities with poverty reduction and rural development, the promotion of community awareness and education on disaster mitigation and reduction, the strengthening of disaster warning and forecasting capacity, the strengthening of the institutional structure and the promotion of international cooperation especially in the region, as well as active contribution to the activities of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM).

NDM-PARTNERSHIP IN CENTRAL VIETNAM

Dr. Marshall Silver, Senior Technical Advisor, United National Development Program presented a paper on the 17 years of the UNDP partnership for disaster risk reduction on Vietnam and explained that disaster risk reduction is an integral part of the UNDP programs in Vietnam for Environment and Natural Resources Management and Sustainable Livelihood as stated in the UNDP Country Cooperation Framework. He elaborated that the country initiatives for disaster reduction focused on integrating poverty reduction, sustainable development and achieving Millennium Development Goals through disaster risk reduction, reinforcing legal and institutional framework for disaster risk reduction to be addressed by all sectors and at all levels, developing multi-hazard approach to disaster risk reduction, using specific tools, guidelines and capacity building for holistic approach to disaster risk reduction and using community based disaster risk reduction with focus on participation of and support to build community capacity for disaster risk reduction. Programs relating to technology transfer included the methods for river dyke protection, the construction of 1000 km of sea dykes in Central and Northern Vietnam and inputs to the First Strategy and Action Plan for Disaster Mitigation in Vietnam which focused on hydro-meteorological hazards such as typhoons, storms and floods. The information communication technology component comprised of the development of the Disaster Management Unit to establish a link between the government and the international community; the provision of emergency communication networks for all provinces, including the provision of computer based message services and training and the development of intranet facilities for the Provincial Committee for Flood and Storm Control; as well as the creation of a website for the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control.

He provided an explanation of the basic function of the National Disaster Management (NDM) Partnership to cooperate, coordinate, prioritize actions, and allocate scarce resources and to serve as a focal point for the Government and donor community. The Partnership was sponsored by the Royal Netherlands Embassy, the Government of Luxembourg and UNDP currently being implemented in Central Vietnam with plans for a nation wide expansion in the future. To date, the Partnership had been involved in providing inputs to the Second National Strategy and Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction in Vietnam by conducting base line studies of all types of hazards that impact Vietnam; the combinations of small scale

structural and non-structural solutions for disaster risk reduction through community based projects such as the rehabilitation of the Dong dyke system (Binh Dinh Province) and the construction of Tung Lam Sluice in the Da Nang Province. Non-physical measures included capacity building of local communities for disaster preparedness, measurement of benefits of construction and capacity building and the promotion of bottom-up planning for disaster risk reduction.

The USAID/OFA funded UNDP initiatives on CBDRM focused on Flood Mitigation in Central Vietnam which encompassed flood mapping in Central Vietnam, enhanced disaster and weather reporting for Vietnam Television, flash flood warning for the City of Hue; early warning of poor fisher folk along the coast of Vietnam which consisted of the provision of emergency radios without the need of batteries, enhanced cooperation between the Vietnam Hydro-meteorological Services, the Voice of Vietnam (VOV–Radio) and Vietnam Television, and extended and more comprehensive storm warning for coastal Vietnam by VOV. This also included the development of new building Codes to reduce disaster risk through the use of international best practices for disaster resistant infrastructure and the updating of Vietnam disaster design atlas; the use of existing legislation to establish a community -based disaster risk insurance fund; and enhanced Provincial flood risk reduction in the Mekong Delta Provinces to complement the Mekong River Commission Flood Management and Mitigation Program.

Dr. Silver also elaborated the links between attainment of the Millennium Development Goals and disaster risk reduction targets for Vietnam. He shared the lessons learned that reducing vulnerability to natural hazards was essential for poverty reduction and achieving Millennium Development Goals, that enhanced information and learning systems are essential components of disaster risk reduction, that appropriate institutional framework was crucial for multi-hazard disaster risk management and vulnerability reduction, that disaster risk reduction is only possible with peoples' understanding of hazards and participation in reducing vulnerabilities and risks. In conclusion he highlighted that economic losses to infrastructure from disasters are increasing, loss of livelihood from disasters are increasingly impacting the people and especially the poor and at risk population, a sharp decrease in mortality from disasters does not decrease the potential for injuries and disease and that rapid urbanization would challenge the successful traditional concepts of water disaster risk reduction now being practiced. Thus UNDP recommended that disaster based disruption of education must be reduced, that drought mitigation must be addressed strongly in future disaster risk reduction programs. Lastly, he emphasized that disaster risk reduction must continue to be a priority for poverty reduction, environmental protection and sustainable development in Vietnam and that it must continue to be a fundamental component of the program to achieve Millennium Development Goals in Vietnam.

SAFER LIVING CLUSTERS IN THE MEKONG DELTA

In his presentation on “Safer Living Clusters in the Mekong Delta”, Mr. Hang Quang Minh, Disaster Management Center, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, gave a brief profile of the Mekong River Delta, the types of natural hazards encountered, its flood features and people’s perception of floods. This defined the government’s major strategy for flood

mitigation in the region “Living with Floods” and included measures such as building residential clusters, the flood proofing of houses, the construction of dykes and boundary embankment, the encouragement of shifting the crop calendar, improve flood release capacities, the establishment of child care centers and the provision of swimming lessons for children. To date, the government had successfully invested 3200 billion VND for the construction and relocation of communities to special, raised residential clusters along roads and dykes provided loans and credit for the strengthening of housing foundations and to raise the levels of houses above the flood level. Significant results of the program included a reduction in the number of lives lost and child mortality rates in relation to disasters as well as economic losses, and the increase in the number of child evacuation centers.

COMMUNITY-BASED DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT IN VIETNAM AND ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGETS

A presentation on the Vietnam Red Cross Community-based Disaster Risk Management program was given by Mr. Phung Van Hoan, Vietnam Red Cross, who elaborated on the programs overall objectives. The specific objectives of the program were to develop human and material resource at different levels, to raise public awareness of disaster management, to reduce disaster risks for at risk communities and to provide humanitarian support to the affected communities.

He highlighted some achievements of the program spanning 1998-2004 which included training that had been provided to 4000 individuals on disaster management and life saving search and rescue, the development of disaster management resource materials aims at different target groups such as primary school children and the different government level officials, the development of 74 emergency response centres, posts, rescue centres and offices and distribution of 15,000 household survival kits, the training of 12,000 primary school teachers and 600,000 children through the development of the training material “An Introduction to Disaster Preparedness for Primary School Children” in 27 disaster prone provinces and the distribution of 80,000 sets of “*Living with floods*” brochures along with a training video to the people at risk in the Mekong Delta.

Other achievements included the, planting of 20,000 ha of mangroves in 8 Northern and Central coastal provinces through which over 4,000 poor households benefited directly and 6,000 households benefited indirectly by harvesting marine life attracted by the mangrove forest; the planting of wind-breaks in typhoon prone communes; the provision of support for the strengthening of 12,000 houses in 18 at risk provinces; the undertaking of hazard, vulnerability and capacity assessment in 200 communes in 16 disaster prone provinces.

Outcomes of their fifth objective included the targeting of disaster response operations to support vulnerable communities, lessons learnt from the major relief operations to improve the quality of future activities (*e.g. Typhoon Linda in 1997, floods in 7 Central provinces in 1999, floods in the Mekong Delta in 2000*), the development of new relief initiatives, i.e. provision of livelihood support to affected people were undertaken in the Mekong Delta and Nghe An and Ha Tinh provinces, and the development of guidelines for humanitarian need assessment and relief operations for application at different levels. The impacts of the

program have resulted in the increased resilience of the community through enhancement of their coping and recovery capacities.

OXFAM'S DISASTER REDUCTION EXPERIENCES OF VIETNAM

Mr. Provash Mondal, Humanitarian Program Coordinator, Oxfam GB, gave a presentation on Oxfam's Disaster Reduction Experiences of Vietnam and started with a brief overview of the types of natural hazards encountered in Vietnam and simple definitions of disaster reduction and the concept of community-based disaster risk management. CBDRM measures being undertaken by Oxfam comprised of facilitating the development of community DM action plans which incorporate the participatory identification of vulnerabilities and analysis of capacities, increasing household level disaster preparedness; enhancement of community preparations for effective response including community managed early warning systems; and building the capacity of provincial, district and community leaders in DM concepts.

Another of Oxfam's disaster risk reduction and preparation component was the sharing of field experiences on CBDRM and research on gender and humanitarian issues at national stakeholder levels and incorporating CBDRM and gender issues into government policies. Their endeavors on promoting standards included the translation of the Sphere publication into Vietnamese and providing introductory workshops and trainings on the Sphere Principles. Oxfam's efforts to improve coordination include convening meetings and briefings for national level DM working groups and the donor community and during emergencies; formalizing agreements, formats, checklists and providing training for Joint Assessments as well as providing coordination support during emergencies. Oxfam's achievements included the increase of family disaster preparedness levels, trained DM facilitators, regular coordination meetings at the community level, the convening of national CBDRM lessons learned workshop, the increased public awareness of the Sphere Standards and enhanced NGO-public sector partnerships. He concluded by listing the challenges faced and highlighting the need for enhanced cooperation at all levels.

PANEL DISCUSSIONS

Achieving the Millennium Development Goals and Sustainable Development through Disaster Reduction

Mr. Tabrani, Deputy for Disaster Management, Bakornas PBP, National Coordination Board for Disaster Management and IDPs, Indonesia, requested Dr. Marshall Silver, to elaborate on the practicalities of the integration of poverty reduction strategies, achieving the MDGs and sustainable development through disaster risk reduction. Dr. Silver thanked Mr. Tabrani for the question and stated that the combination of the impacts of disasters and the effects of disaster risk reduction on achieving the MDGs was derived by examining the MDGs and how they are impacted by disasters. This enabled the UNDP to economically measure the impact of disaster on people, in particular, how it induces poverty and effects health. Likewise, each of the MDGs can be matched with the national disaster risk reduction program as well as quantitative figures related to the impact of disasters and examine the resultant affects of the disaster impact to the national economy. These results could be used to convince the national governments to increase expenditure for risk reduction measures.

Quantifying Disaster Dividends and DRM Approaches to Poverty Reduction

Upon Mr. Micheal Ernst's, Regional Disaster Reduction and Transition Recovery Advisor, UNDP BCPR, request to clarify the measures that had been used to obtain the quantitative gains in his presentation, Mr. Silver responded that it was possible to measure impact on livelihoods though the duration over which people could obtain their pre-disaster levels of income, the amounts that were saved in the health sector through examining the disaster reports from one year to the next. He stated that in Asia, every US dollar spent on disaster reduction saved 10 USD spent on relief and that the money that been spent by the government and the donors on disaster reduction is reflected in the decrease in mortality numbers in Vietnam. This negates the UNDP method of using loss of lives as an indicator for successful disaster reduction initiatives. The loss to infrastructure and of livelihoods has surpassed the use of mortality as an indicator.

H.E. Madam Cora de Leon Vice-Chairperson of ADPC Board of Trustees, ADPC added that the best way to achieve poverty reduction through disaster risk reduction was to apply the community-based disaster risk management approach as this approach not only diminishes the impact but address the issue of livelihood opportunities which is an integral part of sustainable development. This was illustrated through the preceding presentations on dykes encouraging aquacultural activities and providing access to local markets and that of the industry stemming from mangrove afforestation. These initiatives provide direct economic impact for the vulnerable communities.

Derivation of Proportional Budgets for Central and Local Governments

Dr. Wang Zhenyao, Director General, Department of Disaster and Social Relief, Ministry of Civil Affairs, China, enquired on the proportional budget that was available for disaster risk reduction programs for the central and local governments and how they were derived. Mr. Phuc replied that most of the national budget for disaster reduction was spent on maintaining the existing dyke systems, and approximately 10 million USD was allocated annual for the north of Vietnam. The sections of the dyke system were divided into different grades with the responsibility of maintenance falling either with the national or provincial governments. Contributions for dyke maintenance from the general public were in the form of goods in kind or physical labor.

Program Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures in Vietnam

Mr. Earl Kessler, Deputy Executive Director, ADPC, enquired on the formal or informal monitoring and evaluation procedures that were in place under the different programs being undertaken in Vietnam and the lessons that had been learnt within the context of scaling-up the different activities.

Dr. Silver replied that all nationally executed UNDP programs have a formal on-going monitoring and evaluation process that is in-built and undertaken in cooperation with the national government with little international inputs. These processes ranged from monthly reporting to quarterly work plans, annual reviews to bi-annual formal assessment by external parties. In addition, payments to contractors are tied to a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation processes before each payment.

Mr. Minh, replied that when the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control was submitting proposals for programs to the central governments, the Ministries of Planning and Investment, Finance, Construction, Natural Resources and Environment were requested to assess and provide inputs to the proposed programs. These ministries are then involved in monitoring and evaluating the implementation of these programs on a monthly or 3 monthly basis or at the project end. Similar arrangements exist at the provincial levels, where proposals for dyke management and maintenance were submitted to the CCFSC which would technically assess and endorse the grants for these projects. Upon approval, requests would then be made to the Ministry of Finance to transfer the allocated fund to the provincial government. Upon the completion of the project, a financial report would then be submitted to the Ministry of Finance.

The Integration of Sphere Standards and Gender Issues Relating to DRM

Mr. Arambepola requested Mr. Mondal to elaborate on the achievements that Oxfam had made on the integration of minimum standards for the provision of humanitarian aid and response to disasters including the integration of gender issues. Mr. Mondal responded that there was a standard document that had been translated into the local language that was used by the INGOs in Vietnam. In addition, trainers had been instructed on the Sphere Principles as well as the incorporation of Sphere indicators into the assessment formats of the Disaster Management Working Group Joint Assessment Teams. These were applied to when drought assessment was conducted in Vietnam in April 2005. However, these were small scale initiatives that needed to be integrated at a wider scale through working with the national governments, donors, and with other organizations that requires capacity building on a large scale.

Dr. Suvit expressed his gratitude and thanks to the panelists for their useful and valuable presentations and the participants for their questions which led to lively discussions. The session had showcased examples from Vietnam by the national government, by local and international NGOs and the longstanding UNDP programs of managing disasters in Vietnam.

IV. SESSION II: INTRODUCTION AND ADOPTION OF AGENDA

This session in the afternoon of the first day, was chaired by H.E. Madam Cora de Leon, Vice-Chairperson of ADPC Board of Trustees, ADPC and facilitated by Mr. Boon Tiong Tay, Director, Finance and Administration, Monitoring and Evaluation, Information and Knowledge Management, ADPC.

The session commenced with Dr. Suvit Yodmani explaining the role of the RCC and the purpose of the 5th RCC Meeting. He elaborated that the RCC meetings were organized with the vision of its member countries collaborating at technical as well as policy and foreign affairs level. The Meetings also assesses the needs of its member countries, encouraged regional cooperation, confirmed that ADPC activities were in tune with the identified priority needs of its RCC Member Countries, enhanced the sustainability of the RCC mechanism, and identified ways to mobilize resources. The Meetings acted as means through which ADPC could achieve its vision of safer and sustainable communities through disaster reduction and

in the context of the RCC, the term community transcended through all levels from the global, regional, national to that of the community level.

Upon the request of Madam de Leon, each of the RCC delegates and observers introduced themselves to the Meeting and provided a brief description of the organizations they were representing. The agenda was approved without any amendments.

Mr. Aloysius Rego, Director and Team Leader, Disaster Management Systems, ADPC explained that as in previous meetings, it was proposed that a small group of RCC Members be constituted to serve as on the steering committee for the Meeting to keep track of the deliberations, monitor the tempo of the discussions and advise amendments to the agenda as appropriate, and to provide inputs to the outcome documents of the Meeting. He elaborated that under the RCC program on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development (MDRD), smaller meetings comprising of a sub-committee of RCC members had been convened in March and the previous day. During discussions on the previous day, it had been proposed that the RCC Members who served as the Advisory Panel for the RCC-MDRD program should form the Steering Committee for the Meeting as MDRD was the theme for the 5th Meeting. It was confirmed that the following RCC Members would sit on the Steering Committee for the 5th Meeting:

- Bangladesh – Mr. Muhammad Fazlur Rahman
- China – DR. Wang Zhenyao
- Cambodia – Mr. Khun Sokha
- India – Mr. S.K. Chattopadhyay
- Indonesia – Mr. Tabrani
- Lao PDR – Mr. Phetsavang Sounalath
- Pakistan – Brigadier Sarfraz Khan
- Philippines – Director Elma C. Aldea
- Thailand – Mrs Wachana Kulchanarat
- Vietnam – Mr. Dang Quang Tinh

The first meeting of the Steering Committee was held immediately after the end of the first day.

Mr. Rego reported to the RCC on actions that ADPC has undertaken on recommendations from the previous four RCC Meetings and refer to the Meeting documents 19 and 20 that provided a consolidated list of all the major action agendas identified at the RCC Meetings and as well as a detailed listings of all follow-up actions that have been undertaken (*Annex E* of the Report). These were based on priorities that were set during RCC1 and RCC2 and augmented by recommendations made at RCC 3 and RCC 4. These documents was produced upon request by the ADPC Board of Trustees (Bot), RCC Members and the supporting donors and seek to serve as an honest record of the collective ideas of the RCC Members and as a means to monitor the follow-up progress of the recommendations that been undertaken

and to identify areas where action was required. The RCC delegates were requested to examine the document and to approach ADPC for further clarifications and any of the recommendations or follow-up actions that were reported.

V. SESSION III: LESSONS LEARNED FROM RECENT DISASTERS AND PROGRAMS

The third session of the Meeting was delivered in three sub-sessions, in the afternoon of the 18th May and the morning of the 19th May. The first session was co-chaired by Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, and Mr. S.K. Chattopadhyay and facilitated by Mr. Rego, the second was co-chaired by Mr. Phetsavang Sounalath, Director, National Disaster Management Office, Lao PDR and Major General Dr. Purvey Dash, Head of the National Disaster Management Agency, Mongolia and facilitated by Mr. Arambepola, whilst the third session was co-chaired by Director Elma Aldea Administrator, OCD and Executive Officer, National Defence Committee, Philippines, and Mr. Sharad Chandra Paudel, Under Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, Nepal and facilitated by Mr. Kessler Deputy Executive Director, ADPC.

A. RESPONDING TO CHALLENGES OF THE INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI, RESPONSE, RECOVERY AND IMPROVING EARLY WARNING

CHALLENGES IN RECOVERY AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 2004 AND THE NIAS EARTHQUAKE OF MARCH 2005 IN INDONESIA

The first sub-session entitled “Responding to Challenges of the Indian Ocean Tsunami, Response, Recovery and Improving Early Warning” commenced with a presentation by Mr. Tabrani, on the “Challenges in Recovery and Lessons Learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 and the Nias Earthquake of March 2005”. During his presentation, Mr. Tabrani provided figures on the scale, dead, missing and internally displaced persons as a result of the two disasters as well as an evaluation of the damage and loss experienced by the different sectors. These included the social sector including housing, education, health, religion and culture; the infrastructure sector encompassing transportation, communication, energy, dams, water and sanitation; the production center relating to agribusiness, fishery, industry and trade; and cross-cutting sectors such as the environment, government administration, banking and finance. Recapitulation of damage in the agriculture sector to rice and other fields, orchards and livestock in the Kabupaten and Kota districts was provided as was Bakornas’ plans for immediate (up to 3 months) emergency and response-relief, short-term (4 month-2 years) rehabilitation and long-term (3-5 year) reconstruction as well as their framework for rehabilitation and reconstruction planning.

CHALLENGES AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 2004 IN SRI LANKA

In his presentation Mr. Garu Muni Janaka Kithsiri Gunawardena, Assistant Director, National Disaster Management Center, Ministry of Women Empowerment and Social Welfare, Sri Lanka outlined Sri Lanka’s geo-political profile and the main natural hazards that the country encountered were floods, landslides, cyclones, drought and sea erosion. He provided a spatial

overview of the area and the number of families affected, deaths and damaged houses in the 63 divisions, figures of physical units; people affected and total estimated losses for the education, fisheries, health, tourism and infrastructure sector. The immediate response, actions taken by the government on relief operations and relief assistance received were outlined, as well as the governments' response plans and the estimated cost for rehabilitation and reconstruction. An update on the progress of the program for transitional accommodation, the number of schools to be renovated and rebuilt, repairs to infrastructure, health and utilities facilities was given.

Mr. Gunawardena also informed the participants of the three task forces that had been set up to address rescue and relief (TAFRER), logistics and law and order (TAFLOL), and rebuilding the nation (TAFREN). These task forces were accountable to the president through the Secretary to the President. He also elaborated on the challenges faced, and needs and listed the future disaster management and preparedness strategies as i) establishing a multi-disciplinary national disaster operation center, ii) the development of a disaster information management system, iii) the stock piling and provision of relief equipment, iv) the development of a national emergency response capacity, v) the establishment of a legal and institutional framework on disaster management, vi) enhancement of training and education, vii) strengthening regional and international cooperation and viii) the establishment of an Early Warning System.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE INDIAN OCEAN TSUNAMI OF DECEMBER 2004 IN THAILAND

Ms. Wachana Kulchanarat, Planning and Policy Analyst, Ministry of Interior, Thailand presented a paper on "Lesson learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 in Thailand" in which she recounted that the tsunami had affected 58,550 persons in 407 villages in 95 sub-districts, of 25 districts in 6 provinces in Southern Thailand. The lessons learned from this tragic event included the importance of i) the establishment of an early warning system through the setting up of a National Disaster Warning Center and the construction of warning towers, ii) an effective public awareness and education program targeted at vulnerable communities to enhance their understanding of prevailing threats especially through the Community-based DRM approach which encourages public participation, iii) the creation of disaster management networks to enhance disaster management capacities of all relevant agencies and to become an active member of the international disaster management organizations, iv) effective damage assessment systems through ensuring that staff are trained in the use of remote surveying techniques, v) the application of a community-centered approach to enhance their ability to respond to disasters, vi) that focus on disaster prevention should be on par with disaster relief and that an emphasis be placed on investing in disaster preparedness, vii) ensuring that staff are well trained and the supplies are systematically in place and lastly viii) that evacuation drills should be conducted according to an evacuation plan and on a continuous basis.

THE TSUNAMI DISASTER AND STRATEGY FOR DISASTER MANAGEMENT IN INDIA

A paper on the Tsunami Disaster and Strategy for Disaster Management in India was presented by Mr. S.K. Chattopadhyay, Joint Secretary (Coordination), Ministry of Home Affairs, India. He relating the massive damage that that the coastal states of Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Andhra Pradesh and urban towns of Pondicherry and the Andaman and Nicobar Islands had suffered in terms of lives lost and economic terms. The strategy that had been put in place to deal with the aftermath of the Tsunami had been divided into three phases, namely immediate relief and response, temporary rehabilitation and restoration of infrastructure and long-term rehabilitation and reconstruction.

He reported on the coordination, monitoring and review systems that had been put in place as well as the immediate response, logistical supplies and financial assistance that had been rendered. Mr. Chattopadhyay recounted details of the immediate concerns, rescue and evacuation results, amount of manpower and ships and aircraft that had been deployed, numbers of relief camps that had been established, how the dead had been disposed, on the provisions of basic necessities, health and medicine, progress that had been made in restoring the infrastructure that had been damaged, and on further steps and monitoring and coordination activities that had been undertaken.

He also elaborated on the assistance that India had provided Sri Lanka, the Maldives and Indonesia for relief operations and provided details on the special rehabilitation packages that the Government had announced and figures on the construction of immediate shelters and the long-term rehabilitation and reconstruction plans.

He concluded his presentation by sharing India's long-term strategy for tsunami disaster risk management which included i) the establishment of a Tsunami early warning system, ii) the development of an emergency communication network, iii) the strengthening of the National Institute for Disaster Management and iv) building the capacity of communities through training and awareness.

ESTABLISHING END-TO-END MULTI-HAZARD EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Ms. Lolita Bildan, Program Manager, Climate Risk Management team, ADPC spoke on the establishment of a regional end-to-end multi-hazard early warning system in Southeast Asia. She outlined the post-tsunami events that led to the recommendation that ADPC acts as a regional center or focal point, actions taken by ADPC since February 2005, the threats existing, as well as minimum physical units of technical equipment that were required to ensure an effective monitoring network within the Indian Ocean. Explanations of current seismic networks, Global Sea Level Observing Systems and physical and human resources were needed to staff a regional center was given, as was the structure of an end-to-end early warning system. Risk assessment, support to the development of national early warning systems and community preparedness were presented as the crucial pillars of the preparedness component of such a system. Acknowledging the needs expressed in a host of discussion forums on the establishment of an early warning system in Southeast Asia, Ms.

Bildan went on to elaborate on the respective roles of the regional and national centers, the expected institutional arrangement and the plans for the implementation of a regional center.

ADPC INPUTS TO POST-TSUNAMI ASSESSMENT AND RECOVERY

Ms. Supriya Prabhu, Project Manager, Disaster Management Systems Team, ADPC shared with the participants ADPC's "Inputs to Post-tsunami Assessment and Recovery". These included post-tsunami assessments in Sri Lanka for recovery in housing and a collaboration with UNDP to organize an Orientation Training Seminar on the 2nd Phase of Recovery needs; support to the UNDAC assessment mission in Thailand and collaboration with the UNDP on damage and needs assessment in the affected provinces; assessing DRM needs in recovery and long-term DRR programming in the Maldives in collaboration with UNDP; and collaboration with UNDP on integrating DRM into recovery and long-term DRR in Indonesia. Under commission from the World Bank, ADPC was undertaking a "Study on Assessment of the Socio-Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tsunami at the Regional Level" using the ECLAC Methodology". These were based on national assessments with the dissemination of the results to key national decision makers in economic and finance department at a regional meeting. It was envisaged that future financial risk transfer mechanisms would be based on the information provided in the study.

B. LESSONS LEARNED FROM RECENT DISASTERS IN THE ASIAN REGION AND THEIR RECOVERY PROGRAMS

BRIEFING ON THE RECENT HYDROLOGICAL EVENTS IN THE PHILIPPINES AND LESSONS LEARNED

The participant from Philippines informed the participants that four extreme weather events, namely, typhoon "Muifa", tropical storm "Merbok", tropical depression "Winnie" and typhoon "Nanmadal" affected the Philippines within a three week period spanning in November-December 2004 and listed the provinces and municipalities that were severely affected and the types of resulting impacts of the disasters. The speaker elaborated on the problems encountered, listed the immediate priority needs that were encountered, the emergency management activities undertaken and the key actors that were involved in the response efforts. Figures relating to the damage and needs assessments of the area and population affected, casualties, cost of damage to residential, agricultural, infrastructural, educational, health and transmission facilities and the amount of assistance received were also provided.

Lessons learned included the importance of having i) an up-to date forecasting and early warning system, ii) that all stakeholders should act irrespective of their political affiliations, that the capacity of disaster coordinating centers, and that government offices and local government units should be strengthened through the formation of local and international NGO and private sector partnerships. The necessity of strong political will to enforce zoning and land-use laws, hazard mapping of community and residential areas, enhancing capacities of rescue assets, the stockpiling of emergency supplies and equipment, increased public risk awareness was also expressed. The underlying lesson learned was that disaster risk reduction is a key aspect of sustainable development. Mr. Milajres concluded by outlining the four

point action plan for disaster preparedness proposed by the National Disaster Coordinating Council, namely to i) upgrade the capacity of existing forecasting facilities, ii) to conduct public information campaigns on disaster preparedness, iii) to build the capacity of Local Government Units in identified vulnerable areas, and iv) to establish mechanisms to promote Government and Private Sector Partnership for Relief and Rehabilitation.

LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE BAM EARTHQUAKE IN IRAN

Dr, Saeed-Mirza Mohammadi, Deputy Director General of the Economic Studies and International Cooperation Bureau, Management and Planning Organization, Iran presented a paper on Lessons Learned from the Bam Earthquake in Iran 2003. He commenced his presentation with visuals illustrating the increasing trends of global disaster occurrences from 1975 to 2002 and the percentage of people affected by natural hazards by continent. He informed the participants that Iran was one of the most earthquake prone countries in the world and cited the major earthquakes that had occurred in Iran since 1976. Dr. Mirza recounted the destruction caused by the December 26 2003 Bam earthquake and noted that the two main relief and rescue challenges faced included the lack of prompt information dissemination to authorities and the lack of comprehensive coordination between related agencies.

Measures that had been taken to address these issues were i) to revise the Natural Disaster Emergency Management Structure by the establishment of The High Council for Natural Disaster Prevention and Management headed by the First Vice-President and ii) to mainstream natural disaster management in the national development plans through the Islamic Republic of Iran's Vision 2014, the 4th Development Plan (2005-2009) and through the United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). Important measures in macro-level plans that had been identified to mitigate the impact of earthquakes included i) conducting research, ii) the preparation of technical, managerial and safety codes, criteria and guidelines, iii) the development of retrofitting plans for private and public buildings and infrastructural facilities, iv) endorsing an integrated rural housing plan, v) establishing natural disaster information networks and early warning and forecasting systems and vi) active international and regional cooperation and information exchange. The application of these measures during the Zarand Earthquake in 2005, allowed Iran to successfully resolve the challenges they had faced during the Bam Earthquake.

CHALLENGES IN COPING WITH PROLONGED DROUGHT IN THAILAND

Ms. Kulchanarat took the floor and presented the "Challenges in Coping with Prolonged Drought in Thailand" by outlining the affected areas, the number of person affected, and the extent of agricultural damage under the drought situation as of May 2005. She reported on the measures that the Royal Thai Government were undertaking to respond to the drought included the setting up of a drought and mitigation center, the provision and distribution of water, the use of the Royal Artificial Rain-making Project and Water Management System and the establishment of a water management system.

SUB-SESSION III-C: LESSONS LEARNED FROM REGIONAL AND SUB-REGIONAL PROGRAMS ON PREPAREDNESS AND MITIGATION

MRC FLOOD MANAGEMENT AND MITIGATION PROGRAMME

The Director of the Technical Support Division of the Mekong River Commission Secretariat, Mr. Te Navuth, commenced his presentation by explaining the structural components of the Flood Management and Mitigation Programme (FMMP), namely the i) establishment of a regional Flood Management and Mitigation Center, ii) structural measures and flood proofing, iii) mediation of trans-boundary flood issues, iv) flood emergency management strengthening and lastly v) land management. These components served to prevent, minimize or mitigate people's suffering and economic losses due to floods whilst preserving environmental benefits of floods.

He elaborated on the specific activities of each of the components and their performance indicators, highlighting that the goal of the first FMMP component was that the regional flood management and mitigation center maintain the availability of important flood-related tools, data and knowledge, produced accurate regional forecasts with a suitable lead time which could be disseminated in a timely and effective manner. Structural measures and flood proofing measures sought to reduce the vulnerability of people living in the Mekong River Basin to the negative impacts of floods whilst activities under the third component would aim to enhanced the mediation and coordination capacity of MRC on issues of non-compliance in trans-boundary flood management. A capacity building for flood preparedness planning program was being undertaken to strengthen the competence of emergency managers, civil authorities, and communities at various levels in flood emergency preparedness and mitigation as well as activities to ensure the effective land management in the Mekong floodplains through the use of reliable flood-related information.

He informed the participants of the contributions made by the donor community to fund the FMMP, the timeframe for its implementation, the role and functions of the regional flood management and mitigation center and provided an update on its establishment. He concluded by stating that the FMMP was one of the core programs of the MRC.

FLOOD EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT STRENGTHENING COMPONENT OF THE MRC FMMP

Ms. Hnin Nwe Win, Project Manager, Disaster Management Systems, ADPC outlined the collaborative activities between MRC and ADPC beginning with the signing of an MOU in March 2002, which paved the way for the implementation of Phase One of the DIPECHO funded Capacity Building Project (September 2003-June 2004), the GTZ funding of the 4th Component of the FMMP (September 2004-June 2007) and implementation of the Phase Two of the Capacity Building Project (March 2005-February 2006).

She explained that the immediate objective of Component Four was to ensure that the emergency management systems in the Riparian countries were more effective in dealing with Mekong Floods. Relating the specific activities and the expected outputs under the component, she provided details of the schedule of implementation of the three year program

and the implementation arrangements for Cambodia and Vietnam, listing the coordinating and facilitating agency, the implementation and cooperating partners.

In Cambodia, the districts of Peam Chor and Sihtor Kandal in the Prey Veng province and the Lovea Em and Leuk Dek districts of the Kandal province had been identified as pilot sites, whilst in Vietnam, An Giang and Dong Thap provinces had been selected. Progress on the program implementation included the identification of partner institutions in the two target countries, the opening of the program's provincial office in Prey Veng, the conduct of a consultative institutional analysis study in Cambodia, the finalization of the institutional arrangements with the national partner institutions and the regular sharing of information and dialogues of further collaboration with the various partners.

UPDATE ON THE ASEAN COOPERATION ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT

On behalf of the Chairman of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM), H.E. Peou Samy, Mr. Khun Sokha, Head of Emergency, Response and Rehabilitation Department of the National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM), Cambodia, read an update on the ASEAN Cooperation on Disaster Management, outlining the establishment, and members of the ACDM and explaining that it assumes overall responsibility for coordinating and implementing regional activities.

He related that in pursuit of a region of disaster-resilient nations and safer communities, the ACDM had developed an ASEAN Regional Programme on Disaster Management (ARPD) to provide a framework for cooperation for the period of 2004-2010. The ARPD outlines ASEAN's regional strategy on disaster management, as well as priority areas and activities for disaster reduction, and is used as a platform for cooperation and collaboration with ASEAN Dialogue Partners and relevant international organizations. Ongoing partners of ACDM include: the United States Department of Agriculture Forest Service, the Pacific Disaster Centre, the United Nations Office for Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), UNICEF, IFRC, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC).

He informed the participants that the ARPD consists of 29 activities, which are categorized into five major components. To spearhead with the implementation, the ACDM had prioritized 5 out of 29 activities as priority projects, namely i) the establishment of the ASEAN Response Action Plan; ii) the conduct of refresher courses/ expertise development; iii) development of ACDM Website and NDMO Websites; and publication of ASEAN Disaster Management Information Network (ADMIN) Newsletter; iv) building partnerships with relevant organizations and NGOs; and mobilizing financial support and resources; and v) promoting the ASEAN Day for Disaster Management; and Enhancing Disaster Management Public Education and Awareness Programs.

Mr. Khun Sokha reported that following the mandate set by the First ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management in December 2004, and the adoption of the ASEAN Declaration on Action to Strengthen Emergency Relief, Rehabilitation, Reconstruction and Prevention during the Special ASEAN Leaders' Meeting on Aftermath of Earthquake and Tsunami on the 6th January 2005, much progress had been made on the establishment of an

ASEAN Regional Disaster Management Framework. This framework would include the development of a regional agreement on disaster management and emergency response; the development of standard operating procedures to operationalize disaster response mechanism under the agreement; enhancing quick response team of Member Countries; and the conduct of simulation exercises. Much progress had been made on the development of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, which was expected to provide a framework for the development of operational procedures to respond collectively and expeditiously to disasters. He explained that the Agreement would include provisions for movement of relief assistance, expedited customs and immigration clearance; the utilization of military and civilian personnel in disaster relief; the establishment of a centre to coordinate regional disaster response; provisions for setting up an ASEAN disaster relief fund as well as provisions for simulation exercises to test emergency responses on a regular basis.

PROGRAM FOR REGIONAL CAPACITY ENHANCEMENT FOR LANDSLIDE IMPACT MITIGATION (RECLAIM)

Mr. Arambepola provided the participants with an overview on the Program for Regional Capacity Enhancement for Landslide Impact Mitigation (RECLAIM). Funded by the Government of Norway through the Norwegian Embassy in Thailand, and being implemented jointly by the Norwegian Geotechnical Institute and ADPC, the target countries included Bhutan, India, Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Thailand, where partner organizations were engaged in landslide mitigation activities, infrastructure development and had close association with focal points in disaster management in the respective countries.

Having identified the need for a program to enhance the regional capacity for landslide impact mitigation, the long-term objective of the project was to reduce the landslide vulnerability of human settlements, infrastructure, and critical facilities in the target countries. The first of the two specific short-term objectives aimed to provide target countries with a cadre of specialists and decision makers with up-to-date knowledge on landslide disaster mitigation practices and to integrate this knowledge in routine development work initiated by national and local governments. The second short-term objective was to increase collaboration between Norwegian and Asian institutions on jointly developing cost effective methodologies for landslide mitigation and training at national level for the enhancement of capacity of national partners, which would result in more joint programs and opportunities for sharing of experience and learning applications in the subject area.

Detailing the expectations related to the first objective, Mr. Arambepola outlined the preparatory work undertaken, the project outputs and activities and the special features of the regional training activities; and informed the participants of the kick-off meeting that had been held in September 2004 and the activities that had been planned for 2005.

VI. SESSION IV: SPECIAL SESSION TO REVIEW THE PROGRESS ON THE RCC PROGRAM ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT IN ASIA

The rest of the second day's agenda and the morning of the 3rd day reviewed the progress on the RCC program on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development in Asia, the theme of the 5th RCC Meeting. This session was conducted in six-sub-sessions, some of which were co-chaired by a different panel of RCC delegates and observers.

SESSION IV-A: OVERVIEW ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT

The first sub-session, held in the morning of the 19th May, was co-chaired by Brigadier Sarfaraz Khan Director General, Emergency Relief Cell, Pakistan and Dr. Mizra and facilitated by Mr. Boon Tiong Tay, ADPC.

RCC PROGRAM ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO DEVELOPMENT POLICY, PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION IN ASIA (MDRD): OVERVIEW AND REVIEW OF PROGRESS

Mr. Rego commenced the session by presenting an overview of the AusAID funded RCC Program on Mainstreaming Disaster Reduction to Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia (MDRD). He recapitulated the membership composition of the RCC, its role and recalled the previous four RCC Meetings and their recommendations on mainstreaming disaster risk management which led to the launching of the MDRD at the 4th RCC Meeting.

The principal objective of the program is to develop and adoption of national programs to mainstream disaster risk management in RCC Member Countries through:

1. Increasing awareness and political support for MDRD in the RCC Member Countries, and
2. Enhancing the capacity of the National Disaster Management Systems to develop and implement activities to mainstream DRM in ongoing national development work.

The launching of the program in Dhaka, Bangladesh 2004 and discussions on the project during the RCC4 allowed for further refinement of the project and has led to the program team introducing two approaches to the Program, namely, mainstreaming DRM into national development policy, planning and implementation and into specific sectors. The former envisages the integration of DRM into development policy, planning and implementation by encouraging active dialogue and the strengthening of linkages between the national disaster management offices and national ministries for finance, planning and environment as well as multi-lateral and bilateral agencies, whilst the latter recognizes that DRM should be integrated across all and in all sectors through earnest discussions and synergies between ministries responsible for development activities in the various sectors. The priority sectors that had been identified during RCC4 were agriculture, finance, urban planning and infrastructure, housing, health and education.

The discussions at RCC4 also resulted in providing a clearer definition to the Program through which the program team was able to organize the program activities into defined components and specific activities under each program under the two specific objectives. Details of the Program were printed in the form of a brochure had since been distributed at the World Conference on Disaster Management in Kobe, Japan, amongst other meetings.

Mr. Rego recounted the expected outcomes and inputs of the program as well as its linkages to concurrent ADPC activities, work by UNDP, WHO and the Provention Consortium and its synergies with the ISDR Hyogo Framework for Action. In line with the program activity to seek support from other donors, he elaborated on the project objectives and components for a project on mainstreaming disaster reduction into development planning of infrastructure and housing in RCC Member Countries which had been submitted to the Government of Germany, in collaboration with GTZ.

Dr. Kai Kim Chiang, Program Coordinator, Disaster Management Systems, ADPC continued the presentation by outlining the progress on the program since RCC4. Key activities that had been undertaken included i) the renaming of the program to “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development” to better convey that expectations of program, ii) the sending out of questionnaires to documents the current status of MDRD in the RCC Member Countries, iii) the collection of national reports that had been prepared for the WCDR, iv) the identification of a list of guidelines to be developed, v) the preparation of an outline for the guidelines and initial identification of consultants and institutional partners, vi) the formation and conduct of the first and second meetings of the Advisory Panel to steer the development of the program, vii) the convening of the 4th and 5th RCC Meetings, viii) presentation of the MDRD Program at the UN IAFT and Beijing Meeting in May 2004, and to the 1st Meeting of the ASEAN Ministers for Disaster Management in December 2004, ix) negotiations with the East-West Center on a Meeting of Parliamentarians, x) the concept development for the Priority Implementation Projects (PIPs) and requests for initial proposals, xi) the drafting of the outlines for the PIPs, and xii) the registration of the RCC and the MDRD Program as a post WCDR Partnership.

MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK REDUCTION: A UNDP PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Ernst, presented a paper on the UN Perspective on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development. He commenced by defining mainstreaming as a process of making disaster reduction an integral part of sustainable development by incorporating it at all stages of development, i.e. policy, planning, implementation and monitoring. He explained that this required the adoption of institutional mechanisms and procedures, tools and practices to bring disaster risk into the decision making processes.

The existing mainstreaming spheres were outlined as was mainstreaming DRR into the United Nations Country Team strategy through the Common Country Assessment, the United Nations Development Assistance Framework, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers and other Sector Papers, and the National Human Development Reports. UNDP Country Programmes would also seek to i) mainstream their programmes to ensure that disaster risk considerations would be taken into account in their governance, poverty reduction and environment

portfolios; ii) conduct country level risk assessments to inform the project development process; iii) advocate with development agencies and partners to support regional and national efforts to mainstream disaster reduction and to include mainstreaming efforts within their respective programs and lastly iv) to include the development of indicators to measure the mainstreaming process and progress made towards the achievement of the targeted results for mainstreaming.

The UNDP are supporting the Institutional and Legislative Systems, the Local Level Risk Management and the Integrated Climate Risk Management initiatives in their efforts to mainstream DRR as well as promoting the establishment and development of the post-WCDR National Risk Reduction Platforms and Regional and National Recovery Platforms. Programming obstacles that they had encountered included the need to increase local level capacity for DM whilst expanding pilot projects to nation-wide initiatives and the dearth in resources allocated for development and disaster preparedness programs. Lessons learned were i) that post-crisis opportunities, when awareness and resources were high should be taken advantage of, ii) that local level preparedness and early warning initiatives can be effective and sustainable and iii) that strengthening understanding between vulnerable communities and the technical early warning systems is beneficial.

UNDP recommended that i) strong and broad partnerships be developed to promote top-down, broad national support for local level DRR initiatives, that strategies developed for DRR maintain a long-term holistic vision that takes into account economic, social and other risks to development and to the environment; and iii) that approaches that assess all potential impacts of development interventions should be encouraged. UNDP envisaged its role as a partner and supporter of policy implementation relating to MDRR, as well as potentially coordinating and sharing the DRR efforts to facilitate the involvement of more organizations. Dr. Ernst concluded by raising some issues related to MDRR, noting that although the vast majority of governments and developing agencies supported the concept, limited resources affected the addressing of basic development issues and restricted choices. He emphasized the need to identify win-win situations as interventions are more acceptable if there were short and long-term returns on investment.

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE 1ST MEETING OF THE RCC ADVISORY PANEL ON MDRD

SUMMARY OF CURRENT STATUS OF MDRD AND INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS ON MDRD IN THE RCC MEMBER COUNTRIES

Mrs. Geethi Karunaratne, Consultant, ADPC presented a paper on the collated responses to the survey on the current status of mainstreaming and documentation of innovative programs on MDRM in the RCC Member Countries. As of the 5th RCC Meeting, 10 countries had answered the survey which consisted of three sections relating to MDRD in i) national development planning, ii) specific priority sectors, and iii) other sectors. These responses would serve as useful references for the review and selection of the Priority Implementation Projects as well as for the identification of useful case studies for the development of the guidelines.

SESSION IV-B: MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO NATIONAL PLANNING PROCESSES

Following the refreshment break, Mr. Tabrani and Mr. Gunawardana co-chaired the second sub-session facilitated by Mr. Rego, and commenced with three RCC Member countries presenting their efforts on mainstreaming DRM into their national processes, and consisted of presentations on the proposed approach for the RCC-MDRD program related to Mainstreaming DRM into the National Planning Processes, the outline for the Guidelines on Mainstreaming DRM into the National Planning Processes to be developed for this approach and the Integration of Disaster Reduction into Environmental Impact Assessment.

INITIATIVES TAKEN BY THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS OF INDIA IN THE FIELD OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT

The paper “Initiatives Taken by the Ministry of Home Affairs in the Field of Disaster Management” was presented by Mr. Chattopadhyay, in which he recounted the natural hazards that afflicts the Indian sub-continent and the major disasters in the country from 1990 to 2005. He outlined the responsibilities of the Disaster Management Division, of the Home Affair Ministry and explained that the National Disaster Management Framework underlined that in India, the basic responsibility for undertaking rescue, relief and rehabilitation measures during disaster events was under the jurisdiction of the State Government, whilst the Central Government’s role was to supplement the efforts of the State Governments through financial and logistical support. Recent approaches to disaster management included a change in orientation from response and relief to include mitigation and preparedness and a multi-dimensional and multi-sectoral approach emphasizing the incorporation of risk reduction in development planning.

Mr. Chattopadhyay also explained the disaster management framework and the institutional set-up arrangements to be applied in the event of a disaster and elaborated on the National Disaster Management Roadmap which formed a template on which the State Governments could base their individual disaster management plans. This roadmap outlined the establishment of institutional mechanisms, mitigation and prevention measures, legal and policy frameworks, financial mechanisms, national preparedness, early warning and response systems, and human resource development and capacity building initiatives.

DISASTER MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK OF LAO PDR

Mr. Phetsavang, presented a paper on the Disaster Management Political Framework of Lao PDR, providing details on National Decrees and Strategy Notes on Disaster Management as well as the convening and members of the National Committee for Disaster Management (NDMC) and outlining its mandate, framework and responsibilities. He also elaborated on the establishment of an institutional structure at the national, provincial, district and village level, assignments to the NDMC and the aims of the country strategy note to 2020, to 2010, the goals for 2005.

The Country Strategy for Disaster Management focuses on four areas, namely i) to safeguard sustainable development and reduce the damage of natural or manmade disasters to community society and country economy, ii) a shift in strategy from relief and mitigation

after disaster impact to community, society and economy of government organizations to preparedness before disaster strike emphasizing on flood, drought, landslides and fire parallel with continuing mitigate in post-disaster period, iii) turn from responsibility of government only agency people centered in dealing with disaster by building capacity for community; and iv) promote forever protection of the environment and country rich such as forest, land and water.

The practices involved in implementing these aims and goals have i) resulted in the National Disaster Management Office (NDMO) initiating, persuading, convincing and helping to integrate DM concepts in the work of the sectoral ministries and projects, ii) built strong networks with the countries stakeholders and partners, iii) active participation on the implementation of regional and international programs such as the ASEAN Regional Program for Disaster Management (ARPD), and iv) the establishment of a close working relationships with the UN Agencies, INGOs and local NGOs. He concluded by stating that the Country Strategy Note for Disaster Management was being implemented through the convening of meetings, workshops, seminars, consultation, joint projects on health, agriculture, education and safety in both urban and rural areas.

THE PROCESS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHINA'S DISASTER REDUCTION PLAN (1998-2010) AND PROGRESS MADE

Dr. Wang Zhenyao, Director General, Department of Disaster and Social Relief, Ministry of Civil Affairs, China presented a paper on the process in the development of China's Disaster Reduction Plan and Progress Made. Dr. Wang began by elaborating on the different types of natural hazards faced in China, the differences between their frequency, magnitude and geographical occurrences and the losses and damages that are incurred on an annual basis and over the last 10 years. He informed the participants that the distinguishing features of the China's National Natural Disaster Reduction Plan (1998-2010) included i) its formulation in accordance with the 9th Five Year Economic and Social Development Plan and the 2010 Long-term objective, the involvement of more than 100 multidisciplinary scientists and 30 Ministries in its drafting and revision, iii) the provisions of recommendations of local leaders, iv) the support and assistance by the UNDP and v) the ratification of the Plan by members of the State Council and the Premier.

The main principles of the plan included i) that disaster reduction should serve the national and economic development; ii) that prevention should be taken as a priority in combination with resistance and relief, iii) that the role of science, technology and education should be fully visible, iv) that central, local governments as well as all social sectors should be mobilized to reduce disasters and international exchange and cooperation amongst these stakeholders should be strengthened; v) that public awareness and knowledge should be enhanced and that vi) the government's capacity to disaster reduction should be notably improved and that an integrated system of a modernized disaster reduction management should come into being from the central to the local governments. The strategies used to implement the plans included i) the use of mass communication to publicize the National Plan through newspaper articles and TV programs, and the conduct of meetings, ii) an annual review of the implementation of the plans by each ministry, iii) the development of local

government plans complying with the National Plan, iv) the set-up of demonstration programs of local disaster reduction and v) the close combination of disaster reduction with disaster relief.

The actions that had been taken to reduce disasters were i) institutional building to establish an effective management and coordinative administrative structures, ii) the implementation of large scale DM projects to combat flood, drought, pest-stricken farmland, potential earthquakes, storms, landslides and mud-rock flows, iii) the mapping out of an emergency scheme at central and local government levels, iv) the establishment of a disaster monitoring and coordination framework on disaster early warning system, v) the strengthening of the disaster relief logistic system, iv) the improvement of the disaster emergency response system, vii) the mobilization of resources for disaster relief from different sectors in society, viii) the launch preparation for a satellite to monitor national hazards, ix) the conducting of workshops, training and public awareness activities, and x) international cooperation. He concluded by relating that the general further actions on disaster reduction to be undertaken were i) the further refinement of DRM as a basis of ensuring sustainable development of the national economy and society, ii) further identification of DRM priorities, iii) further improvement of the national disaster management system, iv) the broadening of the fund-raising channel to increase inputs for disaster reduction and v) the strengthening of the legal system on disaster management.

PROPOSED APPROACH TO MAINSTREAM DRM INTO NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROCESSES

Following the country presentations, Mr. Rego presented the RCC-MDRD proposed three pronged approach to mainstreaming DRM into National Development Processes focusing on finance, planning and development processes, environment and natural resource management processes and through the National Disaster Management Offices.

Plans to Mainstream DRM into the finance, planning and development policy, planning and implementation process included i) ensuring that the National Development Plans of the RCC Member Countries include a section on DRM, ii) ensuring that the Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers of the RCC Member Countries incorporates an analysis of disaster impacts and a section on the reduction of disaster risks and iii) ensuring that DRM is included as a priority in the in-country assessment and multi-year program framework of international development agencies (i.e. bilateral donors, European Union, multilateral banks and UN-Agencies).

Incorporating DRM into environment policy, planning and implementation would focus on incorporating disaster risk impact assessment as an integral part of the Environment Impact Assessment process for all new development projects, and to establish links between the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) under the UN Framework Convention for Climate Change in each RCC country.

Lastly, the approach seeks to work with the National Disaster Management Offices in i) developing National Disaster Risk Management Plans covering actions by all Ministries and Agencies and link these to the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, and ii)

promoting and assisting the involvement of the National Disaster Management Offices in their national development plan formulation, the poverty reduction strategies, NAPA, country assessments and program formulation by development agencies.

GUIDELINES FOR MAINSTREAMING DRM INTO NATIONAL PLANNING PROCESSES

Ms. Geethi Karunaratne, Consultant, ADPC presented the outline Guidelines and also gave specific examples.

INTEGRATION OF DISASTER REDUCTION INTO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Ms. Geethi Karunaratne, Consultant, ADPC began her presentation by explaining that the integration of natural hazards mitigation into the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) process was not a sectoral issue, but a sub-theme of national development policy, planning and implementation. Acceptance of this viewpoint would result in the integration of disaster risk impact assessments in projects of all sectors through the EIA process. She explained that EIAs were required for specific types of project exceeding a specific value. Recommended considerations that should be taken into account in the EIA by developers included i) the assessment of presence and frequency of natural hazards in the area, ii) an estimation of their potential impact on the proposed development activity (vulnerable assessment and risk assessment), iii) the inclusion of measures to reduce the vulnerability in the proposed development activity and iv) possible increased threat of prevalent natural hazards and v) if new hazards will be triggered. Possible DRM measures that should be taken into account during the feasibility study included the choice of location and availability of land, whilst measures during the design phase included site investigations and surveys, alternative design concepts and appropriate specifications of materials to be used and workmanship.

INSTITUTIONALIZING COMMUNITY-BASED DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT IN GOVERNMENT POLICY, PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. Zubair Murshed, Program Manager, Partnerships for Disaster Reduction – Southeast Asia (PDRSEA), ADPC shared with the participants the elements of the third phase of the DIPECHO funded PDRSEA program which seeks to promote the important role in which multiple government ministries and local government departments can play in strengthening the capacity of community groups and members to take actions for disaster risk reduction. The role envisaged would entail providing, information, training, funding, technology, physical inputs and technical assistance.

Key features of the program implementation strategy were i) orienting government officials on community-based disaster risk management; ii) action planning workshops with the involvement of multiple ministries, e.g. education, health, agriculture, communications, finance, environment and water resources, etc; iii) dissemination of action plans to generate support from within the government systems and from the international community; and iv) the production of a handbook for local government officials on community-based disaster risk management.

PLENARY DISCUSSION

SESSION IV-C: MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO SECTORS

This sub-session focused on mainstreaming DRM into specific sectors and was co-chaired by Dr. Wang and Ms. Kulchanarat and facilitated by Mr. Kessler. In addition to the presentations made, a paper on Mainstreaming DRM into the Health Sector was also distributed.

PROPOSED APPROACH TO MAINSTREAMING INTO THE SPECIFIC SECTORS

A presentation on the overview and rationale behind the RCC-MDRD program approach to the integration of DRM into specific sectors was given by Mr. Rego, in which he outlined the relevant Ministries whom the NDMOs should establish links with under the identified priority sectors of health, education, agriculture, finance and urban infrastructure and housing. The specific themes of focus identified under the specific sectors included:

Urban Infrastructure

- Incorporation of disaster impact assessment as part of the planning process before the construction of new roads and bridges, and
- Promotion of the use of hazard information in land-use planning and zoning programs.

Urban and Rural Housing Development

- Promotion of increased use of hazard-resilient designs in rural housing in hazard-prone areas,
- Promotion of the utilization of national building codes that have special provisions for enhanced design standards for buildings in areas affected by natural hazards, and
- Promotion of the compliance and enforcement of local building laws requiring prescribed standards under national building codes in urban hazard-prone areas.

Financial Services

- Incorporation of provisions in micro-financing schemes to have flexible repayment schedules that can be activated in the event of recipients being affected by natural disasters, and
- Encouragement of financial service sectors and local capital markets to develop schemes for financing disaster risk reduction measures.

Agriculture

- Promotion of effective programs of contingency crop planning to deal with year to year climate variations,
- Promotion of effective programs of crop diversification including the use of hazard resistant crops to deal with shifts in climate patterns,
- Ensuring sustainable livelihoods in areas of recurrent climate risks by promoting supplementary income generation from off-farm and non-farm activities, and

- Promotion of effective insurance and credit schemes to compensate for crop damage and losses to livelihoods due to natural hazards.

Education

- Incorporation of DRM modules into the school curriculum in RCC Member Countries,
- Construction of all new schools located in hazard-prone areas in the RCC Member Countries to higher standards of hazard resilience, and
- Addition of features in schools hazard prone areas for use as emergency shelters such as facilities for water, sanitation and cooking.

Health

- Promotion of programs in the RCC Member Countries by the Ministry of Health to identify hospitals and health facilities that are located in hazard-prone areas, analysis of their internal and external vulnerability during emergencies, and increased hazard resilience of these hospitals, and
- Preparation and implementation of a Hospital Preparedness Plan for all such health facilities.

MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO THE EDUCATION SECTOR

A joint presentation on mainstreaming DRD into the Education Sector was given by Mr. Murshed and Ms Win in which they rationalized the focus on the education sector as it increases the awareness and preparedness of the society at large, is an indirect means of building capacity of future professionals and public officials, children are amongst the most vulnerable groups, educational institutions make-up a major proportion of public infrastructure, and schools are commonly used as evacuation centers. Reiterating the specific focus of the RCC-MDRD Program relating to the education sector, he cited numerous examples of successful cases of integrating DRM into the education sector.

The recommended process of mainstreaming DRM into the education sector included i) the establishment of an organizational mechanism such as a multi-disciplinary committee to facilitate the process of mainstreaming, ii) development of new policies which include provisions for the adoption of DRR as a taught subject, ensuring hazard-sensitive construction of all newly built schools and compliance by both public and private sector institution, iii) the development of a comprehensive curriculum encompassing the orientation of authorities, a review of existing curricula, the provision of teacher's training, the design of a new curricula, the testing, adaptation and adoption of the new curricula, the development of complimentary educational activities and revision and reviews.

The construction of hazard-resilient schools requires the i) orientation of authorities and teachers, ii) conduct of risk and vulnerability assessments, iii) mobilization of the community, iv) identification of available materials and design, v) computation of additional costs, and v) the construction of the building. Lessons learned on the construction of hazard-resilient schools were that i) influential stakeholders should to be convinced of the need for

action, ii) trust should be built with the educational authorities and teachers, iii) continuous support should be provided to develop the curriculum and structural hazards resiliency, iv) training should be provided on a continuous basis, v) emphasis should be placed on the use of local capacity and materials, and that vi) low-cost technology should be transferred to the local community. Additional challenges included the engagement of the society outside the education sector such as religious institutions, media, the entertainment industry and the associations of professionals.

MAINSTREAMING RISK REDUCTION IN AGRICULTURE

Ms. Lolita Bildan, ADPC presented a paper on Mainstreaming Risk Reduction in Agriculture and commenced by citing examples of good practices in India, Bangladesh and Vietnam where farmers were engaged in cyclone cropping adjustments and the restructuring of cropping patterns, early crop diversification and boro rice cultivation to escape floods; and adjustments to the flood season in the Mekong Delta, respectively. Details were given of the new approach of the early crop diversification interventions in Bangladesh and its impacts. This new approach demonstrates a fundamental shift from traditional approaches and involves alternative cropping patterns which take into account climate and market risks, land-use characteristics and economic returns and adopts these agro-climatic features in the cropping system.

Analysis of inter-seasonal variability of the Indian Monsoon, drought occurrences and the subsequent policy response has led to the development of post-drought 2002 policy initiatives which have included the acceleration of watershed management programs, crop diversification to stabilize farmer's incomes against weather fluctuations, agricultural risk management in the form of farm income and weather derivative insurance schemes, and the institutionalizing of climate information generation and application system through which there is an interface with farmers, a revamp of monsoon forecasts and extended weather prediction for 20-25 days.

MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INTO INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND THE HOUSING SECTOR

Mr. Arambepola and Ms. Prahbu, ADPC listed the types of major infrastructure projects that exist and highlighted the practices that place these projects at risk. This included the siting of the project in hazard-prone areas, designing and construction to sub-standard design building codes, the lack of maintenance or ignorance of maintenance regulations, the implementation of post-disaster recovery programs without the consideration of potential or existing risks and the non-application of appropriate design event parameters for designs.

Options for mainstreaming DRM into infrastructure development programs included the i) revision of construction practices and land-use regulations, ii) application of risk assessment data in site selection, iii) design and siting, the establishment of controls through lending and financial institutions, iv) introduction of downstream preparedness planning for projects such as reservoir, power and irrigation projects, v) policy decisions on design of recovery programs, vi) strengthening of the EIA process, vii) review of the feasibility study criteria for high magnitude less frequent events for selected facilities, viii) capacity building of

professionals, project approving authorities, project appraisal teams and financial institutions, ix) introduction of risk transfer for large-scale infrastructure projects and x) incentives to undertake research and development programs.

The challenges in mainstreaming DRM for engineered and non-engineered housing, include the strengthening or retrofitting of existing buildings which is an effective mechanism which is rarely observed, the promotion of safer construction practices for the future which is observed in demonstration projects and carefully engineered construction, and during repair and reconstruction during the recovery phase, which is observed occasionally.

Strengthening of existing infrastructure and housing provide opportunities to promote the use of insurance and regular inspection of structural integrity but can however pose complex and expensive challenges, the lack of adequate technical expertise and hence are difficult to finance. Safer construction practices for future engineered housing would entail regular inspection during and after construction, the risk assessment of selected sites, and institutionalization within housing and urban development authority. For non-engineered future housing practices, mainstreaming would encompass the wide-distribution of simple and 'easy-to-build' strengthening techniques, the training of masons (human resource building) and public awareness. Mainstreaming DRM into repair and reconstruction would require avoiding the creation of new risks, to build using locally available materials using local skills, techniques, labor and with the consultation of resident community and participatory approaches for cost-effective raising of awareness.

Key overarching concerns included i) institutional and policy constraints, ii) inadequate human resources, insufficient demand for safer housing and the non-use of locally appropriate building materials and familiar construction techniques.

SESSION IV-D: GROUP DISCUSSION ON MAINSTREAMING

Day three of the Meeting began with the presentation of the group discussions on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Policy, Planning and Implementation, which had taken place the previous day. This sub-session was co-chaired by Mr. Fazlur Rahman, Secretary in charge, Ministry of Food and Disaster Management of Bangladesh and Mr. Iiayan K.H.S. Hammad, Assistant to the General Inspector, General Directorate of the Jordan Civil Defense of Jordan and facilitated by Mr. Rego.

Three groups had been formed, two of which comprised of RCC Members and the third of the UN Agencies, Donors, RCC Partners and Observers. The RCC Members had been requested to review the list of proposed guidelines and themes, to select themes of high priority, to provide examples of good practice from RCC Member Countries, to suggest possible consultants and institutional partners, and to list existing documents with respect to Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into National Planning Processes (Group 1) and Mainstreaming Disaster Risk in Specific Sectors (Group 2). Supporting the RCC Program on Mainstreaming DRM into Development was the focus of Group 3.

Presentation of Group Discussions

Mainstreaming DRR into National Planning Processes

Upon the request of Mr. Rahman, Mr. Mijares, Assistant Director General, Regional Development Office of the National Economic and Development Authority of the Philippines, presented the discussion of **Group 1**. This group had been chaired by Mr. Fazlur Rahman from Bangladesh and comprised RCC delegates from Cambodia, Iran, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mongolia the Philippines, Thailand and Timor Leste. Whilst deliberating on the themes for mainstreaming DRR into National Planning and Processes, the group ranked the following as high priority areas of focus:

- Mainstreaming DRR into the National Development Plan (Theme 1.1);
- Implementing the Hyogo Framework of Action in RCC Member Countries (Theme 1.4);
- Mainstreaming DRR into National Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (Theme 1.2); and
- Institutionalization of Community-based DRM in Government Policy (Theme 1.9).

Having noted the four themes of high priority, the group also noted the importance of the themes relating to Mainstreaming DRR into the UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework Process in RCC Member Countries (Theme 1.6) and Mainstreaming DRR into the National Environmental Impact Assessment for New Development Projects (Theme 1.7).

In the identification of the best practices, the group was able to cull out some of the common elements that had been cited by its members. These were:

- The presence of political will as reflected in the establishment of a national platform to be headed by a person of position and authority and founded on a sound legal basis, and
- The willingness and commitment by the local government units, NGOs, private sector as well as the community in sharing the burden of addressing the financial requirement of disaster management.

The common challenges faced in mainstreaming disaster risk management included:

- establishing and strengthening the legal basis for comprehensive disaster risk management activities;
- expanding the coverage of initiatives to cover the whole country
- the continuing issues of limited resources; and
- identifying common national strategies, especially when dealing with both multi-lateral organizations and bilateral institutions to facilitate dialogue and unity between the different stakeholders in terms of focus and the priorities.

Mainstreaming DRR in Selected Sectors

The outputs of the discussions of **Group 2** were presented by Director Elma C Aldea, and centered on the themes relating to mainstreaming DRM into the priority sectors, agriculture, urban planning and infrastructure, urban and rural housing, financial services, education and health. The group comprised of RCC Members from China, India, Iran, Jordan, Lao PDR, the

Philippines and Thailand. The high priority themes under these sectors, examples of best practices and possible consultants identified were as follows:

Agriculture Sector - Mainstreaming DRR by effective insurance and credit schemes to compensate for crop damage and loss to livelihood (Theme 2.4).

The discussions revealed that credit schemes and crop insurance were available in most of the RCC Members Countries. However, the practices in Pakistan and the Philippines were selected for special attention:

Pakistan: Victims of disaster who incur damage to crops and livelihood are compensated by the Government, through suspension of taxes for the period, authorization for the application of soft loans and provision of grants for the replanting planting of lost or damaged crops.

Philippines: Department of Agriculture provides seeds for replanting of crops, the affected farmer are given access to the local calamity fund and priority is placed on repairing of farm-to-market roads.

Urban Planning and Infrastructure Sector - Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Impact Assessment into construction of new road and bridges (Theme 3.2).

The unanimous best practice selected under this theme was that from *Iran* in the wake of the Bam Earthquake which entailed a Retrofitting Plan for private and public building, infrastructures, facilities and lifelines as a preventive measure which includes codification of strategies and policies, codification of safety and performance level of key structures and infrastructure, codification and notification of a retrofitting guidelines for resilient buildings to executive bodies, training of engineers, provision of funds, guidelines and monitoring of research and studies for vital facilities such as hospitals, schools, oil refineries, telecoms, etc.

Iran was identified as a source for possible consultants from which many lessons could be learnt.

Urban and Rural Housing Sector –Mainstreaming DRR by promoting the compliance and enforcement of local building laws in urban hazard prone areas (Theme 4.3).

The majority of RCC Member countries were found to have mainstreamed and enforced housing laws in local areas, however, experiences from *Iran* was highlighted as an example of good practice and that the possible consultants should be from Iran.

Financial Service Sector – Mainstreaming DRR by encouraging financial services sector and local capital markets to finance DRR measures (Activity 5.2).

Although this theme was widely practiced in the RCC Member countries, *Philippines* was cited as a good example where support to DRR sectors stem from local and international NGOs/ organizations such as JICA, Save the Children, UNDP, ADRC, WBI, UNHCR and others. No possible consultants were identified.

Education Sector - Mainstreaming Disaster Risk concepts into the school curriculum (Theme 6.1)

The best practice identified was that from *India* where DR has long been integrated into the school curriculum at all levels. Possible consultants from India were to be determined.

Health Sector – Mainstreaming DRR by the development and implementation of disaster preparedness planning for hospitals and health facilities (Theme 7.2).

During the discussions, the *Philippines* example was cited where all government/ military hospitals from national down to local levels and major medical centers have Hospital Disaster Preparedness plans. Department of Health and the Armed Forces of the Philippines also implement the Hospital Emergency Incident command system for mass casualty situation.

Director Aldea personally recommended, Dr. Carmencita Banatin, head of the Hospital Emergency Management System in the Philippines as well as Dr. Teodora Herbosa from the same organization. Should these consultants not be available, Director Aldea volunteered herself as she had a Masters Degree in Hospital Administration as well as hospital disaster management plans.

Supporting the RCC Program on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development

The members of **Group 3** were asked to indicate the themes of interest for which they would like to form an institutional partnership with the RCC to develop and produce guidelines documents, to identify existing documents that should be used as a base document to be adapted in the development of the guidelines, and to suggested other ways in which their institutions would be interested in cooperating with the RCC on its MDRD Program.

Dr. Nancy Lewis from the East-West Center presented the findings of the group. General comments on the guidelines acknowledged that MDRR in the priority areas needed to be summarized within a broader framework and categorized into:

- Mainstreaming into Policy
- Mainstreaming into Sectors
- Mainstreaming into Community

The members also expressed the importance of having a common language and common understanding across donor community. Mr. Kessler elaborated further that the importance of this issue relating to donor appreciation which revolved on and manifests itself through a common vocabulary. It was important that the RCC Members had a clear and common understanding of the concept of mainstreaming and the activities under the RCC-MDRD program. This would allow all the RCC Members to speak with a same and united voice when engaged in discussions with the donor community and other stakeholders.

Whilst discussing themes of interest, the group focused mainly on *Mainstreaming of DRR in National Planning Processes* and identified 10 themes for specific attention. These are listed below in order of importance as determined by the group.

- Mainstreaming DRR into the National Development Plans (Theme 1.1)
- Implementing the HFA in RCC Member Countries (Theme 1.4)

- Mainstreaming DRR into in-country assessments and multi-year program framework of International Development Agencies (Theme 1.5)
- Mainstreaming DRR into the UN Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework Process in RCC Member Countries (Theme 1.6)
- Mainstreaming DRR into the National Environmental Impact Assessment for New Development Projects (Theme 1.7)
- Institutionalization of community based DRM in government policy (Theme 1.9)

Proposed Addition of Theme on Donor Awareness

In addition, a new theme relating to donor awareness was suggested for inclusion. This is also a topic under the ADPC-UNESCAP DIPECHO funded Partnership for Disaster Reduction – South East Asia program. Mr. Murshed informed the participants that a regional one day workshop would be conducted with the participation of donors, particularly those based in SE Asia. He requested that the RCC participants to reflect on the content of the workshop and its expected outputs and to provide ADPC with their inputs for the workshop. The issue of the participation of RCC Members at this workshop would be discussed with UNESCAP and DIPECHO, especially in relation to costs and the capacity under which they would attend the meeting.

Mr. Mijares commented that he observed a common interface between that of Group 3 and Group 1 where discussions on unity and priority areas were identified. It would be incumbent on the RCC Members to clarify what their priorities were to the donor community.

Group 3's discussions relating to ***Mainstreaming DRR into Specific Sectors*** focused primarily on the Housing and Education sectors and with the ***addition of sector on Environment and Natural Resource Management***. Ms Mellgren elaborated further on the latter by informing the delegates that Sida had identified active and relevant cross-cutting impacts between the environment and disaster management sectors. Promoting the environment sector within this context, allows for the identification of the challenges and possibilities and the capitalizing of such energies. This additional theme would take into account not only the environment projects related specifically to reduce environmental degradation but also natural resources in its broadest sense where climate issues could be included. There was also a pedagogical or practical advantage of promoting the environmental as a sector within disaster management as it had already manifest itself in the form of the Environmental Impact Assessment tool for sensitizing development projects where disaster reduction aspect could be easily inserted. This could provide an initial demonstration effect upon which the development sector and community could build on. Mr. Rego commented that this had been discussed amongst the RCC-5 Steering Committee and was being included in the Hanoi RCC-5 Statement and that he was pleased that there was consensus between all the groups on this issue.

Plenary Discussion

Initiative involving policy makers and parliamentarians

Commenting further on raising the issue of mainstreaming disaster risk reduction with policy makers and parliamentarians, Dr. Lewis informed the participants that the East West Center have been working with parliamentarians and policy makers in the region over the decades and had recently acquired resources to initiate further activities. She reported that the President of the EWC, Charles Morrison has had discussions with the Executive Director of ADPC, Dr. Suvit and Mr. Rego about using these resources for MDRR and that a planning meeting would be held. Some of the topics to be deliberated over were if these initiatives should be undertaken at the regional or a national basis.

Increasing the Impact of the RCC Meetings

Upon the suggestion by Dr. Le Huu Ti Economics Affairs Officer, Water Resources Section Environmental and Sustainable Development Division, UN-ESCAP that the RCC Meetings should be more interactive, Mr. Rego replied that ADPC looked forward to support from UNESCAP on enhancing the interactive nature of the RCC and in convening add-on forums to the RCC Meetings.

SESSION IV-E: NEXT STEPS ON MAINSTREAMING PRIORITY IMPLEMENTATION PROJECTS AND THE PREPARATION OF GUIDELINES

Following the Session IV-D, Mr. Rego noted that the purpose of Session IV-D was to review the list of priority themes for the PIPs and for the production of the Guidelines. Following the expansive discussions that have been held, the RCC-MDRD program has to date approximately 30 sub-themes which have been identified as priority areas of action for mainstreaming. Bearing in mind that there are 25 RCC Member countries, the resulting figure of possible projects would total up to 600, and pose a significant challenge from a project management and facilitation perspective collectively for the RCC. Thus, it was necessary to further identify projects for priority implementation with the limited resources available.

The discussions that had taken place the day before, and that had been presented earlier in the morning, was one of the steps taken to identify the areas of highest priorities and had provided one set of answers. Mr. Rego proceeded to share the second set of inputs, these derived from requests for submission of initial proposals for priority implementation projects. A summary of indications revealed that 23 PIP themes had been identified by 11 countries was distributed. Themes of interest in ***Mainstreaming DRR into National Development Processes*** included:

Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into the National Development Plan (Theme 1.1, indicated by one country);

Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into the National Poverty Reduction Strategy (Theme 1.2, indicated by three countries); and

Developing and Implementing the National Disaster Risk Reduction Plan with inputs from all relevant Ministries and Agencies (Theme 1.3, indicated by three countries).

These were similar to the set of discussions presented in the morning, with the inclusion of “Institutionalizing CBDRM into Government Policy (Theme 1.9)”. He remarked that in the light of the interest in this theme, the DIPECHO funded ADPC-UNESCAP PDRSEA project was much welcomed and being undertaken in five of the RCC Member Countries.

Under the *agricultural sector*, Mr. Rego noted with interest that three of the countries in SE Asia which have been severely affected by drought over the last three years have indicated a desire to implement on a priority programs related to “Promoting Effective Programs of Contingency Crop Planning to deal with year to year climate variations” (Theme 2.1). This echoed strong calls made at the several of the MRC meetings including the last Annual Flood Forum to undertake action on drought mitigation. The other PIP cited by one RCC Member Country related to “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction by Promoting Supplementary Income Generation from Off-farm and Non-farm Activities” (Theme 2.3).

The two themes relating to Urban Planning and Infrastructure, drew one submissions each on “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Impact Assessment into construction of new roads and bridges” (Theme 3.1) and “Promoting the use of hazard risk information in land-use planning and zoning programs”;

In the area of *Rural and Urban Housing*, RCC Members had submitted PIPs for “Promoting hazard-resilient designs (e.g. flood proofing, seismic safety, etc) in rural housing in hazard-prone areas” (Theme 4.1, indicated by two countries), “Promoting the use of national building codes that have special provisions for enhanced design standards for buildings in areas affected by natural disasters (Theme 4.2, indicated by one country)” and “Promoting the compliance and enforcement of local building laws that requires standards prescribed in building codes in urban hazard-prone areas (Theme 4.3, indicated by one country).

Incorporating micro-financing schemes to have flexible re-payment schedules that can be activated in the event of recipients being affected by natural disasters (Theme 5.1), attracted submission from one RCC Member country relating to the *financial services sector*. The theme which a significant number of RCC Member Countries expressed interest in fell under the *education sector*, particularly incorporating disaster risk concepts into the school curriculum (Theme 6.1, indicated by five countries).

The requests for submission of the PIP were useful as they indicated the top most themes on which the RCC-MDRD program should be focused, with regards to selecting PIP for implementation, and provided impetus for the development of all the other guidelines. It also acted to facilitate the formulation of new proposal to put forward to specific partners, UN agencies and donors. This was the key recommendation that derived from the 1st Meeting of the Advisory Panel for the RCC-MDRD program. Mr. Rego thanked the RCC Members for their PIP submissions of interest, which provided welcomed feedback which assisted the challenging task of program implementation and provided credibility and clarity when engaging the mobilization additional resources from partners and donor agencies.

The presence of AusAID, ECHO and Sida at the RCC-5, as well as country representatives from the World Bank and the Embassy of Netherlands, allowed for the concerns and priorities of the RCC Member Countries to be aired to the donors.

Mr. Rego informed the Meeting that ADPC had had informal discussions with some of the RCC Member Countries who have provided strong indications that they were interested in submitting specific proposals. These countries were already engaged in significant projects funded either from their own national budgets or from external resources, and in order not to place a burden on the limited resource available for the RCC-MDRD program, initial proposals for PIPs have thus not been submitted. ADPC has welcomed the documentation of those experiences into case studies of good practice for use as a resource for the collective process. Parts of these engagements have been in consultation with ministries of planning or finance, partner agencies from the UN and with bilateral donors.

Mr. Rego encouraged the RCC participants to review the outline for the production of guidelines which was developed based on consultation with the RCC-MDRD Advisory Panel; the draft guideline for Hospital Disaster Preparedness Planning; and the outline implementation plans for the mainstreaming in national development planning, environmental impact assessment, hazard resilient design in rural housing and the enforcement of building by-laws in the urban housing sector, that had been prepared. He also requested the RCC Member Countries to refer these documents to their counter part ministries and agencies in the relevant sectors. He also appealed to the donors and partner agencies at the Meeting, who are interested in these themes, to examine and engage in an effective process to jointly develop and produce these guidelines.

PACIFIC REGION IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION ADOPTED AT THE WCDR

Upon the invitation of Mr. Rahman, Dr. Netatua Prescott, Sustainable Development Adviser, SOPAC gave a presentation on the Pacific Region Implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action adopted at the WCDR. She began her presentation by sharing with the participants of the regional issues faced by the region. This included the presence of a unique fragile environment, distinct and diverse cultures, limited natural resources, low economic diversification, geographic extremes, frequent natural disasters and demographic transitions. Responses that the region was adopting to address these issues included the preparation of a Pacific Plan which focused on sustainable economic growth and development, governance and security, regional policies.

Following the listing of SOPACs programs, namely oceans and islands, community lifelines and community risk, she elaborated on the concept of the latter. This focused on building safer communities through improved disaster risk management practices by strengthening resilience to disasters, mitigating the effects of hazards and mainstreaming disaster risk management. Specific activities that had been undertaken included the strengthening of the National Disaster Management Office, provision of disaster and risk management training, the promotion of Environment Vulnerability Index (EVI) and the advocacy of the Comprehensive Hazard and Risk Management (CHARM) tool.

Details of the framework structure of the Pacific Islands Disaster Risk Reduction and Disaster Management Framework for Action 2005-2015 was explained including its vision, mission, guiding principles, priorities for action, the six thematic areas, expected outcomes,

national, regional and international implementation and follow-up, resource mobilization and conclusion. The plan envisages safer, more resilient Pacific Island nations and communities to disasters, so that Pacific peoples may achieve sustainable livelihoods and lead free and worthwhile lives, whilst the mission of the plan is to build the capacity of Pacific island communities by accelerating the implementation of DRR and DM policies, planning and programming to address current and emerging challenges. Goals to achieve the mission included the i) development and strengthening of DRR and DM, including preparedness, response and relief/recovery systems, ii) integration of DRR and DM into national sustainable development planning and decision-making processes at all levels; and iii) strengthening an effective partnership between all stakeholders in DRR and DM.

SESSION IV-F: DIALOGUE WITH BILATERAL AND MULTI-LATERAL DONORS AND UN AGENCIES ON MDRD

This sub-session consisted of a panel discussion where representatives from bilateral and multi-lateral donors, UN Agencies and RCC partners for all observers from donor and ADPC partners were invited to sit on the panel. They included AusAID, East-West Center, ECHO, GTZ, Netherlands the Proventium Consortium, Sida, UN-ESCAP, UNDP, UN-ISDR, UN-OCHA and the WB with Mr. Marc Gordon, Technical Assistant DIPECHO-South East Asia, facilitating the sub-session.

The discussions addressed the following issues:

- Connecting appropriate resources within line ministries with national platforms,
- Effective engagement with policy makers and decision makers beyond the community of DRR stakeholders; and
- Facilitating the creation of DRR programming capacity within individual sectoral line ministries (planning departments).

These issues were considered within the context of reinforcing capacities at national, sub-national and local levels. The main aims of the sub-session were to explore and discuss the means by which the dialogue and discussion on MDRR and the strategic formulation process could be taken forward beyond the community of disaster reduction stakeholders in a proactive, practical manner to achieve concrete, comprehensive programming whilst advocating the merits of this approach into the areas. The panel thus sought to provoke reactions from the floor and questions to the panel.

Connecting appropriate resources within line ministries with national platforms

Mr. Laurent Msellati from the World Bank expressed concerned that too much focus was being placed on the line ministries especially in countries like Vietnam which is involved in a very progressive decentralization agenda. Figures from a recently completed public expenditure review indicated that the budget of MARD which encompasses the national disaster budget has evolved from 40% managed at the provincial level five years ago to the current 80%. Decision makers in a country like Vietnam have to include provincial and local government leaders who are particularly important when it comes to planning processes, setting priorities and as receivers of large amounts of financial resources.

Madame Cora agreed that decentralization is the present agenda of governance in many countries. The Philippines is a noteworthy example with the creation of local governments as early as 1991, but much is still left to be desired in terms of the kind of engagements for project that cut across communities for example rivers.

Effective engagement with policy makers and decision makers beyond the community of DRR stakeholders

Millennium Development Goals and National Poverty Reduction Strategies

On the issue on the effective dissemination of disaster reduction and mainstreaming message beyond that of the disaster management community, Ms. Eva Mellgren, Senior Regional Advisor Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict Management, SIDA explained that the Swedish position is that disaster prevention and management is a development issue and poverty and that it should be targeted in an integrated manner towards the achievements of the Millennium Development Goals and poverty reduction. This concept is not revolutionary but is a basis of their work and it is important and should not be overlooked. The majority of Sida's engagement in risk reduction is part and parcel of programs with other targeted objectives (e.g. poverty reduction objectives as well as specific disaster reduction projects in some countries).

Tools for Effective Dissemination and Coordination of DRM Concepts

Ms Mellgren provided further personal insights from her experiences in disaster reduction, commenting that effectiveness, efficiencies and success of disaster risk reduction actions began with the undertaking responsibility of the analyses of the outcomes of the programs and determining their efficiency. She was particularly impressed by the presentation made by Lao PDR where there was a goal setting or country strategy note on goals where indicators of success had been included in the outset of the project. She concluded that the challenge of efficient budget decision-making amongst the disaster management community, it between regional or national divide, could be elaborated with greater sophistication using the available tools. This would make quantities in economic and social terms of efficiencies of disaster reduction action more visible. Examples of this included the pointing out the sphere indicators by Oxfam, tools for economic analysis of investment of projects by the Prevention Consortium in addition to the Lao example. This is a challenge that the RCC should address with the support of ADPC.

Mr. Nikko Bakker, Water Management Expert of the Netherlands Embassy of Hanoi, explained the relationship between the Netherlands Embassy and disaster management and mitigation. They, together with UNDP, supported the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development on behalf of the Government of Vietnam to establish the National Disaster Mitigation Partnership (NDM-P) which brings together members of the donor community, the government, civil societies and the number of NGOs involved in the disaster reduction sector) and supports initiatives in the field of risk reduction and disaster management. Mr. Msellati further highlighted the need for effective coordination such as the national platform mechanism provided by the NDM-P.

Dr. Lewis from the East West Center informed the delegates that it has found its 35 years of working with journalists in the region can be an important way of raising public awareness and effecting policy makers.

Dr. Ti commented that when the consequences of the Asian tsunami are discussed, in terms of action oriented policy, action lies at the national level, and therefore, it was important to mobilize national resources for the disaster reduction. The budget required for action is negligible therefore we should ensure that appropriate information should be given to the policy or decision makers such that they appreciate the impacts of disaster. The current information provided to the decision makers are filtered and are influenced by political decisions that center on the provision of relief services and not sustainable development strategies or sustainable economic growth.

Quoting an example from Pakistan, he observed the assessments of the impact of drought. The estimated impact of the drought that was presented to the decision makers using the local impact assessment were of an order of 200 million rupees. It is comparable to another assessment made that estimated an impact of 12 billion rupees. This big difference between the two suggests that a reliable methodology must be tested and used to ensure that decisions are based on reliable information.

In that context, he announced the UNESCAP was undertaking a joint project with UNDP which tries to apply the ECLAC methodology which can be used to assess the socio-economic impacts of disasters in Asia Pacific. The methodology examines disaster at three levels, namely the direct, indirect and at the macro-economic levels and is being applied in 7 countries. Although it is applicable to Asia, however, it needs to be modified to suit the prevailing conditions in the countries.

In order to examine how the lack of uniformity of the methodology in the region can be maintained, the RCC offers the best opportunity to share these experiences. He hoped that this process would be continued and he looked forward to working with ADPC and the RCC in this direction. He urged moving a step forward, by trying to examine the kind of information and methodologies that would enable the countries in the region to make a quick assessment that can be directly presented to decision makers.

Dr. Ti also shared with the participants that when UNESCAP initiated a project on the ECLAC Methodology before the occurrence of the Asian Tsunami, they had planned to follow a stepped procedure to ensure that the methodology was accepted by decision makers in the region. When the Asian Tsunami occurred, the World Bank, the ADB, and the United Nations decided to use the methodology to assess the damage of the tsunami. This resulted in the immediate acceptance of the methodology by the government such that they no longer needed to be convinced on its uses. These are the examples of the opportunities that need to be explored following the Asian Tsunami.

Facilitating the creation of DRR programming capacity within individual sectoral line ministries (planning departments)

Improving the visibility and efficiency of the RCC and support to ADPC

Dr. Ti highlighted that the opportunities presented by the tsunami and the visibility that it has created for disaster management should be capitalized upon to make a positive difference. Dr. Ti urged the RCC to operate under this new perspective of sustaining the visibility in disaster reduction issues, to ensure that the momentum that has been generated is built upon. This has to be done through action oriented initiatives which has to be accountable to decision makers. He commented that there was sufficient attention placed on the effective communication and engagement of policy and decision makers and they are now aware of disasters and their impacts. Thus, focus should now be placed on how the RCC can make a difference. He asked the RCC Members of their expectations of the observers and the partners to make the RCC more visible and effective.

Mr. Kessler responded by noting that discussions on making the RCC more visible and effective should be directed at the donor community. He reasoned that in order to address this issue would require the participation of not just the NDMOs but a broader audience to strategize and develop projects. In this context, support for project development from the donor community perspective is almost non-existent. He suggested that support should be provided to the RCC such that they could coordinate fact finding teams on subjects of interest to the RCC Members, to identify the proactive stakeholders who can make the difference, as well as cross-sectoral issues etc. He emphasized that project development needs to be integrated with project implementation and that support is needed to fund the field-based research from which projects can be developed. The challenge faced by ADPC is the lack of resources to develop projects which are relevant and meets to needs of the RCC Members.

Supporting National and Regional Level Entry Points

This led to another issue raised by Mr. Gordon, who responded that in terms of the issue of active engagement in the determination of primary interlocutors for effective strategy development would be more effective if done on a national rather than from a regional perspective. Whilst the RCC will have a role in endorsing and promoting project development, the field-base work would be done on a country by country basis, because whilst there are parallels in the institutional structures, they would differ quite substantially in how policy making implementation and decision-making was being made.

Mr. Kessler replied that on a regional level, the kind of dialogue that ADPC can hold with its national partners, is through working to structure methods which they can then apply on a national level. The advantage of any regional program is that it could then be replicated at the national level, i.e. taken from the region, into the region, translated into the local language, and implemented through the different tiers of society. Opportunities should exist to ensure a level of consistency in implementation procedures at a regional level, in order to maximize the efficient use of limited resources for the development these processes. He hoped that this regional scope would be supported so that the national endeavors could prosper. Mr. Kessler's comments were supported by Madame Cora.

Madame Cora noted that the RCC-5 had given her the opportunity and provided her with the knowledge of the work that is being done in Vietnam regarding the dykes and prevention of flooding. From her experiences in Manila, she was aware that since the dredging of the river two years ago, they have had no flooding. The impact of this intervention has not been assessed in economic terms in costs that have been saved from the prevention of the floods. This is the kind of work that should not be limited and the RCC Meeting provides a venue to enable its Members to observe the practices in the host country and provides examples on how they can engage their own country representatives in World Bank and other resource institutions.

On the issue of national versus regional entry points, Mr. Msellati explained that the World Bank did not have the right instruments to work at the regional level. The difference between the World Bank and the other observer organization is that they provide loans and credits that governments will have to reimburse. They could support the implementation of 10 PIPs at the national level especially if they are listed in the development agenda of the country through their Country Assistance Strategy (CAST). Vietnam was an example where the focus on disaster response was being re-directed to disaster reduction and was part of their development agenda which had strong commitments and support from the national government. The World Bank was, with assistance from donors, in the midst of preparing a large loan for the Government of Vietnam to promote disaster risk management.

Ms. Bronwyn Robbins First Secretary, AusAID informed the participants that they work at the bilateral country and at the regional level, with a view that approaches on the subject of disaster risk reduction should be made on as many levels as possible. She was interested to hear from the RCC members, areas in which the most strategic interventions happen and whether they agreed that it should be at a number of levels. The donors on the panel working in Asia and the Pacific were constantly being challenged as to if their interventions should be regional or bilateral, what was most effective and if it should be a combination.

Mr. Mijares supported the idea of the existence of entry points at the regional level; however, he did not view it as a national versus regional issue. Although he hoped that the contributions by ADPC and AusAID in providing assistance at the regional level would be appreciated, he reasoned that it was understandable that there would be less preference for regional entry. As regional organizations in general had limited exposure, greater interest is therefore given to national engagement. He rationalized that entries at the regional level would allow for national governments to take up agendas which otherwise may be seen as a lower priority. This would ensure that there was regional pressure, likewise a regional continuing, sustained, advocacy. This is something that must be borne in mind and if there are no such facilities as of now, it may be useful to consider finding some entry points and reforms within the institutions where each of the donor representatives belongs.

Mr. Mijares believed that there was room for regional entry points and likewise for country to country arrangements. Examples of this could be found in the Philippines and perhaps also in Timor Leste where provisions had been made in some sectors, some initiatives had been taken in terms of disaster management in the aspect of supply management and he suggested that these were opportunities that could be explored in the region. He also recommended

examining the opportunity to tap on the volunteerism spirit. This however would require some facilitation and this is where a regional facility would be of extreme help. Otherwise, it would be very difficult to find what the good practices and competencies in other areas that have been proven. The need for modification of approaches will also have to be facilitated and identified by a regional body.

Mr. Mirza appreciated all the inputs contributed by all the international organizations and donors in all the countries. He presented some of his observations on the on-going activities in Iran and the development in regard Mainstreaming DRR. Political will and support for disaster reduction in Iran enabled the participation of Iranian delegation from the Management and Planning Organization (MPO) at the RCC. The MPO were directly responsible for mainstreaming disaster management and for the appropriate organizational arrangements for disaster risk management in Iran. Public awareness on the importance of preventive and relief management was at an especially high level because of the Bam earthquake which resulted in huge casualties and the public were now more ready to cooperate with the government. He thanked the international societies for their help in this regard especially after the Bam earthquake offered by the World Bank, UNDP and other agencies in this regard. However, in his view, the region and sub-region of the South and South West Asia are still facing inappropriate levels of regional and international networking on disaster management issues. Therefore, more networking opportunities were required to be included in the programs as well as the use of opportunities and capacities available in the whole region. This requires more active participation of all countries, international organizations and donors to further facilitate the networking.

Mr. Gordon noted the lack of reference to some already existing regional and sub-regional mechanism, for example the ASEAN Committee of Disaster Management which is an intergovernmental endorsed body for disaster management and which addresses issues with a regional perspective of the SE Asia region. He wondered to what degree the RCC Members had explored this particular avenue.

Mainstreaming DRM within the Donor Community and UN Agencies

Mr. Rego remarked that there had been a lot of discussion at this meeting on the earlier drafts of the statement on the need for action by UN Agencies, bilateral donors, multilateral, international financial institutions, to develop stronger links between the humanitarian assistance and development portfolios within their own agencies (i.e. mainstreaming within agencies). Discussions have also focused on the need for better integration of disaster risks impacts and DRR into the initiatives of the agencies whilst undertaking common country assessments and country strategies. He urged the observers to elaborate on their initiatives within their organizations and the challenges of obtaining funds for disaster risk reduction compared to the wealth of funds available to post-disaster humanitarian assistance.

With regards to UNESCAP's efforts on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management, Dr Ti informed the participants that the Asian tsunami has created such a vast amount of opportunity that it resulted in the UNESCAP Executive Secretary's attendance at the WCDR and subsequently, they have been able to include disaster risk reduction into one third of the

regional implementation plan on sustainable development as well as also convening a tsunami panel and disaster reduction conference at a Ministerial level in Bangkok in May 2005. This exemplified the successful integration of risk management into UNESCAP's regional sustainable development policy.

As a consequence, he explained that one of the topics that he was trying to move forward was linking the UN-ISDR-Asian Partnership (IAP) as a mechanism to support the implementation of the HFA. He expressed his aspirations of making its current five regional partners accountable to the region and the donors, followed by the expansion of the IAP. Bearing this in mind, UNESCAP would like to initiate further work by the IAP on community-based disaster risk management with the vision of linking it to the RCC mechanism. He sought comments from ADPC on this proposal.

Ms. Paola Albrito, Programme Officer, UN-ISDR commented that Dr. Ti's remarks were in line with previous comments and discussions. In the HFA, one of the strategic goals is precisely the systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into recovery programs and it is with this perspective that ISDR had been working towards the inclusion of the disaster risk reduction dimension within the perspective of early warning projects from the tsunami. Negotiations in relation to this project were on-going and copies of the project document were available upon request. The main initiative of the project is linked with the UN Agencies and other regional organizations to support the integration of tsunami dimension within the context of early warning towards disaster risk reduction such that it responds to a need and the reality of preventing future disasters through the introduction of risk reduction approaches in recovery programs.

Dr. Rajan Gengaje, Regional Disaster Response Adviser, OHCA Regional Officer in Bangkok for Asia and the Pacific, explained that it was not a donor agency and unlike most other agencies in the UN family, it is also not an operational agency. It is a part of a Secretariat with a mandate from the UN General Assembly to coordinate international humanitarian action primarily for the UN agencies and also for other national and international actors. OCHA's mandate focuses upon emergency response preparedness and is also committed to provide support in terms of mainstreaming, specific support to strengthen response tools and capabilities as well as coordination mechanisms at the regional and national levels in collaboration with the inter-agency standing committee members and the UN country teams. Recognizing that the international community support, whether bilateral or multilateral, is generally a small fraction of the development assistance that is provided, OCHA focuses upon strengthening and expanding the availability of response tools including standby arrangements and to enhance coordination arrangements and partnerships with key stakeholders particularly in disaster prone countries.

Dr. Gengaje informed the meeting that OCHA has recently set up a regional office for Asia and the Pacific in Bangkok. They were endeavoring to meet the demands of the UN Headquarters in Geneva, the UN country teams in the region, and that of the donors, following which they will coordinate a meeting for all relevant members. They were also attempting to deepen their engagement in relevant development policy initiatives including in particular those that are concerned with slow onset disasters, human rights issues, that are

prominent in disaster situations, and the circumstances that are particular to disasters in conflict settings. Thus, OCHA will be working with the RCC members through ADPC in providing support required for taking further this initiative on Mainstreaming DRM.

Madame Cora suggested that UN-OCHA look into the psycho-social aspects of disaster rehabilitation such as assisting families that had been separated and for children who had lost their families and noted that Save the Children and UNICEF had intervened in this particular area.

Ms Mellgren reflected on a few of the points made and noted that it was the point that the panel was trying to get across, i.e. to make processes demand driven by making references to the MDGs and the national PRSPs and through financing the development of strategic plans within countries. Sida avoided, as much as possible, project to project based financing, which creates gaps between resources and the needs. She noted that these processes are lengthy in nature and require patience. She viewed the role for the RCC as providers of best practices and to influence support received by donors to countries on a program basis. Donor assistance ethics and behavior was also an issue that needed to be examined, to assess how it meets the needs of the recipient, that it should follow a code of conduct and include a flexibility to accommodate demand driven programs.

Mr. Bakker agreed with Ms. Mellgren comments that the donor aims are poverty reduction and alleviation as well as the attainment of the MDGs as central issues that have to be addressed. He conferred that poverty alleviation and disaster reduction were closely linked and noted that the challenge of mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction lies in planning processes at the national level and the other levels of government (e.g. province, district and commune levels). It was important that the donors had joint consensus on how to approach poverty alleviation in the areas that are vulnerable to disaster and how their support could strengthen the planning processes in the broader sense. He added that it should not only target disaster risk reduction but aim to improve the planning of government interventions and preparedness at all the local government levels. These were complicated processes which require sound government policies that singles out and presents disaster mitigation as one of their priorities to the donor community. This allows the donor community to work with the governments on short term and long term planning components (e.g. long-term infrastructure development projects that are placed within the context of disaster awareness, mitigation and preparedness at the commune level). Consensus was required as practices are currently fragmented. Good practices that link the relationship between poverty and disasters need to be undertaken at the local government level and demonstrate that the interventions had led to alleviation of poverty and the strengthening of livelihoods of vulnerable communities, and examples of these good practices need to be collated. Governments that place disaster mitigation as a priority in their policy would then have good practice examples which they could replicate in their daily practice. The challenge lies in convincing both the disaster management community and the governments that the disaster mitigation interventions are addressing the MDGs and poverty reduction.

Mr. Kessel noted the earlier comment by Mr. Msellati that the Bank operated at the national level and the important contributions that they make in terms of capital investment to

infrastructure and shelter programs in general. He stated that the need for capital investment in mitigation is a next area of endeavor in which ADPC is going to pursue. In this light, Mr. Kessler inquired if within the structure of the Bank project development; there was a component or a set of criteria in design of an infrastructure program that included mitigation as part of a review process as opposed to a check list item e.g. indicating that they had completed a project hazard mapping; or if there was a specific set of investment policies within the Bank that focused on mitigation that can account retrofitting of historic urban areas that require capital that only the Banks can provide. He sought clarification in terms of the institutionalization within the donor community, if the notion of mainstreaming manifests itself in project design and development.

Mr. Msellati responded from the perspective of the Bank's water portfolio in Vietnam, although it was not specifically mentioned, the safeguard policy review with regards to dyke construction, dam rehabilitation and dam safety have an important element of risk management that is inherent to their infrastructure portfolio and policy that was viewed from either an environment or social perspective that examines the vulnerability of people who reside downstream and they follow all the dam safety issues etc such that it is part of the technical review, either under social safeguards or environmental safeguards. To his knowledge there was no disaster risk or mainstreaming risk management safeguards in their body of procedures and regulations. However, it is fully included in its water portfolio whenever they work on dams.

Current Challenges and Requests to the Donor Community

Ms Mellgren commended the discussions on the RCC efficiency, support to ADPC, mainstreaming within the donor community and how the processes whereby RCC meets and the member countries enter into dialogue with the sectoral ministries and ministry of finance and all levels could be promoted. She expressed an interest to hear what challenges and issues the NDMOs face in engaging the other line ministries.

Challenges experienced in Lao PDR

Mr. Phetsavang complimented the usefulness of the forum for discussions between RCC Members and the donor community. On the issue of integrating disaster risk management in the national development and poverty reduction plans etc, it is clear that the NDMOs mandate focuses on all stages of the disaster cycle including pre-disaster, during and post-disaster issues. To date, a large extent of the national resources and that from external donors have been focused on relief and response to disasters, however their current direction lay in reducing disasters through focusing on the prevention aspect. One of the challenges faced by the NDMOs was in understanding the mindset of all the stakeholders including that of the policy makers. This provided them with an indication of their perceptions and priorities of their responsibilities, which may not necessarily reflect their understanding of the importance of disaster prevention. From experience, governments have no hesitation to utilize the national budgets for relief and response and post-disaster recovery efforts including acquiring large external loans and assistance from bilateral donors, UN agencies, international organizations etc during disasters.

In the year 2002, more than 200 irrigation schemes were destroyed in Lao PDR and amounted to huge losses for the national economy as 95% of Laotian citizens are rice farmers and destruction of the irrigation schemes results in large scale unemployment. Therefore, the government had no hesitations in allocating funds for immediate rebuilding and recovery purposes. To date, the government has yet to service these loans and payment to private sector entities who were employed to rebuild the irrigation schemes. These are the realities faced by the government.

The other challenge faced is to convince the decision makers and to find resources to work on disaster preparedness issues and its many components (e.g. early warning, building networks, provision of training, etc). Some of the countries lack experience on the disaster preparedness issues, whilst others may be aware of disaster preparedness issues but lack resources. The current situation in Lao PDR is that although these activities may be of importance, they are not amongst the high or top priorities of the government. Therefore, it is difficult to obtain resources from the government and policy makers. He also explained that disaster reduction would be realized if resources were available to the government and that situations and priorities in the various countries were different.

For example in Laos, they are far from being in a position to build insurance schemes against crop losses as they are currently focused on relief and the provision of seeds for replanting of rice fields. However, it is a learning opportunity for everyone on the importance of planning to plant other crops to compensate for the loss. He proposed that the RCC Members should work together on these issues. In the past, humanitarian assistance projects were usually of short durations of 18-24 months and the implementation of projects were of a simple nature in which interventions involved the purchasing of rice, seeds and tools which were then distributed to the affected population. However, current interventions include the building of capacities of vulnerable communities, which are more complicated in nature and involves changing cultures of crop production and the changing of habits of reliance. These interventions need to be implemented over a longer time frame. Thus, the issues on how activities can be made sustainable should be examined.

Dr. Wang noted that in China, a majority of the projects were big in nature and of 1-3 years duration. However, China's post-WCDR efforts are examining means of creating smaller, short-term project of several thousand dollars each to facilitate and encourage countries experts or official to exchange ideas and case studies. He commented that these projects were easier to implement and more efficient compared to projects of longer duration that involved lengthy discussions and resulted in the loss of time.

The delegate from India commented that the guidelines set by the donor countries should be more flexible and take into account that the project finalization processes are lengthy and delays in implementation. India is currently undertaking a World Bank funded cyclone mitigation program and as India is a vast country, once the guidelines published by the World Bank is circulated to all states and India territories, there are 13 states involved of which all of their reports have to be considered at a national level before decisions are made. These processes take a long time to finalize. These are considerations for the donor community to be flexible, broad and allow for discretions to be taken by the countries as they are in the best

position to judge what their priorities areas are. This allows the aims and objectives of the loans to be met.

Mr. Tabrani commented that the dialogue was very important, not only regionally but also bilaterally. Mainstreaming of DRM is one activity of many. He was aware of many bilateral programs between the donor community and the Indonesia government; however he highlighted the difficulty for Bakornas, as a focal point for disaster management, to map the different on-going activities and programs that were being undertaken between the donors and the various line ministries. Thus, he suggested that whenever the donor agencies were considering undertaking disaster management activities in Indonesia, that they should inform the focal points of their intentions. His consultations with other focal points in the ASEAN confirmed similar experiences in their respective countries, especially if these projects were being implemented with other line or sectoral ministries or other organizations within the country. This would enable a more systematic and effective implementation of activities and use of resources.

Mr. Aramebepola noted that after much discussion on mainstreaming DRR at the international and regional forum, the next level where the concept of mainstreaming should be promoted is at the national level. However, efforts by the NDMOs alone would not suffice. Thus, he suggested that donor agencies could expedite the process by requesting the government and also to facilitate the discussion at the national level. This would ensure that funds provided to reduce poverty and disaster would be used in an efficient and collective manner. Current examples where resources were being used inefficiently included funds for the Tsunami reconstruction and rehabilitation, where funds were being provided to re-build the countries, however, potential risks are not being addressed in most of these rebuilding and re-construction programs, leaving them vulnerable to future hazards. In order to reduce poverty, risks management needs to be part of the development process. He suggested that the donors apply more pressure on the Governments to integrate risk reduction into development planning. It was also true that risks cannot be integrated unless there was a mechanism to facilitate the integration such the governments have the resources to convene meetings of all the planning agencies and development departments to engage in the necessary dialogue. This would assist the NDMO's in their tasks to mainstream DRR.

Mr. Gordon noted that the discussion had raised further questions on the capacity of the NDMO institutions, their ability to be the primary driver of the mainstreaming process, how they should position themselves in the promotion of mainstreaming disaster reduction, how they link with other sectoral ministries, the ministries of planning and finance etc.

Madam Cora consolidated her thoughts on the discussions and noted that in connecting appropriate resources, within the Ministries, the agencies represented on the panel had their own counterparts in the countries, at regional meetings the RCC Members represent the region but much of the national work remains when they return to their countries. The effective engagement with policy makers and decision makers beyond the community of disaster risk reduction stakeholders should be the mandate of the RCC as to how to go about doing it when they go back to their own countries. Therefore to achieving the third issue, which is facilitating the creation of disaster risk reduction programming capacity as referred

to by Mr. Kessler, within the individual sector and line ministries, so that the RCC Members and Meetings becomes the catalysts to assist the countries develop projects that have been identified. She urged the donor agencies to examine the 18 Priority Implementation Projects (PIPs) that have been identified by the 10 RCC Member Countries and assess which of these demand driven flagship programs best fits into the limited resources available from the donor. This underlines the importance of support not only for the RCC Meetings but also to forge follow-up activities in the home countries as this is where the results will matter.

Mr. Mijares commented that the mainstreaming activity within the RCC Members would have to be a continuing effort and the opportunities presented by incidents like that the tsunami allowed for the provision of entry points with policy and decision makers. The role played both by the national agency in their engagement with both the ministries and other policy makers was important especially in RCC Member Countries and the donor communities where disaster management has not been identified as a specific sector, where the challenge would lie in the disaster practitioners being able to create an eventual identity. He noted that in the successful at mitigating or preventing of disaster, sacrifices would have to be made by the personalities involved in disaster and the mainstreaming from the point of view of consciousnesses as well as in terms of procedures and process. This would lead to a substantive impact in terms of the expected outputs.

Mr. Rahman thanked Mr. Gordon for facilitating the dialogue with the bilateral and multi-lateral donors and UN agencies. It had been a lively discussion between the donors and the RCC Members. The few points that had arisen from the discussions included that programs or projects should be undertaken on the country by country basis, that poverty alleviation should receive greater attention and there should be some flexibility and this would generate activities from the donors and their partners in other countries. He hoped that this would result in proactive reactions from the donor community as well as to the RCC Members. He thanked them for their patience and attention.

VII. SESSION V: SPECIAL CONSULTATIVE SESSION FOR THE ASIAN REGION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION (HFA) ADOPTED AT THE 2ND WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER REDUCTION

This session was co-chaired by Dr. Michael Ernst from UNDP, Ms Paola Albrito from UN-ISDR and Mr. Aloysius Rego from ADPC.

Following on from the precedent that was set during the last RCC Meeting (RCC4) which included a pre-World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR) Special Consultative Session for the Asian Region in Preparation for the 2nd UN-ISDR WCDR, the Special Consultative Session for the Asian Region on the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (HFA) can be viewed as a post-WCDR follow-up for the Asian region. Co-organized by ADPC, ISDR and UNDP, it introduced the HFA, the concept of National Platforms and provided good examples of the implementation of the HFA by National Governments (e.g. Bangladesh) to the RCC Member Countries. The objective of the session was to ensure that

the HFA is kept on the agenda of the RCC Member Countries such that its implementation is discussed and planned for in the future.

Dr. Ernst began by welcoming everyone to the next session and reminded everyone that mainstreaming DRM was part of the agenda of the HFA and that in trying to implement this international strategy and action plan, it was important that this should result in activities on the ground such that communities would benefit from the risk reduction that occurs. This was adopted at the WCDR in January and is a tool that can be used to help motivate other relevant stakeholders who may not be part of the disaster management community but are supporting the HFA, when the topic of mainstreaming is discussed.

THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK FOR ACTION 2005-2015: BUILDING THE RESILIENCE OF NATIONS AND COMMUNITIES TO DISASTERS

Ms. Albrito, ISDR divided her presentation into two parts, one introducing the HFA and its main components, followed by a listing of the different initiatives and tools that have been developed by ISDR to support the implementation of the HFA at the country level. She explained that the HFA defined the strategic goals, priorities for action, cross-cutting issues, proposed implementation, follow up and expected outcomes. It emphasizes the importance of integrating disaster risk reduction into policies, plans and programs of sustainable development, recognizes risk reduction as both a humanitarian and development issue (in the context of sustainable development) and focuses on national implementation with bi-lateral, multi-lateral, regional and international cooperation. Targets and indicators for the implementation of the HFA were to be developed by the individual countries according to their needs.

The strategic goals toward mainstreaming of DRR into development included the integration of DRR into sustainable development, policies and programs, the strengthening of institutional mechanisms to build capacities for resilience to hazards, and that DRR should be a part of preparedness, relief and recovery. Details were given of the initiatives undertaken by ISDR to implement the HFA which included i) the development of a basic matrix of roles and initiatives on HFA priorities, including partnerships and resources, ii) the development of an initial set of generic benchmarks and indicators for HFA to be discussed with Governments and stakeholders, iii) support to countries to identify, strengthen or establish national mechanisms/platforms for disaster risk reduction and to define national baselines, iv) the preparation of planning tools and guidelines to mainstream DRR into different sectors (including for national platforms and the Common Country Assessment for the UN Development Assistance Framework, and v) the promotion and advocacy for all levels concerning awareness and training.

During this session, ADPC distributed its plans to support the HFA that had been submitted to the 11th IAFT Meeting in Geneva for discussion. These plans have been drafted in the context of the role that ADPC plays as a regional entity member of the IAFT, which ADPC has been a part of since 2000, as a founder member of the IDSR-Asia Partnership as well as in ADPC's capacity as the Secretariat for the RCC, and have been discussed at ADPC's Board of Trustees Meeting. The key areas of the plan are to:

- Support countries of the region on the planning and implementation of the HFA, which is mentioned in the RCC-MDRD program, primarily to support certain national government members of the RCC who have requested ADPC's involvement and assistance in convening national workshops of all key stakeholders, primarily concerned government ministries and departments, scientific and technical institutions, NGOs, UN Agencies, donors and the private sector. These workshops would identify current national actions being undertaken by various stakeholders to allow for the exploration of possible synergies, the identification of priorities and gaps, discuss the way forward as well as establish linkages with the ongoing, nationally funded and internationally funded projects in each country.
- Support the establishment of national platforms for disaster reduction in interested countries. ADPC has been in close contact with UNDP country offices, ISDR regional advisors, UNDP BCPR regional advisors, ESCAP, the ISDR-Asia Partnership and the German National Platform for Disaster Reduction.
- The implementation of the RCC program, and
- Continuing the collaboration with regional offices of UN Agencies, other regional institutions under the framework of the IAP, as well as the past work undertaken by ADPC, ADRC, OCHA and WHO in convening periodic regional meetings of regional organizations and regional offices of UN Agencies. It is expected that in the future, this activity will coalesce into a regional inter-agency task force for disaster reduction patterned on the current global task force based in Geneva.

RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION (PRIMARY OUTCOME OF THE 2ND WORLD CONFERENCE ON DISASTER REDUCTION, KOBE 2005)

The session also included break-out discussions which focused on:

- i) A preliminary review of initiatives to implement the HFA in RCC Member Countries
- ii) A preliminary survey of existing National Platforms or initiatives to establish National Platforms in RCC Member Countries, and
- iii) RCC Members Countries expectations of UN-ISDR, the IATF, the UN Agencies, ADPC, the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) and the donor community.

Preliminary Review of Initiatives to Implement the HFA in RCC Member Countries

Several countries namely, Bangladesh, India, Iran, Philippines, Mongolia, and Timor Leste indicated that initiatives were underway in their countries to implement the HFA. These were either specific events related directly to the HFA implementation or initiatives that need to be out into the context of the HFA. Specific activities included in-house meetings within their respective departments or by country/national delegates to the WCDR for planned implementation in a phased manner. Whilst other countries stated that no formal meetings or plans to implement the HFA have been established to date, but noted that meetings had been held in the past to implement the Yokohama Strategy.

Preliminary Survey of Existing National Platforms or Initiatives to Establish National Platforms in RCC Member Countries

Mechanisms that are similar to the National Platforms concept that UN-ISDR is currently exist in some RCC Member Countries and have been established as far back as 30 years ago until the recent past. They comprise line ministries civil societies, local and international NGOs and UN agencies, that meet are often chaired by senior state officials and they meet at a range of intervals from a monthly basis to a set time prior to the onset of an expected natural anomaly or during emergency events. Where existing platforms do not exist, there are plans to constitute them

However, the core issue of the existence of these platforms or mechanisms is their effectiveness, thus there challenges therein lie in meeting the expectations for support at the country level not in developing new national platforms but to assist the existing mechanism to improve their coordination in the sharing of information and improving their effectiveness within the context of disaster risk reduction at the national level.

It was felt that while some of the existing platforms were not originally structured to specifically address the HFA, their activities could be expanded to include all relevant stakeholders.

RCC Expectations for the Support of Implementation of the HFA and the National Platforms from the UN-ISDR, the IATF, the UN Agencies, ADPC, the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) and the Donor Community

The RCC Members and delegates called for the respective organizations:

- i) to play a greater role beyond supporting and monitoring;
- ii) to provide guidance on program in key areas such as mainstreaming DRM in Development;
- iii) to encourage the implementation of the HFA within a regional context with regional HFA projects/activities/programs for every sub-region within Asia;
- iv) to conduct Capacity Building programs for HFA implementation;
- v) that the ISDR-Asia Partnership role as catalyst be improved;
- vi) that the regional advisors from OCHA/ UNDP/ ISDR who have started working together at their regional offices in Bangkok, and the Deputy Resident Representatives of UNDP from each of the Asian countries, who have met recently, should consider the HFA implementation as one of many forms for regional collaborative action though working closely with all of the partners of the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP); and
- vii) that assistance be provided to enhance the exchange of information, communications systems and capacity of communication and technology transfer including funding and resource mobilization for these activities.

All the actors, namely, the UN-ISDR, the IATF, the UN Agencies, ADPC, the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) and the donor community, who are currently working on the same

issues, were urged to meet and discuss the ways in which they can provide comprehensive support to the countries in their implementation of the HFA.

The UN-ISDR was requested to assist in capacity building, to provide guidelines and guidance and to provide an oversight into the implementation of the HFA.

The IATF was called upon to assist in capacity building particularly in the area of response and to provide technical assistance.

It was also felt that there was a need from the UN agencies to support the implementation of the HFA within the context of the task force through the use of indicators, which are to be shared at the country level. These indicators would assist the national efforts in prioritizing their actions and assessing what further steps that are needed in their implementation of the HFA. The UN agencies were also called to provide technical expertise.

The UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) was particularly called upon to fill in the gaps where initiatives were lacking. In terms of support, an expectation of the IAP (in particular the UN-ISDR) was in the documentation and exchange of good practices but also on lessons learned as it was felt that these should be shared in addition to an increase in the flow of information.

Expectations of the IAP were also to provide support to the establishment of an appropriate national and international monitoring and coordination mechanisms for the implementation of the HFA and the follow up of the HFA. It was suggested within the IAP framework/partnership that ADPC should be designated to provide leadership in the coordination and networking, and communicating the progress of the HFA implementation to UN-ISDR.

Madam Cora supported the objective of the meeting to ensure that the HFA is kept on the agenda of the RCC Member Countries and that it's implementation is discussed and planned for in the future. However, she highlighted the need to involve other agencies, with their own flagship interest, in the implementation of the HFA within its 10-year time spectrum. She suggested that the RCC could be used as a forum to provide an update on the implementation and that the 10-year framework should be broken down into 2-year milestones of accomplishments to facilitate a workable implementation of the HFA for each of the countries. This would serve as a useful forum for the ISDR to monitor the progress of HFA implementation.

ISDR thanked ADPC for the opportunity to participate in the forum and were particularly grateful as they appreciated that the RCC mechanism was a great forum for exchange of experiences and opportunities to learn about the planned activities in the region. They noted that the timeliness of the meeting ahead of the 11th meeting of the UN-ISDR IATF which will examine the exact issues as this special session allowing for the views of the RCC Member Countries to be reflected in the discussions of the IATF. They hoped that the RCC exchange mechanism would continue in an active way as it was envisaged that the outcomes of the IATF meeting would be an agreement on the road map of how to integrate the implementation of the HFA into the agenda of everybody. The ISDR is focusing on key workable elements that would initiate the process of HFA implementation within a short 1-2 year span which it hopes will be supported by the IATF.

Unsolicited Proposals

A dialogue was held on the issue of unsolicited proposals. As countries begin to examine the HFA, the relevance of the HFA to their local context, how it can be used to meet their needs, which HFA activities they would like to prioritize and the process through which it should be implemented, this will generate a demand for a host of different services, otherwise known as unsolicited proposals.

Unsolicited proposals provide a vehicle for demand driven initiatives. Examples of these unsolicited proposals given were site visits and exchange of visits between countries for the RCC-MDRD program.

It was expected that the donor community would support the implementation of these unsolicited proposals such that local support groups are able to carry out activities that they have prioritized. It was also expected that the donor community would have mechanisms in place in order to respond to these unsolicited proposals. The UN-ISDR, the IATF, the UN Agencies, ADPC and the UN-ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) were also called upon to examine how their institutions could respond to these unsolicited proposals. The plans to respond to unsolicited proposals need to occur in the near future and not during the next funding cycle.

UNDP South-South Exchange Program

Following on from the above comment, the representative from UNDP Mr. Ernst added that there needs to be a mechanism that facilitates the sharing of south-to-south experiences in and amongst the countries. When a country identifies an experience of another country that it would like to learn from, there exists a need for a resource mechanism to mobilize the relevant trainers or facilitators. He informed the participants that that within UNDP they have a program to facilitate south-south exchanges and learning which has seen an increase in demand in exchanging lessons learned in risk reduction following the recent tsunami. The current interest in the subject provides an opportune time for countries within the RCC to consider if they would like to have exchanges with other RCC members to learn about how they are dealing with this risk in a specific sector. There are opportunities for the RCC members to make request through the UN system for support in organizing these exchanges. He suggested that unsolicited requests along these lines to ADPC, UNDP and ISDR for support on these kinds of exchanges would be a good way to start. The notion of a host-moderated internet based networking mechanism for exchange of ideas and listing of proposals was supported as a means for resource mobilization.

Individual Calls for Support

In addition, individual calls to support for projects and programs came from Bangladesh for its UNDP-DFID funded Comprehensive Disaster Management Program and Iran called for UNDP to finalize the proposed project - area based development of 5 disaster prone province including Kerman and they currently seek the results of the UNDAF assessment on the transformation of the Post Bam Task Force originally comprising of and lead by UNDP and UNICEF to the Disaster Management Task Force for Prevention that occurred in June 2004.

UN-ISDR Follow-up Activities

The UN-ISDR representative, Ms. Albrito, informed the participants that as a follow-up of the WCDR, UN-ISDR was in the processes of compiling at regional level a number of good practices and lessons learned that documented in the national reports received in preparation for the WCDR.

VII: SESSION VI: EVALUATION OF THE MEETING AND ACTIONS FOR THE COMING YEAR

This session was co-chaired by Director Elma C Aldea, Civil Defense Deputy Administrator, Office of Civil Defense, Department of National Defense, Philippines and Mr. Khun Sokha, Head of Emergency, Response and Rehabilitation Department, NCDM, Cambodia. The session reviewed the Statement of RCC-5 and discussed suggestions for other RCC activities as well as the date and venue for the 6th RCC Meeting.

REVIEW OF THE HANOI RCC-5 STATEMENT ON MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT IN DEVELOPMENT (MDRD) IN ASIAN COUNTRIES

Director Aldea started the session by stating that the Declaration was an affirmation of the RCC Members commitment to mainstream disaster risk management in the development in Asian countries, the main theme of RCC-5. Comments and suggestions were noted and amendments to the Statement were sent to the Steering/RCC Members for a final review. The finalized Statement is found in **Annex G**. Following the confirmation that no more changes were recommended from the floor, Director Aldea, on behalf of the RCC Members, approved the Statement.

SUGGESTIONS FOR OTHER RCC ACTIVITIES

Announcements by ISDR

Mr. Joe Chung, Senior Regional Officer, UN- ISDR announced their contribution to the ISDR-Asia Partnership (IAP) which would entail a financial amount of 40,000 USD to support the publication of the IAP Newsletter “Disaster Reduction in Asia: ISDR Informs”. He also announced that a further substantial amount of funds was being allocated for an Early Warning project from the IDSR Tsunami project and that as part of this and funds provided by other UN regional offices, further contributions of up to 100, 000 USD to ADPC which would be apportioned to strengthening a comprehensive hazard early warning systems and for the implementation of the HFA.

Ms. Albrito added that the context in which ISDR was providing support for the newsletter reflected ISDR’s appreciation of a need for the exchange of information and sharing of experiences. The second contribution stemmed from the context for early warning project and was part of the funds donated to ISDR following the Asian Tsunami.

Mr. Rego responded that from his understanding, part of the funds will also be made available to the RCC program on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and that we would seek further clarification on this matter at the IATF Meeting. All the five countries that have been affected by the Asian Tsunami have been members of the RCC, comprehensive, multi-hazard, risk reduction has been on their individual and collective agenda before the Asian

Tsunami, mainstreaming DRR was an agreed direction in each of those country before the event, while the support is for the strengthening of tsunami related systems, ADPC would be comfortable if some of the funds be used for supporting the mainstreaming of multi-hazard disaster risk reduction in each of the countries where there is a great need and is in line with some of the discussions of the Meeting. He called on the RCC Member countries to support this ADPC recommendation directly to the ISDR representatives both before and after the IATF Meeting.

Dialogue with Donors

Madam Cora suggested that one day of the next RCC be devoted to dialogue with resource partners in order to get a better understanding and appreciation of the work that they are undertaking in the region and countries. This would preferably be scheduled on the first day of the meeting. Mr. Rego accepted on behalf of the ADPC secretariat, Madam Cora's advice for serious consideration and implementation.

Study Tours

Requests were made by Director Aldea and Mr. Rahman on the possibility of the conduct of study tours for RCC Members to areas afflicted by disasters such as Bam, or areas where mainstreaming of disaster risk reduction is being undertaken in order facilitate the exchange of information and experiences,. The venue and dates for these study tours were to be determined later, subject to the availability of funds.

Electronic Information Sharing and Knowledge Management

Mr. Mijares suggested that in order to invigoration information sharing and stir up some debate, web-based discussions should be held on a continuing basis which adopts certain themes for certain periods and includes an expanding mailing list. His particular interest was in information and knowledge management in the aspect of indigenous approaches to disaster risk management, especially from the cultural point of view. Director Aldea thanked Mr. Nestor adding that the point raised was in concert with the earlier suggestion that issues and concerns, lessons learnt and activities be organized through e-mail or hosted on a website. However, there was a need to identify a moderator for these discussions. Mr. Nestor noted that the suggestion needs to be assessed. He also suggested exploring the possibility of using the short messaging system (SMS) technology as means to which countries could respond to information needs by the public on national disaster risk management queries.

Mr. Rego offered that with regards to website moderation, ADPC would look into making its website more active. The notion of the study tour would be challenging. In the context of the recovery platform, ADRC, ISDR, UNDP and the Government of Japan had discussed at Kobe in the preceding week, ADPC has been working with the ADB, the ProVention Consortium and UNDP on developing modules of training for recovery program managers. This training which was supported by the other agencies that were present at that meeting involves the organization of site visits to areas of successful recovery programs from past disaster, hands-on interaction with the agencies, with the challenges of beneficiary administration and integration of risk resilience into the recovery process. These subject focused study tours or learning experiences will be tailored for representative who have

assumed new responsibilities. This is an initiative that ADPC has been pursuing and intends to continue pursuing. He informed the Meeting that if there were similar ideas and interests of specific focus, resources were available from the national budgets to allow for the exchanging of experiences and learning and is an area in which unsolicited proposals can be readily accepted.

Expansion of Scope for RCC Meetings

Mr. Gordon asked if there was any interest in the context of promoting the advocacy role of the RCC in facilitating a potential forum with the Ministry of Planning and Ministry of Finance in the country where the RCC Meeting was being hosted. This could ensure an increased engagement in some of the issues which were being discussed. On the same note and in the context of promoting the notion of the national platforms, he suggested that a similar forum be established or facilitated during the RCC for information exchange and discussion.

In response to Mr. Gordon's suggestion, Mr. Rego highlighted that representatives from planning agencies from two countries were in attendance, namely, Mr. Nestor from the Philippines and Dr. Mizra from Iran. Invitations had been extended to key planning agencies from two other countries for RCC-5 and the intention for the next RCC is to find additional resources to bring key focal points within planning agencies to both the RCC and its preparatory meetings, and intensive PIPs. He envisaged that in future RCC Meetings counterparts of Mr. Nestor and Dr. Mizra would be attending the RCC Meetings, not as initial observers and interlocutors but as key participants of the mainstreaming agenda and with lessons to share.

Mr. Rego requested the participants to refer to the structured summary of all key action areas identified and set at all previous RCC Meetings (Document 19). These activities were those that the RCC had set of itself on, which ADPC as the Secretariat for the RCC has to take action. The RCC Members and Observers were asked to study the document, identify gaps within this framework of specific activities that need to be done and provide feedback.

Engagement with the Media

Madam Cora suggested that in order to raise public awareness, a forum with media organizations should be organized to ensure that the various lessons learnt could be shared. Director Aldea welcomed the suggestion and added that the media representatives should be invited as active participants as well as local government officials from selected countries and parliamentarians.

On the issue of extending the invitation to the media, the ISDR Secretariat and the Asia Pacific Broadcasting Union were conducting region workshop on Media and Disasters, particularly related to Tsunami Early Warning and Community Preparedness in June, on which ADPC had been consulted. Mr. Rego urged participants who were interested in the subject and were keen to involve media organizations from their countries that this was the appropriate event for which they should identify possible media participants from their respective countries to the ISDR office in Bangkok and ADPC.

Engagement with Parliamentarians and Others

Dr. Lewis announced that a small planning meeting would be held in ADPC within the next few months, and welcomed suggestions on topics that would be useful for discussions. Mr. Rego added that the Parliamentarians workshop was an activity under the RCC-MDRD program for countries that are planning on taking up PIPs. Resources were also available to conduct national parliamentarian workshops. Thus, he encouraged the RCC Members to informally approach in advance and suggest one or two key parliamentarians who were proactive in issues relating to disaster reduction from their respective countries who could attend the regional planning meeting for parliamentarians to contribute to the substantive preparation as well as to take the leadership in conducting the national workshops, to facilitate the pre-identification and organization of these workshops.

DATE AND VENUE OF THE 6TH RCC MEETING

Dr Wang from China revealed that he had been in discussions with Dr. Suvit on the hosting of the next RCC Meeting. The date and topic for RCC-6 was to be determined at a further date.

Dr. Mizra from Iran, thanked China for offering to host the next RCC Meeting and reiterated the offer made at RCC-4, he reserved the honor of hosting the subsequent RCC Meeting (RCC-7) in Iran, as well as an organized visit to Bam, following its reconstruction.

IX. CLOSING CEREMONY

The Closing ceremony was chaired by Madam Cora and Mr. Dang Quang Minh, Disaster Management Center, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Vietnam who represented Mr. Dang Quang Tinh. Joining them on the dias was Ms Robbins, Mr. Tabrani, Dr Wang, Director Aldea, Mr. Kessler and Mr. Rego.

In presenting a summary of the meeting, Mr. Rego remarked that the participants had come to the close of this meeting with a sense that RCC-5 has come of age. He commended, the strong sense of ownership amongst the countries of the RCC as their mechanism and the continuing offers to host the subsequent meeting further demonstrated this. Referring to the first RCC Meeting, Mr. Rego noted that ADPC had been requested to organize the Meetings in different countries such that the RCC Members could learn by observation. The organization of the RCC Meetings in India, Bangladesh, and now Vietnam in conjunction with the National Disaster Days, has given the participants a special opportunity to be in a place at a special time and to have been in a country which is hosting its National Disaster Prevention Day for the 49th year in succession had been inspiring. The Meeting had learnt of the significant achievements of the host country, their innovative 20 year action plan till 2020 which was integrated into their development and water resource plans of the country, the National Disaster Management Partnership – an example of an existing national platform in action; inputs from political leadership - in the form of a letter from the President of the country to the entire people calling on them to prepare for disasters; the personal presence of the Deputy Prime Minister and two ministers demonstrating the political commitment of the leadership of the country.

Following on from RCC-4, RCC-5 continues to be an action oriented meeting, with the RCC-MDRD program, having moved from advocacy to action. He acknowledged comments made on the sidelines of the Advisory Panel Meeting and of RCC-5, and confirmed that the RCC-MDRD program was ambitious and overwhelming but at the same time specific and result oriented and contained actions and deliverables. Targets had been set for production of guidelines, implementation of the PIPs, to leverage partnerships and mobilize additional resources.

ADPC was inspired by the affirmation of commitment from the RCC Members, by the demonstrable commitment of governments, UN agencies and donors by their presence and active participation at the Meeting, and ADPC has a clear but somewhat ambitious road map on which to move ahead. ADPC therefore accepts with a sense of honor and onerous responsibility the task of serving as the secretariat and facilitate the RCC-MDRD program and would continue to act on its partnerships with the UN, technical and donor agencies.

In the post-WCDR era, the Meeting had delved into the specifics of implementing the HFA. Madame Cora's guidance on the division of the HFA into shorter, achievable time frames and milestones was inspiring and realistic and places an additional responsibility on the IAP and ADPC.

The RCC-MDRD programs states that impacts will be measured by the active role played by advocates and champions of MDRR, and significant progress had been made in achieving this impact through the RCC-5 and the committed leaders of the national disaster management systems. He concluded the summary of the Meeting by noting that the RCC has moved beyond being a committee to being a regional council of champions.

Mr. Tabrani observed that the RCC-5 had been well organized and prepared and appreciated ADPC proactive efforts and numerous visits to Indonesia, not only to engage the national agencies but also the provincial, district and sub-district local government in preparation for the Meeting. He commended the Meeting for being fruitful and extremely beneficial for the RCC Members. The numerous presentations enabled the participants to gain a deeper understanding of the issues of Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction and he wished that this endeavor would be a success.

He expressed his belief that with the coordination of the RCC-MDRD program by ADPC, it would achieve the goal of MDRR. He noted that the HFA provided a legal basis for MDRD and that it called for all nations to ensure that DRR is a national priority and that ADPC had elaborated the HFA into a bona fide activity in the respective RCC Member countries. In the implementation of the HFA, the RCC Members are able to use the RCC-MDRD program and the PIPs as a means to identify their areas of focus and project titles as well as the RCC-MDRD framework of components as a checklist of activities to be undertaken. He conveyed his aspirations that the RCC Members would be able to execute the RCC-MDRD program in their countries and in its implementation reduce disaster risks for communities throughout Asia.

In August 2003, the Meteorological and Geophysical Agency in Indonesia held an International Tsunami Seminar in commemoration of the 120th anniversary eruption of

Krakatoa in 1883. The eruption had led to a tsunami and one of the important recommendations stemming from the seminar was to set up an early warning system for tsunamis. However, difficulties were faced in the mobilization of resources. He speculated that had the early warning systems recommended in 2003 been in place, it would have reduced the impact of the 26 Dec Asian Tsunami in Aceh, not only on the loss of human life, but on property and the environment and the ecosystem. He explained that the RCC-MDRD program was a good starting point for the RCC Members and ADPC on the vision for safer and sustainable communities through disaster reduction and called for the donors to support the RCC-MDRD program.

Dr Wang informed the participants that this was the first time he had attended the RCC Meeting and that it was a very good forum although it was not a senior official level meeting, it provided an opportunity for NDMOs to meet, discuss, increase their understanding, establish friendships and build close relationships. It also provided a good and important platform for the exchange of information, experiences, case studies and best practices from other RCC Member countries. He appreciated the good work of ADPC under the RCC framework and commended the preparation for the Meetings and the provisions of a good set of guidelines and a good Statement. When he was previously the in-charge of the Chinese Bureau for Election, he invited experts from Bangladesh, India, Indonesia, Singapore and Malaysia and other countries to provide the Chinese Government with recommendations about rural elections and democratization. He remarked that as disaster reduction was a non-political issue, the exchange of views and perceptions was more straightforward. He informed the participants that the UN-ISDR had asked China to host the Asia Conference for Disaster Reduction in September and noted that the Chinese Premier, Mr. Wen Jia Bao, had remarked that this was a good opportunity to exchange Asia disaster reduction experiences and for the Asian countries learn from each other.

Ms Robins informed the participants that she was honored to speak on the occasion of the closing ceremony and that she had gained much pleasure of meeting some of the RCC Members as well as to hear of the progress that they had made on mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into development policies, planning and implementation. It had been interesting to engage in the debate on bilateral, regional and other community levels of entry for disaster management. AusAID was committed to providing 2.491 billion Australian dollars worth of development assistance in 2005-2006 and of this total funding 170 million had been allocated for humanitarian emergency and refugees assistance which is an increase on the previous year's budget. Through that funding, they have been pleased to have provided over 4 million dollars to ADPC, since 1994, for its core funding. She hoped that the participants shared her view that the money had been well spent from the result of the day's meeting. She was pleased to note that ISDR was also in the same view.

Long before the advent of the Asian Tsunami, it had been obvious that proactive steps needed to be taken to build closer synergies between disaster risk management and development planning, implementation and evaluation. Development offers great potential to reduce disaster risk but that potential depends on all of the stakeholders being able to mainstream disaster risk management into the various stages of the development cycle. Knowledge on the

relationship between disaster risk and development, needed to be generated as well as to share the experiences and best practices on how to make it work. There was also a need to ensure that this was a continuous process and that the commitment continued across all the sectors.

All of the participants had played and would continue to play an important role in this process in their respective countries. She was delighted to note that bilateral donors and international organizations and UN agencies are working together to try and harmonize support for disaster management. AusAID was pleased to be working with ADPC to support RCC Member Countries in disaster preparedness in the Asia region and they had been encouraged by what the RCC members have reported over the last three days and that they considered mainstreaming disaster risk management into national development as a priority, whilst acknowledging the challenges involved. This effort was similar to the approach taken in Australia where they are working to mainstream disaster mitigation into a wide range of both public and private practices. Successful mainstreaming requires strong political will in addition to participation by communities and civil society. It's complexity also requires careful consideration of the countries socio-economic and political situation. She hoped that the knowledge and wisdom gained during the RCC Meeting will help to guide all the participants to overcome the challenges and to accomplish the important goal.

She thanked ADPC for organizing the RCC-5 and for being an AusAID partner. She also thanked the Government of Vietnam for generously hosting the event as well as all the participants for all of their contributions to an important meeting. She hoped that they had gained much from sharing experiences from each other and that they would leave Hanoi with a renewed sense of the importance of mainstreaming disaster risk management.

Mr. Minh delivered the closing remarks of the host country, Vietnam. He began by saying that after three days of discussions, cooperation, building of friendships, sharing and exchange of lessons and the contribution of ideas, the 5th RCC Meeting has achieved an impressive array of successful results, with the ultimate results are reflected in the Hanoi RCC-5 Statement. On behalf of the host country, he sincerely thanked the participants of their contributions and participation of all the RCC Members and overseas international delegates and the donors. The exchange and sharing of information was much valued and useful for Vietnam and the other countries in terms of disaster prevention and mitigation. He thanked ADPC and the RCC Secretariat for their hard work in the organizing of the meeting and for providing the opportunity bringing of all the RCC Members closer together. He also thanked the Government of Australia for their support of the Meeting. He hoped that the delegates had enjoyed their stay in Hanoi and wished them a pleasant journey home.

Madam Cora shared her thoughts with the participants that although the meeting had come to an end, it was in a sense a beginning, particularly with the HFA and the Hanoi RCC-5 Statement which asks so much of all the participants for the next 10 years and between now and the next RCC Meeting. The three words that had resonated through out the meeting in recalling the many initiatives of the RCC Member countries to address disaster risk management and in celebrating the people behind all of the initiatives and believing that all of the delegates had a contribution to make to develop their own road maps to reduce poverty

in the process and reduce the risk of disaster and vice-versa. She challenged the delegates to reflect on the acronym ADPC and think in the terms of it being a great capacity on which the RCC Members could plan and build their countries to work for the Advancement of Appropriate and sound technologies, for the Development of Policies that should be responsive to their needs and aspirations, the Participatory Partnerships and Public awareness and Commitment to Community-based capacity building for disaster risk management. She urged the delegates to respond and commit their capacity to mainstream disaster risk management. She remarked that it had been a good meeting and she hoped that the participants would return home full of enthusiasm and passion in the mainstreaming disaster risk management.

Madame Cora commended Director Aldea for her chairing of the review of the Hanoi RCC-5 Statement.

Mr. Kessler expressed his pleasure in provided the vote a thanks to the Government of Vietnam for their hospitality that had been shown, the encouragement that had been given and the opportunity to meet.

X. ANNEXES

ANNEX A: DELEGATES AND OBSERVERS TO THE 5TH RCC MEETING

Delegates

Bangladesh	Mr. Muhammad Fazlur Rahman	Secretary in-charge Ministry of Food and Disaster Management
Cambodia	Mr. Khun Sokha	Head of Emergency Response and Rehabilitation Department The National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM)
China	Dr. Wang Zhenyao	Director General Department of Disaster and Social Relief Ministry of Civil Affairs
India	Mr. S.K Chattopadhyay	Joint Secretary (Coordination) Ministry of Home Affairs
Indonesia	Mr. Tabrani	Deputy for Disaster Management Bakornas PBP National Coordinating Board for Disaster Management and IDPs
Iran	Dr. Saeed-Mirza Mohammadi	Deputy Director General Economic Studies and International Cooperation Bureau Management and Planning Organization (MPO)
Iran	Mr. Hamid Reza DehKordi Moghaddam	Head Specialist Project Monitoring and Evaluation Bureau Management and Planning Organization (MPO)
Iran	Mrs. Farzaneh Agharamezanali	Head Specialist Technical Affairs Bureau Management and Planning Organization (MPO)
Iran	Mr. Shabani	Embassy of Iran, Hanoi
Jordan	Mr. Ilayan KH. S. Hammad	Assistant of General Inspector/JCD General Directorate of Jordan Civil Defence
Lao PDR	Mr. Phetsavang Sounalath	Director National Disaster Management Office Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare
Malaysia	Mr. Badrul Shah B. Mohd. Idris	Principal / Director National Security Division Prime Minister's Department
Mongolia	Major General Dr. Purev Dash Doctor of Military Science (PhD), Professor	Chief, National Emergency Management Agency of Mongolia (NEMA)
Nepal	Mr. Sharad Chandra Paudel	Under Secretary Ministry of Home Affairs
Pakistan	Brigadier Sarfraz Khan	Director General Emergency Relief Cell Cabinet Division

Philippines	Director Elma C. Aldea	Administrator , Office of Civil Defence Department of National Defence and National Disaster Coordinating Council (NDCC)
Philippines	Mr. Nestor Mijares	Assistant Director General Regional Development Office National Economic and Development Authority
Sri Lanka	Mr. Garu Muni Janaka Kithsiri Gunawardena	Assistant Director National Disaster Management Center Ministry of Women Empowerment and Social Welfare
Timor Leste	Mr. Francisco F.M. Do Rosario	Head (NDMO) National Disaster Management Office Directorate of Civil Protection Ministry of Interior-Timor-Leste
Timor Leste	Mr. Domingos Pinto	Deputy Director Civil Protection National Disaster Management Office Ministry of Interior-Timor-Leste
Thailand	Mrs. Wachana Kulchanarat	Chief of Planning and Budget Section Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Ministry of Interior
Thailand	Ms. Luckana Manimmanakorn	Chief of Foreign Relations Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Ministry of Interior
Vietnam	Mr. Dang Quang Tinh	Director Department for Disaster Management and Flood and Storm Control Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Vietnam	Mr. Nguyen Huu Phuc	Chief of Master Planning Division Department for Disaster Management and Flood & Storm Control Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Vietnam	Mr. Dang Quang Minh	Disaster Management Center Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
Vietnam	Ms. Hoang Thi Ninh	ASEAN Department Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Observers

ADRC

Mr. Akihiro Teranishi
Senior Researcher

AusAID

Ms. Bronwyn Robbins
First Secretary

CDMP

Mr. Ian Rector
Chief Technical Advisor
and Team Leader Disaster Management and Relief
Bhaban

DIPECHO

Mr. Marc Gordon
Technical Assistant DIPECHO - South
East Asia

Mr. Thearat Touch
Programme Assistant - South East Asia

European Delegation

Mr. Dirk Gerlach
Team Leader

EWC

Dr. Nancy D. Lewis
Director
Research Program

Ms. Meril Dobrin Fujiki
Project Manager **FAO**
Mr. Markku Skytta
Hanoi

Government of France

Mrs. Lucie Moore

Government of Netherlands

Mr. Nicco Bakker

First Secretary

Mr. Fred Smiet **GTZ**

Dr. Christina Bollin

Programme Manager

Disaster Risk Management into Development
Cooperation

ISTED

Mr. Jean Brunot de Rouvre

ISLAND Project Manager (Asia ITand C)

MRC

Mr. Te Navuth

Director

Technical Support Division

MFESB

Mr. Brian Parry

President

Oxfam GB

Mr. Provash Mondal

Humanitarian Program Coordinator

PDC

Mr. Glenn Dolcemascolo

Regional Liaison- Asia

ProVention Consortium

Dr. Charlotte Benson

Economist

Save the Children UK

Mr. Matthew Frey

Director

Mr. Ngo Cong Chinh

Coordinator

Sida

Mrs. Eva Mellgren

Sida Regional Advisor Humanitarian Assistance and
Conflict Management

Mr. Rolf Samuelson

First Secretary

SOPAC

Dr. Netatua Prescott

Sustainable Development Adviser

UNDP

Dr. Subinay Nandy

Deputy UNDP Resident Representative

Hanoi

Dr. Michael Ernst

Regional Disaster Reduction and

Transition Recovery Adviser

Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recover

Regional Center in Bangkok

Ms. Pham Thanh Hang

UNDP Representative, Hanoi

Mr. Marshall Silver

Senior Technical Advisor

UNDP Disaster Risk

Reduction Programme

UN-ESCAP

Dr. Le Huu Ti

Economic Affairs Officer

Water Resources Section

Environment and Sustainable Development

Division

UNESCO

Mr. Keith Maska

UN-ISDR

Ms. Paola Albrito

Programme Officer

Mr. Joe Chung

Senior Regional Officer

UN-OCHA

Mr. Rashid Khalikov

Head

OCHA Regional Office in Bangkok for
Asia and the Pacific

Dr. Rajan Gengaje

Regional Disaster Response Adviser

OCHA Regional Office in Bangkok for

Asia and the Pacific

VNRC

Mr. Phung Van Hoan

Mr. Dang Van Tao

WB

Mr. Laurent Msellati

Mr. Cuong Hung Pham

ANNEX B: LIST OF RCC MEMBERS (AS OF MAY 2005)

GENERAL SULTAN MOHAMMAD EBADI
DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF DISASTER PREPAREDNESS
GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN

MR. MUHAMMAD FAZLUR RAHMAN
SECRETARY IN-CHARGE
MINISTRY OF FOOD AND DISASTER
MANAGEMENT
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH

MR. A.H.M. SHAMSUL ISLAM
DIRECTOR GENERAL
DISASTER MANAGEMENT BUREAU
MINISTRY OF DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND
RELIEF
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH

MR. DASHO PENDEN WANGCHHUK
SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND
CULTURAL AFFAIRS
KINGDOM OF BHUTAN

MR. HAJI AWANG JOHARI BIN JALUDIN
DIRECTOR
BRUNEI FIRE SERVICES
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
STATE OF BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

MR. HAJI MOHD ZAKARIA HAJI SARUDIN
ACTING DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT, PARKS
AND RECREATION
MINISTRY OF DEVELOPMENT
STATE OF BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

H.E. MR. NHIM VANDA
1ST VICE PRESIDENT
THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR DISASTER
MANAGEMENT (NCDM)
KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA

MR. PEOU SAMY
SECRETARY GENERAL
NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR DISASTER
MANAGEMENT
KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA

DR. WANG ZHENYAO
DIRECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DISASTER SOCIAL RELIEF
MINISTRY OF CIVIL AFFAIRS
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

MR. PRIDON SADUNISHVILI
CHIEF
EMERGENCY SITUATIONS AND CIVIL
SAFETY SERVICE

MINISTRY OF INTERNAL AFFAIR
REPUBLIC OF GEORGIA

MR. D.K. SHANKARAN
SECRETARY
(BORDER MANAGEMENT)
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
REPUBLIC OF INDIA

MR. ASHIM KHURANA, IAS
JOINT SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
REPUBLIC OF INDIA

DR. INDRAWADI TAMIN
VICE-SECRETARY, BAKORNAS PBP
NATIONAL COORDINATING BOARD OF
DISASTER
MANAGEMENT AND IDPS
REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA

MR. MEDHI TAFAZOLI
DEPUTY FOR TECHNICAL AFFAIRS
MANAGEMENT AND PLANNING
ORGANIZATION
TEHRAN, IRAN

MR. ABBAS SYED JAZERI
DIRECTOR GENERAL
COORDINATION OF SAFETY AND
RECONSTRUCTION AFFAIRS
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF IRAN

MAJOR GENERAL MAHMOUD EBADI
DIRECTOR GENERAL OF CIVIL DEFENCE
MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
HASHEMITE KINGDOM OF JORDAN

MR. ZAMAMBEK NURKADILOV
CHAIRMAN, EMERGENCY AGENCY
REPUBLIC OF KAZAKHSTAN

MR. KWON WOOK
HEAD
NATIONAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT
AGENCY
MINISTRY OF GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION
AND HOME AFFAIRS
REPUBLIC OF KOREA

MR. PHETSAVANG SOUNALATH
DIRECTOR
NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT
OFFICE
MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND SOCIAL
WELFARE
LAO PDR

MR. MUHAMMAD BIN MUDA
DIRECTOR
CRISIS AND DISASTER MANAGEMENT
NATIONAL SECURITY DIVISION
GOVERNMENT OF MALAYSIA
MALAYSIA

MR. ABDULLAHI MAJEED
DEPUTY MINISTER
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND
CONSTRUCTION
REPUBLIC OF MALDIVES

DR. MAJOR GENERAL PUREV DASH
HEAD
NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT
AGENCY
MONGOLIA

MR. U THAN OO
DIRECTOR GENERAL
RELIEF AND RESETTLEMENT DEPARTMENT
OFFICE OF THE MINISTERS
MYANMAR

MR. CHANDIPRASAD SHRESTHA
SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS
KINGDOM OF NEPAL

BRIGADIER SARFRAZ KHAN
DIRECTOR GENERAL, EMERGENCY RELIEF
CELL
CABINET DIVISION, ISLAMABAD
REPUBLIC OF PAKISTAN

COLONEL RAUKA ERIC ANI
DIRECTOR GENERAL
NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT
OFFICE
DEPARTMENT OF PROVINCIAL AND LOCAL
GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS
PAPUA NEW GUINEA

COLONEL ELMA C. ALDEA
ADMINISTRATOR, OCD AND EXECUTIVE
OFFICER
NATIONAL DISASTER COMMITTEE
OFFICE OF THE CIVIL DEFENSE
REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

MRS. SITA RAJAPAKSE
SECRETARY
MINISTRY OF SOCIAL WELFARE
**DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF
SRI LANKA**

MR. N. D. HETTIARACHCHI
DIRECTOR
NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT
CENTER
MINISTRY OF SOCIAL WELFARE
**DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF
SRI LANKA**

MR. SOONTHORN RIWLEUNG
DIRECTOR GENERAL
DEPARTMENT OF DISASTER PREVENTION
AND MITIGATION, MINISTRY OF INTERIOR
THAILAND

MR. FRANCISCO F. M. DE ROSARIO
CHIEF
NATIONAL DISASTER MANAGEMENT
OFFICE
TIMOR L'ESTE

MR. DANG QUANG TINH
DIRECTOR
DEPARTMENT OF DIKE MANAGEMENT,
FLOOD AND STORM CONTROL
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL
DEVELOPMENT
SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

**ANNEX C: MEETING PROGRAM OF THE 5TH MEETING OF THE ADPC REGIONAL
CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT**

(in collaboration with the Government of Vietnam)

18-20 May 2005

Melia Hotel, Hanoi, Vietnam

Tuesday 17th May 2005

14:00-17:00	<i>(For Advisory Panel Members only)</i>	2nd Meeting of the Advisory Panel of the RCC Program on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development (MDRD-2), Venue: Function Room 3, Level 2
17:00-19:00	Registration	Venue: ADPC Secretariat Room, Lotus Private Room 1, Level 2
19:00-21:30	Welcome Reception	Venue: Ballroom 3, Level 1

Wednesday 18th May 2005 *(Open to all invitees)*

08:00-08:45	Registration of Participants (Participants to be seated in Thong Long Ballroom by 08:50 a.m.) Film Screening of Vietnam Experiences on Disaster Management	
09:00-10:40	Celebration of Vietnam Disaster Prevention Day and Opening Ceremony of the 5th RCC Meeting	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduction of Dignitaries on the dais by Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, Director, Department of Dyke Management, Flood and Storm Control• Welcome Address by Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC• Opening Speech by H.E. Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Chairman of CCFSC• Address and Inauguration of the meeting by H.E. Mr. Vu Khoan, Honourable Vice Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam• Address by Dr. Subinay Nandy, UNDP Deputy Resident Representative in Vietnam• Address by Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Minister of MARD• Address by Ministry of Defence Representative• Address by a Representative from Bac Ninh Province• Address by H.E Professor Dr. Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman, ADPC Board of Trustees• Vote of Thanks by Mr. Dang Quang Tinh, Director of DDMFSC

- 11:00-12:30 **Session I:** **Showcasing the Achievements of Disaster Management in Vietnam**
To showcase disaster management experiences of Vietnam including recent innovations in institutional arrangements and initiatives and share lessons learned
Chair: Dr. Suvit Yodmani, ADPC
Facilitator: NMSI Arambepola
- “Vietnam National Plan for Water Related Disasters” 2001-2020 - Mr. Nguyen Huu Phuc, DDMFSC
 - “NDM Partnership in Central Vietnam” – Ms. Pham Thanh Hang/Dr. Marshall Silver, UNDP
 - “Safer Living Clusters in the Mekong Delta” – Mr. Hang Quang Minh, CCFSC/DMC
 - “Community Based Disaster Risk Management and Achievement of Targets” – Mr. Phung Van Hoan, VNRC
 - “OXFAM experiences on Community-Based Disaster Management” – Mr. Provash Mondal, OXFAM
- 13.30-14.15 **Session II:** **Introduction, Adoption of Agenda and Overview of the Meeting**
To explain the objectives of the RCC meeting and the outputs expected from this meeting
Chair: H.E. Mme Cora de Leon, ADPC
Facilitator: Mr. Boon Tiong Tay, Director, Information and Knowledge Management, ADPC
- “Role of RCC and Purpose of the Meeting” – Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC
 - Self-Introduction by all Delegates and Observers
 - Adoption of Agenda
 - Confirmation of the Advisory Panel to serve as Steering Committee for the Meeting
 - Overview of ADPC’s RCC Follow up Activities
- 14:15-15:15 **Session III-A:** **Responding to Challenges of the Indian Ocean Tsunami, Response, Recovery and Improving Early Warning**
Co-Chairs: Mr. Dang Quang Tinh and Mr. S. K. Chattopadhyay
Facilitator: Mr. Loy Rego
- Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004
 - Indonesia: “Challenges and Lessons Learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 and the 2005 Nias Earthquake” – Mr. Tabrani, Deputy Secretary for Disaster Management, Bakornas PBP, Indonesia
 - Maldives: “Lessons learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 in the Maldives” (Paper circulated)
 - Sri Lanka: “Challenges and Lessons Learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 in Sri Lanka” – Mr. GMJK Gunawardana, Assistant Director, Disaster Management Center, Ministry of Women’s Empowerment and Social Welfare, Sri Lanka
 - Thailand: “Lessons learned from the Indian Ocean Tsunami of December 2004 in Thailand” – Ms. Wachana Kulchanarat, Planning and Policy Analyst, Ministry of Interior, Thailand
 - “Establishing End-to-End Multi-hazard Early Warning System in Southeast Asia” – Ms. Lolita Bildan, Program Manager, Climate Risk Management Team, ADPC

- “ADPC inputs to Post-Tsunami Assessments, Recovery and Planning” – Ms. Supriya Prabhu, Project Manager, DMS, ADPC
- 15:30-16:00 **Session III-A: Responding to Challenges of the Indian Ocean Tsunami, Response, Recovery and Improving Early Warning**
(Continued)
- 16:00-17:15 **Session III-B: Lessons Learned from Recent Disasters in the Asian Region and their Recovery Programs**
Co-Chairs: Mr. Phetsavang Sounalath, Director, National Disaster Management Office, Lao PDR & Major General Dr. Purev Dash, Head NDMA, Mongolia
Facilitator: Mr. N.M.S.I. Arambepola
- Lessons Learned and Experiences from RCC member countries
 - Bangladesh: “Lessons Learned from Floods of August 2004” – Mr. Fazlur Rahman, Secretary-in-charge, Ministry of Food and Disaster Management, Bangladesh
 - Philippines: “Lessons Learned from Floods of November 2004” – Mr. Nestor Mijares/Col. Elma Aldea, Administrator, Office of Civil Defense and Executive Officer, NDCC
 - Iran: Lessons Learned from the Recovery of the Bam Earthquake 2003 and Feb 2005 Earthquake” – Mr. Mehdi Tafazoli, Deputy of Technical Affairs Management and Planning Organization, (MPO) Iran
 - Thailand: “Challenges in Coping with Prolonged Drought in Thailand” – Ms. Wachana Kulchanarat, Thailand
- Thursday 19 May 2005** *(Only for RCC Members and Invited Observers)*
- 08:30-09:15 **Session III-C: Lessons Learned from Regional and National Programs on Preparedness and Mitigation**
To showcase and analyse experiences in disaster preparedness and response to recent disasters as well as new programs in Asian Countries and what general lessons can be learned for broader application
Co-Chair: Col. Elma Aldea, Philippines and Mr. Paudel, Nepal
Facilitator: Earl Kessler, Deputy Executive Director
- “Mekong Flood Management and Mitigation Program (FMMP)” – Mr. Navuth Te, Director, TSD, Mekong River Commission
 - “Flood Emergency Management Strengthening” Ms. Hnin Nwe Win, Project Manager, DMS, ADPC
 - “ASEAN Ministerial Meeting and Launch of ASEAN Regional Program on Disaster Management (2004-2010)” – Mr. Khun Sokha, NCDM-Cambodia
 - “Regional Program on Landslides (RECLAIM)” – Mr. N.M.S.I. Arambepola, Director, Urban Disaster Risk Management, ADPC
- 09:15-10:15 **Session IV-A: Overview on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Development**
Co-chairs: Brigadier Sarfaraz Khan, Pakistan and Mr. Mehdi Tafazoli, Iran
Facilitator: Mr. Boon Tiong Tay, Director, Information and Knowledge Management, ADPC
- RCC program on Mainstreaming DRM into Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia (MDRD): Overview and review of Progress - Mr. Loy Rego, ADPC
 - UNDP Perspective on Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management

into Development: Mr. Michael Ernst, Regional Disaster Reduction Advisor, UNDP BCPR

- Survey of current status of MDRD in countries: Ms. Geethi Karunaratne, ADPC and Dr. Kai Kim Chiang, Program Coordinator, ADPC

- 10:30-12:00 **Session IV-B:** **Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into National Planning Processes**
Co-chairs: Mr. Tabrani, Indonesia and Mr. Gunawardana, Sri Lanka
Facilitator: Mr. Loy Rego
- Country Experiences in
 - India: “Implementation of the National Disaster Risk Management Program: Approach Taken, Gains Made, Lessons Learned” – Mr. S. K. Chattopadhyay, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Home Affairs, India
 - The Disaster Management Strategic Plan for Lao PDR; Targets and Implementation Strategy: Mr. Phetsavangh Sounalath, Lao PDR
 - The processes in Development of Chinese Disaster Reduction Plan and Progress Made: Dr. Wang Zhen Yao, Director General, Department of Disaster and Social Relief, Ministry of Civil Affairs, PR China
 - Proposed approach for Mainstreaming into National Processes;
 - Guidelines for Mainstreaming: Ms. Geethi Karunaratne, ADPC
 - Integration of Disaster Reduction into Environmental Impact Assessment: Ms. Geethi Karunaratne, ADPC
 - Plenary Discussion
- 13:00-13:45 **Session IV-C:** **Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management into Sectors**
Co-chairs: Dr. Wang Zhen Yao, China and Ms. Wachana Kulchanarat, Thailand
Facilitator: Mr. Earl Kessler, ADPC
- Proposed approach for Mainstreaming and Guidelines
 - Education: Zubair Murshed and Hnin Nwe Win, ADPC
 - Agriculture: Lolita Bildan, ADPC
 - Infrastructure and Housing: NMSI Arambepola and Supriya Prabhu, ADPC
- 13:45-15:00 **Session IV-D:** **Group Discussion on Mainstreaming**
- 15.20-18:00 **Study Tour**

Friday 20 May 2005 (*Only for RCC Members and Invited Observers*)

- 09:00-10:15 **Session IV-E:** **Next Steps on Mainstreaming Priority Implementation Projects and Preparation of Guidelines**
Co-chairs: Mr. Fazlur Rahman, Bangladesh and Jordan
Facilitator: Mr. Loy Rego, ADPC
- 10:15-11:00 **Session IV-F:** **Dialogue with Bilateral and Multilateral Donors and UN Agencies on MDRD**
Panel Discussion: UNDP, UNISDR, UNOCHA, ADB, World Bank, ECHO, DFID, AusAID, GTZ, ProVention

11:15-12:30	Session V:	<p>Special Consultative Session for the Asian Region on the Implementation of Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) Adopted at the 2nd World Conference on Disaster Reduction (co-organized with ISDR and UNDP)</p> <p><i>To learn of country expectations on the implementation of the HFA, comments on draft benchmark indicators; and expectations from ADPC, IAP & UN Agencies to support HFA implementation</i></p> <p>Co-Chairs: ISDR, UNDP and ADPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Introduction to the Hyogo Framework of Action and National Platforms” – ISDR • Implementation of HFA by National Government – Experience of Bangladesh and other countries • Support to National Governments by UN Agencies & national Partners • Support to National Implementation of HFA from Regional Organizations • Plenary discussions • Discussion in Break-out sessions
13:30-14:30	Session V: (Continued)	<p>Special Consultative Session for the Asian Region on the Implementation of Hyogo Framework of Action (HFA) Adopted at the 2nd World Conference on Disaster Reduction (co-organized with ISDR and UNDP)</p>
14:30-15:30	Session VI:	<p>Evaluation of Meeting, and Actions for coming year</p> <p><i>This session will detail the conclusions of the 5th RCC Meeting and set out priorities for action.</i></p> <p>Co-Chairs: Col Elma Aldea, Philippines & Mr. Khun Sokha, Cambodia Facilitator: Mr. Loy Rego, ADPC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plenary Discussions • Review of Declaration of RCC-5 • Suggestions for other RCC activities • Date and Venue of the 6th RCC Meeting
15:45-16:30	Session VII:	<p>Closing Ceremony</p> <p>Co-chairs: Mr. Dang Quang Tinh and H. E. Cora de Leon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Summary Overview of the Meeting” – Mr. Loy Rego • Remarks by the Participants • Reading of RCC-5 Declaration • Address by Ms. Bronwyn Robbins, First Secretary, AusAID, Thailand • Closing Remarks by Co-Chairs

**ANNEX D: ADDRESSES AT THE JOINT OPENING CEREMONY OF THE VIETNAM DAY FOR
DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND OF THE 5TH RCC MEETING**

Address by Professor Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman ADPC Board of Trustees

Your Excellency Mr. Vu Khoan, Honorable Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, Excellency Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Minister, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Chairman of Central Committee on Flood and Storm Control, Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director, ADPC, Mr. Subinay Nandy, UNDP national representative in Vietnam, Excellencies, RCC members and observers, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is indeed a great pleasure for me to join you all this morning at this special occasion in Hanoi, observing the commemoration of the Vietnam Disaster Day and the opening ceremony of fifth annual meeting of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management.

Your Excellency Mr. Vu Khoan, we are honored to have you with us this morning. Your presence at this opening ceremony is ample evidence of the commitment and confidence of Vietnam to effectively deal with the disaster risks it faces. Special thanks go to our host the Government of Vietnam for their warm hospitality and excellent arrangements in this beautiful city of Hanoi.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

As we have been reminded by the catastrophic Tsunami about five months ago, the developmental process and poverty reduction priorities of nations and communities in the Asian region are dealt serious economic and social set backs whenever sudden disasters strike. Likewise, the cumulative impacts of slow onset and prolonged disasters like drought confront an increasing number of Asian countries.

When such disasters strike, housing, school, hospitals, buildings, roads and bridges, agricultural crops and livelihood suffer damage or are destroyed. Scarce resources that are programmed for development are diverted for relief and rehabilitation efforts. On the other hand, development activities may sometimes induce new risks if disaster risk considerations do not figure into project design. We all know of roads built in flood plains that increase the incidence and impact of flooding. A hospital that gets flooded or collapses in an earthquake, adds to the problems after a disaster. Development activity and disaster risk reduction are therefore two sides of the same coin and have to be dealt with in harmony.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Disaster risk management is not a stand-alone sector but an essential concern that should operate at all levels and across all sectors. Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction into the development process is a necessary part of making development more risk resilient and sustainable. This requires action by decision makers in a range of national Ministries, and

also the donors and development agencies. I am glad this is a priority theme for discussion at this meeting.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I have spent many years as a medical doctor and public health specialist promoting global vision of “Health for all by the year 2000”. For a successful and sustainable primary health program; the four key pillars were recognized to be:

- Technically sound
- Socially acceptable
- Financially feasible
- Fully participatory.

I commend these principles to you as keys for success as you move forward with programs for disaster risk management.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I derive immense pride and satisfaction in leading ADPC, as the Chairman of its Board of Trustees. Over the last 19 years, ADPC has played a unique role in raising awareness, building capacities and promoting cooperation in disaster reduction. It is a pleasure to see it has a new charter as an international organization, supported by countries of the region.

This is an appropriate occasion to remember and pay tribute to Colonel Brian Ward, the first Director of ADPC, who laid the foundation of this institution. We miss his presence at this meeting.

Having personally participated in all of the four meetings of the RCC and seen its growth and momentum increasing, Our Board of Trustees supports is convinced that the key direction that the RCC has set itself through mainstreaming program, will augur well for the future development of Asia.

I am pleased to be here in this beautiful city of Hanoi, which I first visited in 1975 at the invitation of the Vietnam Medical Association. In the intervening years, much development has taken place and the bonds of friendship between our countries have deepened.

I would like to thank the Government of Vietnam for their support and collaboration and warm hospitality.

I sincerely wish you all a very pleasant stay in Hanoi and a successful meeting.

**Inaugural Address by the Honorable Mr. Vu Khoan,
Deputy Prime Minister, Socialist Republic of Vietnam**

Ladies and Gentlemen, Distinguished international guests;

Today, I am very pledged to attend this Celebration Ceremony of Traditional Day for Disaster Reduction (22/05/1946 – 22/05/2005) and announce the Opening of the Fifth Conference on Disaster Management of Regional Consultative Committee in Asia on Disaster Management.

On behalf of Vietnamese Government, I warmly welcome the presence of Representatives from country members and the Observers from International Organization, from Government and Non-Government Organization in this important Conference.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Being a tropical country in the coastal area of Pacific Ocean. Vietnam is always influenced by many types of disasters, particularly flood and storm. The history of Vietnam development is connected closely to flood and storm control activities. The first dyke lines were build thousand years ago, such as dyke saved Thang Long citadel (is known as Hanoi capital nowadays) was build in Ly dynasty, almost before 11th century. From then on, dyke line is continuously prolonged and upgraded reflecting enormous effort of Vietnamese people in disaster control.

On May 22, 1946, less than one year since the establishment day of Vietnam Republic and Democratic (02/09/1945), President Ho Chi Minh Signed Decree on founding a flood and storm control agency. On May 22, 1990, on the occasion of 100 years anniversary of President Ho Chi Minh, Vietnam Prime Minister signed the Decision on making the 22nd May into the Traditional Day of Flood and Storm Control and Disaster mitigation.

Flood and Storm Control is important mission in all development periods of the country. Vietnamese Government has set up strategies and gives many measures for flood and storm control as well as disaster mitigation which are suitable for the weather characters and topography conditions of each region, area; has mobilized many resources to prevent and mitigate at minimum level the damages caused by floods, storms under the motto: Initiatively prevent, timely response to, effectively overcome flood, storm and disasters.

A large fund has been invested by the State in constructing, improving dyke system; building the water reservoirs to regulate flood; strengthening the forecasting and preventing system and realizing the population project, infrastructure development project, changing the crop production season to mitigate the disasters; supporting to propaganda and community's awareness raising activities. Beside the efforts of the government, the contribution of people has played important and decided role in the disaster control strategy.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Due to the global climate fluctuation, the occurrence of disaster in all over the world has shown an upward tendency, danger caused by natural disaster is larger and more violent, such

as the earthquake triggered tsunami in the end of 2004 in Indonesia and in the countries in Indian Ocean areas caused hundreds of deaths, millions of homeless people, this is a tough loss for the affected countries.

To have an effective measure to prevent and mitigate damages caused by natural disasters international co-operation in each area, in each region and in over the world is needed above all time. Vietnamese Government has early participated in cooperation mechanism of ASEAN nations, countries and organizations in the world in the field of preventing and mitigating disaster. This is opportunity for Vietnam to share and exchange experiences; simultaneously to court the other nations and international organization's support.

Today, Vietnam is honored to be the host country, in cooperation with Asian Disaster Prevention Control (ADPC) to organize the Fifth Meeting of "Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management".

I hope that in this Conference, the managers, the scientists and the experts will share experience, and advance effective policies and measures to initiatively response to actively prevent, and efficiently overcome and mitigate the damages caused by natural disasters.

On this occasion, on behalf of the Vietnamese Government, I also would like to express my gratitude to have the great and effective support from all the nations. Governmental Organizations, and Non-governmental Organization, International Organizations, the bilateral and multilateral donors on flood and storm prevention and disaster mitigation in Vietnam. Hopefully in future, Vietnam will continue to have the greater supports from international friends.

I wish good success to the meeting.

Statement by Dr. Subinay Nandy, UNDP Resident Representative in Vietnam

H.E. Deputy Prime Minister Vu Khoan, H.E. Mr. Cao Duc Phat, Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Chairman, Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control, Mr. Krasae Chanwongse, President, Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am delighted to speak on behalf of the United Nations Development Program at this Regional Consultation on disaster management and commemoration of the Vietnam National Day for Flood and Storm Control on 22 May 2005.

The United Nations congratulates the Government of Vietnam for hosting this important event. It shows the Government's commitment to protect human lives and property, its willingness to share disaster management experience, and its support to enhancing regional cooperation.

Vietnam's long history in coping with natural hazards has led to impressive results. The death toll in natural disasters that occurred almost annually over the last decade has reduced

significantly. The storm number 4 in 2004 did not cost any life, but more than 3,000 poor fishermen perished in a similar devastating storm in 1997.

However, economic losses caused by natural hazards are increasing, which is a global trend. In addition, there are still serious health risks during disasters in Viet Nam, disruption in education, and losses of livelihood opportunities, particularly for poor women-headed households. Many ethnic women and children in Ninh Thuan province walk 1.5 hours to the nearest clean water source during the current drought, and in some communes the child malnutrition rate has significantly increased (by 20%).

The rapid urbanization process causes higher vulnerability to natural hazards of some communities, and industrialization is increasing risks that are not yet well-known here. Indeed, in the backdrop of impressive results, many challenges remain for Vietnam. In the context of this regional dialogue, let me list the most critical challenges based on the lessons that we have learned through more than 15 years of partnership for disaster management capacity building in Vietnam.

Firstly, reducing vulnerabilities to natural hazards is essential for poverty reduction and achieving the Millennium Development Goals

Asia is the most dynamic region in the world. At the same time recurring floods, droughts and storms are natural hazards that form part of life in Asia. Whether these natural hazards become disasters depends on vulnerability of the people who are exposed to the hazards. Reduction of vulnerability, and especially vulnerability of the poor should be at the centre of all disaster management strategies and actions. Poverty reduction has clearly been identified as one of the three main goals of Vietnam, together with economic growth and environmental protection. It is therefore important that vulnerability reduction is included in the Socio-economic development plans at all levels. The Vietnam Development Targets have set a goal of halving the number of people falling back to poverty due to natural disasters by 2010. It is equally important that the targets that Vietnam has set to achieve the Millennium Development Goals take into account the vulnerabilities and capacities of communities in different hazard-prone areas.

In September this year State leaders all around the world will gather to review the progress after 5 years of implementing the Millennium Development Declaration. I hope that the experts in disaster risk management like you will bring strong messages as to the need for reducing vulnerability of nations and communities to natural hazards in the context of achieving the MDGs.

Secondly, enhance information and learning systems

The ambitious targets of vulnerability reduction and, for example, ensuring disaster-proof water supply and environmental sanitation require resources that communities can access in support of their preparedness, response and recovery efforts. Reaching these targets also requires improved knowledge of the hazards; warnings on potential impacts; and institutional learning on disaster prevention and mitigation, and post-disaster recovery.

Vietnam has well-developed 'Early Warning Systems': it is collecting weather and hydrological information, and informs the public and officials through the mass media and specialized departments and agencies. UNDP has been a steady and proud partner in developing these systems and capacities. However, more, better, and more timely information is needed. Information on risks and vulnerabilities at national and local levels should be developed further, and made more widely available to officials, social organizations and the public, to support decision-making and action by the Government, provincial and district authorities, social organizations, and communities at risk.

This information should also support the preparation and implementation of the Socio-Economic Development Plans of all sectors and at all levels – because disaster risk reduction is all too often a separate, sectoral issue dealt with by specialist departments and agencies only. All sorts of development interventions should, where possible, contribute to reducing vulnerabilities to natural hazards and help develop community capacities for preparedness and effective mitigation of disaster impacts.

We are pleased to see Vietnam's proactive involvement in developing a regional Early Warning System for tsunamis. This new priority should be reflected in the Second Strategy and Action Plan for Disaster Reduction that we hope the Government will finalize and approve soon, to guide policy development and actions in this important field.

Thirdly, an appropriate institutional framework is crucial for multi-hazard risk management and vulnerability reduction.

Vietnam has developed its legal framework and built up institutional capacity through the Central Committee for Flood and Storm Control and Committees at province, district and commune level. We wish to see the same capacity for other hazards such as drought and forest fires; for avian influenza; and for serious industrial disasters, even though those have not yet happened in Vietnam. We are pleased to learn that the National Assembly has approved the preparation of a Law on Dyke management and flood and storm control, and the United Nations stands ready to support this strategic action through the Natural Disaster Mitigation Partnership. But this Law or other new Laws should address all types of hazards that Vietnamese people are exposed to. Work is also needed for a more comprehensive institutional set up to address multi-hazard disaster risk management.

Finally, disaster reduction is not possible without people's understanding of hazards and their participation in reducing vulnerabilities and risks.

People need to be involved in decisions relating to their own safety and well-being. This is even more critical in the context of climate change because hazard-risks are increasing, as well as some of the vulnerabilities, particularly of the poor.

The United Nations Secretary General, Mr. Kofi Annan said, "*Disasters are the problem that we can and must reduce*". I hope that your discussion over the next three days will lead to new initiatives at national and regional levels for safer lives and more sustainable livelihoods of the people who are most at risk in the countries where we live.

Thank you.

Address by Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Honorable Minister, MARD

High Excellency Mr. Vu Khoan – Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam! Distinguishes international guests, Ladies and Gentlemen,

On behalf of Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development – The standing office for Flood and Storm Control of Vietnam – we are very honor to express a warm welcome and great appreciation to the Deputy Prime Minister of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to attend the opening ceremony of Vietnam’s Disaster Prevention Day and the Opening ceremony of the 5th meeting of ADPC Regional Consultative Committee (RCC5) on Disaster Management. I also warmly welcome international guests, representatives from Ministries, sectors and local authorities for attending this meeting.

High Excellency Deputy Prime Minister! Ladies and Gentlemen,

Designated as the Standing Office for Flood and Storm Control of Vietnam by the Government, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development would like to express our sincere thanks to the Party leaders, National Assembly, State, Government and the Deputy Prime Minister for their supports in this challenging course of disaster management. The MARD is committed to make their best efforts to promote a close cooperation with relevant ministry agencies local authorities for an utmost realization of the directions by the Deputy Minister and the Decision No 12/2005. CT-TTg dated 08 April issued by the Prime Minister on natural disaster preparedness, response, search and rescues in 2005.

Mr. Deputy Minister,

Human beings have suffered from detrimental and massive loses brought about by all kinds of natural disasters, among which are typhoon, tornado, flood, drought, forest fire and epidemic diseases. Natural disasters have claimed millions of lives all over the world for the last 10 years of 20th century and for the 4 first year of 21st century. Life of hundreds of million people was changed and can never be the same again. Poverty loss because of natural disasters is as much as billions dong. Located in a monsoon and tropical area with high humidity. Vietnam is vulnerable to a wide range of natural disasters, among which are typhoon, flood, tornado, drought, forest fire, and land slide. Natural disasters originate not only from unpredictable development of natural environment. Natural disasters respect no border. Currently, preventing the occurrence of natural disaster is still far from our reach. What we can do now is to prepare and mitigate consequences caused by natural disasters. With experience accumulated and support of scientific and technological advances, and a closer cooperation between countries and international community, human beings are envisaged to take a more active role in disaster preparedness, response and mitigation.

Like regional countries and other countries in the world, Vietnam has been making every of its effort towards a more effective and proactive management of disasters through appropriate adaptation of new agricultural crop patterns, building livelihood constructions appropriate with the natural disaster evolution, natural condition and socio-economic situation of a particular region. Enormous efforts made by the Government and public in natural disaster preparedness and mitigation are well reflected through a system of constructions such as the

river dyke, sea dyke for flood water prevention, and dyke for salinity intrusion and tidal wave prevention which are thousands of meters in length. It is said that natural disaster preparedness and mitigation of Vietnam country is closely associated with history of the country's development. During this process, Vietnam has received enormous support of its international friends. Those supports are highly appreciated.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

Vietnam National Day for Disaster Management this year is organized in coincidence with the 5th Meeting of ADPC Regional Consultative Committee for Disaster Management (RCC5) and Vietnam is the host country of this event. On behalf of MARD, I would like to take this event to warmly welcome you all to RCC5 and wish RCC5 a big success.

Thank you very much and I wish the Deputy Minister Vu Khoan and all distinguished guests good health and prosperity.

**Welcome Address by Dr. Suvit Yodmani, Executive Director,
Asian Disaster Preparedness Center**

Excellencies Mr. Vu Khoan, Honorable Vice Prime Minister, Excellency Dr. Cao Duc Phat, Minister, Agriculture and Rural Development, Excellency Professor Dr. Krasae Chanawongse, Chairman of the ADPC Board of Trustees, Mr. Le Huy Ngo, Chairman of Central Committee on Flood and Storm Control, Socialist Republic of Vietnam Mr. Subinay Nandy, Deputy UNDP resident representative in Vietnam, Excellencies, Ambassadors and members of the diplomatic corpse in Vietnam, RCC members and friends, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is an honor and privilege to welcome you for ADPC to be co-hosting the Fifth Annual Meeting of the Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management, coinciding with the official celebration of 59th Annual Commemoration of the Vietnam Disaster Day that falls on 22nd May. And as this year marks the 115th Anniversary of the later President , Ho Chi Minh, permit me to join the people of Vietnam in paying the highest respect to the great leader. I would also like to express our gratitude to the Government of Vietnam for kindly hosting this Fifth RCC meeting. We are grateful to the Government of Australia, who by their generous support of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee, have made it possible for us to meet again.

I would especially like to extend our deep appreciation to Your Excellency Mr. Vu Khoan, Honorable Vice Prime Minister of Vietnam, for your gracious presence here today which demonstrates the leadership and commitment of the highest levels of the Government of Vietnam to protecting its people from Floods and Storms, and towards building a more disaster resilient nation. We look forward to learning from the rich experience of your country for hundreds of years in mitigation of natural disasters, and learning to live with floods, and especially during the past 7-8 decades under the direction of the great leader and now under this Government's leadership.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC) was established at the initiative of 3 UN Agencies; the UN Disaster Relief Organization which is now UN OCHA, UNDP and WMO. Since 1986, ADPC has served countries of the Asia Pacific region in enhancing their capacities for disaster management. I am proud to announce that in February 2005, eight countries, namely Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand, signed a charter establishing ADPC as an international organization.

The Regional Consultative Committee (RCC), set up in 2000, comprises 30 members who are the heads of the National Disaster Management systems of 25 countries of the Asian region. The RCC, whose role is now affirmed by the new charter, provides a consultative mechanism for the development of action strategies and cooperative programs on a regional and sub-regional basis; so as to guide ADPC's work.

Annual meetings of RCC are convened by ADPC and are co-organized by the Government of the host country. The first two meetings of the RCC were held in Bangkok in November 2000 and October 2001; the third in Delhi, India in October 2002 and the fourth in Dhaka, Bangladesh in March 2004. This year with the generous offer of Vietnam, the meeting returns to South-east Asia.

This year, the theme of this 5th RCC meeting is “***Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia***”.

The theme reflects the needs expressed by member countries at the previous meetings and the work we have been undertaking for over a decade in promoting safer housing, better compliance of construction codes and integration of disaster risk mitigation as part of the school curriculum at the provincial and district levels, under our Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program and other regional initiatives. ADPC's Climate Forecast application and climate change adaptation programs, implemented in collaboration with the Hydro-meteorological Service of Vietnam, aimed to provide locally relevant/usable climate information, with more than a minute's lead time, for contingency crop planning and resource management.

In this region, under the Flood Emergency Management Strengthening project of the Mekong River Commission's Flood Management and Mitigation Program, ADPC is working closely with the provincial and district Governments in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Vietnam in integrating flood preparedness into development planning programs. I am also honored to note that the Government of Vietnam has also agreed to partner with Cambodia, Myanmar, Thailand and ADPC in building and operating the Tsunami Early Warning System for the Greater Mekong Region.

Following mandates from the first three meetings, the RCC Program on Advocacy and Capacity Building for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Management in Development Practice (MDRD), was unanimously endorsed at the 4th Meeting in Bangladesh last year.

The program aims to systematically promote the integration of disaster risk management into sustainable national development policies and practices and donor-funded programs in the

RCC Member Countries. It focuses on Mainstreaming DRM into national development plans, as well as and in specific priority sectors, namely agriculture, infrastructure, housing, financial services, education and health. The program is supported with core funds from the Australian Government (AusAID) and is likely to receive support from other donor countries and UN agencies.

This meeting will launch priority implementation projects on mainstreaming in several RCC countries. The program helps advance a key priority of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA), adopted globally, at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction (WCDR). The RCC Program has been successfully registered as one of the first two Post-WCDR Partnerships and is thus a pioneering contribution to the implementation of Hyogo Framework.

The Hyogo Framework of Action calls on countries to “Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation” well integrated into development policy, planning and programs, with adoption of legislation to support disaster risk reduction, and multi-sectoral national platforms to support implementation.

A special session on the last day, co-organized with ISDR and UNDP, will discuss the Implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action in RCC member countries. This will provide an important input to the UN Inter Agency Task Force chaired by UN Under-Secretary General, Jan Egeland next week in Geneva.

Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

We have reached a consensus that it is high time disaster risk management becomes a part of the development agenda of every country.

We are confident that through the actions we plan at this fifth RCC meeting, we will be able to further mainstream disaster risk reduction into development. I wish all delegates and guests fruitful deliberations and a pleasant stay in this wonderful city of Hanoi.

Thank you very much.

ANNEX E: FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS ARISING FROM ALL PREVIOUS RCC MEETINGS

Consolidated List of Recommendations made at RCC Meetings (RCC1-4)

(As reported at 5th RCC Meeting)

1. Creating Awareness and Political Support (RCC 1 and 2)
 - 1.1. Creating Awareness, Promoting Political Will and Support
 - 1.2. Advocacy of Comprehensive Disaster Risk Management
2. Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia (MDRD) (RCC 1 and 4)
3. Capacity Building of National Disaster Management Systems (RCC 1 and 2)
 - 3.1. Capacity Building of National Disaster Management Systems
 - 3.2. Development of Disaster Management Plans
 - 3.3. Exchanging Experience on Legal and Institutional Arrangements
 - 3.4. Building of National Disaster Management Information Systems
 - 3.5. Improving Disaster Management Training
 - 3.6. Enhancing Scientific and Technical Cooperation in Disaster Management
4. Public Awareness and Media (RCC 1, 2 and 4)
 - 4.1. Enhancing Public Awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction and Media Coverage
5. Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) (RCC 2)
 - 5.1. National CBDRM Trainings and Country Level Pilots
 - 5.2. CBDRM Regional Programs
 - 5.3. Mobile, Neighborly, Cross-border Search and Rescue Team
 - 5.4. Actionable Community Level Early Warning System
6. Cooperation with Sub-Regional Agencies (RCC 1 and 2)
 - 6.1. Cooperation with Mekong River Commission (MRC)
 - 6.2. Cooperation with ICIMOD/WMO
 - 6.3. Cooperation with ASEAN
 - 6.4. Cooperation with SAARC
 - 6.5. Cooperation with SOPAC
 - 6.6. Cooperation in East Asia
 - 6.7. Cooperation in Central Asia
 - 6.8. Cooperation in West Asia

7. Regional Initiatives (RCC 1 and 2)
 - 7.1. Asian Regional Conference
 - 7.2. Asian Regional Report on Disaster Reduction
 - 7.3. Vulnerability Atlas for Asia: Development of Risk Maps and Local Level Referencing for Countries in the Asian Region
8. Flood Management and Mitigation (RCC 2 and 3)
9. Drought Management and Mitigation (RCC 3)
10. Urban Disaster Risk Management (RCC 4)
11. Building Capacity for Management of Man-made Disasters (RCC 2)
12. RCC Mechanisms (RCC 1 and 2)
 - 12.1. Periodic Information Dissemination/ Sharing in the Region
 - 12.2. Role and Function of RCC
 - 12.3. Expansion of RCC Membership and Observer Base

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS TAKEN BY ADPC ON RECOMMENDATIONS OF PREVIOUS RCC MEETINGS (RCC 1 - 4)

(Presented to the 5th RCC Meeting at Hanoi, Vietnam, 18-20 May 2005)

No.	FOLLOW-UP AREAS	ACTIONS BY ADPC SINCE 2000
1. Creating Awareness and Political Support (RCC 1 and 2)		
	1.1. Creating awareness, promoting political will and support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inauguration of Opening Ceremonies of RCC Meetings by Head of State or Government and participants of senior political figures. Holding of RCC meetings in conjunction with the commemoration of National Disaster reduction days. • ADPC prepared concept paper “Creating Awareness, Political Will and Support for Disaster Management and Mitigation” discussed at RCC2. • Making presentations at ASEAN Ministerial Meetings on Disaster Management, December 2004 – Phnom Penh, Phuket Ministerial Meeting on Regional Cooperation on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements, 28-29 January 2005 – Thailand, ESCAP Ministerial Conference on Environmental and Sustainable Development, March 2005 - Pusan, Korea. • Exploring probability of making presentations on disaster management at regional meetings of parliamentarians - on-going dialogues with EWC. • Planning meetings with National Committees/ Councils of Disaster Management and with agencies responsible for Finance and Planning under the RCC program on MDRM.
	1.2. Advocacy of Comprehensive (Total) Disaster Risk Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RCC 3 noted the work done in Bangladesh, China, India and Philippines and endorsed the need for RCC and its member countries to promote comprehensive multi-hazard approach. • Workshops held for Royal Thai Government officials on “Institutional Arrangements for Total Risk Management”, 3-4 April 2002, Bangkok, Thailand and “Total Disaster Risk Management” with DDPM-Thailand, 18 July 2004. • “2nd Consultative Meeting on Total Disaster Risk Management”, jointly hosted by ADRC/OCHA/ADPC, 13-14 June 2002, Bangkok, Thailand. Attended by Regional Organization and Regional Offices of UN Agencies. • Primer on Disaster Risk Management developed by ADPC with support from UNDP and USAID, draft versions presented and discussed at RCC 3 and 4 (2004-05). • 2 tailored courses on “Total Disaster Risk Management” conducted in Bangladesh in 2003. • The 3rd Regional Consultative Meeting of Regional Organizations & Regional Offices of UN Agencies jointly organized by WHO& ADPC from 24-25 February 2004 in the Philippines.

2. Mainstreaming/ Integrating Disaster Management into Development Planning (RCC 1 and 4)		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of “Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction into Development Policy, Planning and Implementation in Asia (MDRD)” program in 2002. • Submission of revised concept paper of MDRD to RCC4 and further development of concept on MDRD. • Presentation of Mainstreaming concept at the 1st ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management, 7 December 2004 and at Phuket Ministerial Meeting on Regional Cooperation on Tsunami Early Warning Arrangements, 28-29 January 2005. • “Disasters and Development (D&D)” course launched in Asia in 2004 jointly by ADPC, WHO, and UNDP. • Production and wide distribution of brochure on MDRD in 2005 and launching of the Program at World Conference on Disaster Reduction, January 2005 – Kobe, Japan. • Registration of RCC MDRD Program as a post WCDR Partnership. • Development of draft outline for Priority Implementation Projects. • Development of outline for guidelines and production of draft guidelines. • 1st Meeting of the Advisory Panel for the RCC program on MDRD, 23-24 March 2005. • Request for Initial Proposal for Priority Implementation Projects (PIPs) from RCC member countries in April 2005. 	
3. Capacity Building of National Disaster Management Systems (RCC 1 and 2)		
3.1.	Capacity Building and Institutional Strengthening of National Disaster Management Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has programmed and implemented capacity building activities for the NDMOs of Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, East Timor, India, Lao PDR, Philippines, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Vietnam. • Successful implementation of Danida funded Disaster Reduction Program for Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam in Disaster Risk Communication. • ADB Technical Assistance project in Uttaranchal and Uttar Pradesh in strengthening their disaster management systems, resulting in the establishment of the first state level Ministry of Disaster Management and state level Disaster management Center in Uttaranchal, in 2002-03. • ADPC-World bank Workshop on “Reconstruction Needs Analysis, Planning and Implementation” 13-15 August 2002, Bangkok, Thailand. • Conducted DM training for provincial DM authorities in 5 provinces of China. • Assisting GSDMA, India, in enhancing their “Damage Assessment and Loss Estimation” skills through adaptation of ECLAC methodology (2004-2005).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Regional Capacity Enhancement for Landslide Impact Mitigation (RECLAIM)” project with funding from Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (2004-05).
3.2.	Development of Disaster Management Plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Finalization of National Disaster Management Plan of Sri Lanka. • ADPC supporting development of state and pilot district plans in Uttar Pradesh and Uttar Ranchal States in India under ADB project (2002-03). • Under AUDMP, assisted municipal authorities in Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh and Indonesia to improve preparedness plan. • Conducted 3 training courses in “Planning for Disaster Management” in India in collaboration with NDMC, India. • ADPC supports development of Provincial and District Flood Preparedness Plans in Mekong provinces of Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam.
3.3.	Exchanging Experience on Legal and Institutional Arrangements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asian Regional workshop held on “Legal and Institutional Arrangements for Disaster Management”, 24-26 April 2002 in Bangkok. • Publication on “Overview of Disaster Management in Southeast Asia” under PDR-SEA 1 project. • Special session in Regional Workshop in Bali, September ’02. • Research on National and Provincial Arrangements for Preparedness and Response in PDR-SEA 3. • Documentation of the current practices of national, provincial and district disaster management systems to support CBDRM, in Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, Lao and Vietnam in June 2005 under PDR-SEA 3 project.
3.4.	Building of National Disaster Management Information Systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC presented paper on “National DM Information Systems in Asia” at 4th GDIN Conference in Canberra 2001. • National level trainings for Information Management in Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, the Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam under PDR-SEA 2 project in 2004.
3.5.	Improving Disaster Management Training (RCC 1, 2 and 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening capacities of national institutions and consolidating ADMIT; review of capacities and needs. • Supporting NDMOs Training Capacity Building under PRD-SEA 1, 2 and 3 projects and MRC-ECHO and MRC-GTZ projects.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and delivery of courses Public Health in Emergency Management in Asian and the Pacific (PHEMAP), Hospital Emergency Preparedness and Response (HERP), Public Health in Complex Emergencies (PHCE), Disasters and Development (D&D), Management of Public Health Risks in Disasters (MPHR). • Has undertaken consultancy assignments in evaluation of training courses run by partner organizations in Cambodia, Lao, Myanmar. • “Capacity Building in Asia using Information Technology Applications (CASITA)” project under AUDMP, for the institutionalization of academic courses of disaster mitigation at university level.
3.6.	Enhancing Scientific and Technical Cooperation in Disaster Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC through ECE and Climate Forecasting Application in Bangladesh (CFAB) project is promoting dialogue among scientists and users in Indonesia, Philippines, Bangladesh, Vietnam and Thailand. • At the RCC 1 and 3, India proposed regional study on drought in South Asia. ADPC is trying to identify resources. • “Drought Management and Livelihood System” pilot projects in Rajasthan, India and Bali, Indonesia with IRI (2005). • Applied Research Grants for Disaster Reduction in collaboration with Provention Consortium, World Bank in 2004 and also in 2005. • Joint implementation of Pilot National Hazards and Vulnerability Atlas’s for Vietnam and Thailand with Pacific Disaster Center in 2005.
4. Public Awareness and Media (RCC 1, 2 and 4)		
4.1.	Enhancing Public Awareness on Disaster Risk Reduction and Media Coverage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working with the Department of Local Administration - Thailand on producing of Public Awareness Material on floods, earthquakes, landslides and tsunamis. • Working in Thailand on Mine Awareness Campaign in Province of Sae Kaew, Mae Hong Son and Chiang Mai. • Working in AUDMP project on Public Awareness Campaign in Nepal, Sri Lanka and Indonesia. • “Disaster Reduction Program in Cambodia, Lao and Vietnam (DRP-CLV)” focused on disaster risk communication with pilot program at the provincial level in Cambodia and Vietnam implemented and public awareness materials distributed. • Educational materials on flood and earthquake preparedness produced and distributed in Uttar Pradesh under ADB-TA (2002-03).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNESCAP-ADPC Journalism Award for Outstanding Reporting on Emergencies and Disasters, launched at International Day for Natural Disaster Reduction, Bangkok, Thailand, 13 October 2004. • “Climate and Media” workshop held in 2004 by CRM team to promote dissemination of climate and extreme weather related information to the public through media (print, radio and TV).
5. Community Based Disaster Risk Management (CBDRM) (RCC 2)		
	5.1. National CBDRM Trainings and Country Level Pilots	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted national training courses on CBDM and Urban Disaster Mitigation (UDM) in Cambodia, East Timor, Indonesia, India, Laos, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam in collaboration with national partner training institutions. • Pilot flood project in Hat Yai Thailand in 2003. • Coordinated regional training on CBDRM with SOPAC in February '05.
	5.2. CBDRM Regional Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of concept paper for Asian Earthquake Vulnerability Reduction Program for high risk cities and districts. • Twelve international CBDRM courses in Bangkok and the region (since 1997). • Development of CBDRM curriculum, Regional Training of Trainers and Development of technical capacity of practitioners and partner organizations in CBDRM under PDR-SEA 1 (2001-02) project. • Community based Flood Risk Management Project developed and implemented in Cambodia and Thailand under AUDMP. • “Integrating CBDRM into Socio-Economic Development Process” workshop in Bangkok, 11-13 August 2004. • “3rd Disaster Management Practitioners Workshop on CBDRM”, by ADPC, UNESCAP and IFRC in Bangkok, 11-13 May 2004. • Publication of regular printed and electronic newsletters on CBDRM to facilitate information sharing under PDR-SEA 2 project. • Publication of Practitioners Handbook for CBDRM Practitioners. • Developed new training courses on participatory planning, monitoring and evaluation, disaster risk communication at the community level and participatory disaster risk assessment. • Institutionalization of CBDRM into Government, Policy, Practice and implementation at the regional level under PDR-SEA 3 project (2005-06).

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training and Capacity Building Project (TCBP) in Afghanistan (2004-05).
5.3.	Mobile, Neighborly, Cross Border Search and Rescue Team (RCC 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Establishment of ASEAN Response Action Plan” – one of the priority projects under the ASEAN Regional program on Disaster Management, jointly developed by ACDM and ADPC. • Facilitation of trans-boundary emergency assistance under the GTZ-MRC-ADPC program “Flood Emergency Management Strengthening” in MRC member countries – Cambodia, Lao, Thailand and Vietnam.
5.4.	Actionable Community Level Early Warning System (RCC 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Publication of “Overview of Early Warning System in Southeast Asia” under PDR-SEA 1 (2001-02) project. • Community level flood early warning system a key component within the trainings conducted in Cambodia and Vietnam under ECHO-MRC-ADPC Capacity Building project Phase I (2003-04). • ADPC taking lead role in establishing end-to-end Multi-Hazard Early Warning System for parts of Southeast Asia.
6. Cooperation with Sub-Regional Agencies (RCC 1 and 2)		
6.1.	Cooperation with Mekong River Commission (MRC) (RCC 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contributed to the formulation of the regional Flood Management and Mitigation Strategy Implementation Program of MRC. • Appraisal of “Flood and Emergency Management Strengthening” component 4 of the MRC Flood management and Mitigation Program FMMP (June-July 2003). • Successful Implementation of Joint Program with MRC on DIPECHO funded “Capacity Building for Flood Preparedness Planning using Flood Information Systems in the Lower Mekong Basin” project (2003-04). • Implementation of GTZ-MRC-ADPC “Flood and Emergency Management Strengthening” program under MRC’s FMMP (2004-07). • Participated in the 1st, 2nd and 3rd Annual Flood Forums of MRC in May 2002, October 2003 and April 2005 and gave presentations on “Enhanced Flood Preparedness at Community, Provincial and National Levels”, “Regional Capacities and Partnerships for Flood Preparedness, Damage Mitigation and Flood Proofing” and “Proposed Mekong FMM Newsletter and Awareness Materials: First Steps towards a Mekong FMM Partnership” respectively.

	6.2. Cooperation with ICIMOD/WMO (RCC 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC participated in ICIMOD-WMO meetings on South Asian Cooperation in Flood Management and is in dialogue on further collaboration (2001 and 2003). • Currently undertaking a study commissioned by WMO on “Social Aspects of Integrated Flood Management”.
	6.3. Cooperation with ASEAN (RCC 1, 2 and 3)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Held a workshop on “Development of ASEAN Regional Program on Disaster Management (ARPD M)” on 25-27 March 2002 to facilitate the development of the program. • Provided assistance in development of the ASEAN Regional Program on Disaster Management which was presented and endorsed at 12th AEGDM meeting, August 2002 in Hanoi, Vietnam. • On-going dialogue with ASEAN Secretariat on proposal for ADPC collaboration on the Implementation of the ARPD M. • Assisted with the production and printing of the ARPD M which was launched in Bali at ACDM meeting, 26-27 May 2004 and submitted proposals to ACDM at its 1st and 3rd meetings in Brunei (2003) and Phnom Penh (2004).. • Conducted “Feasibility Study for Establishment and Operationalization of an ASEAN Emergency Response and Strategic Planning Institute for Environmental Disasters” in 2004
	6.4. Cooperation with SAARC (RCC 1, 2, 3 and 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A concept paper prepared on “South Asian Cooperation in Disaster Management”, which was discussed at SAARC Technical Committee Meeting on Environment & Meteorology in March 2001 in Bhutan: as well as SAARC Standing Committee in August in Colombo. SAARC Secretariat supports Collaboration between Member countries and ADPC. • Assisted Indian Meteorological Department for SAARC regional workshop in Delhi on 25-28 March 2002. • On-going discussion with SAARC Secretariat on a collaborative MoU with ADPC and convening of a regular meeting of SAARC focal points on disaster management. • Call for strengthening cooperation on disaster management in SAARC made at both RCC 3 and 4. • RCC 3 calls for development of South Asian Regional Program on Disaster Management. ADPC developed a proposal on “Strengthening of South Asian Cooperation on Disaster Management”, in partnership with UN-ISDR and submitted it to ECHO (2003).
	6.5. Cooperation with SOPAC (RCC 1 and 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MOU signed between ADPC and SOPAC in March 2001. • ADPC participated in SOPAC Annual Meeting in September 2001 in Auckland. • Delivery of CBDRM course in Fiji in 2005.

	6.6. Cooperation with East Asia (RCC 1, 2, 3 and 4)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study tours for Chinese Civil Affairs officers to Thailand and Sri Lanka. • FRM course conducted in Beijing in cooperation with the Research Center on Flood and Drought Disaster Reduction, Ministry of Water Resources. • Planned activities on CBDRM trainings at provincial level in Jiangxi and Qinghai provinces of China. • ADPC facilitated cooperation between Mongolia and Australia Fire Services on wild land fire management.
	6.7. Cooperation with Central Asia (RCC 1 and 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow-up with USAID on the feasibility study on the establishment of a regional center in Georgia (2002). • Dialogue with ISDR Central Asia office, UNDP & SDC offices and Focus Humanitarian in Tajikistan.
	6.8. Cooperation with West Asia (RCC 1 and 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jordan has invited ADPC to participate in West Asian regional consultation 27-30 Oct 2001. • Disaster management training courses for disaster management practitioners in Iran and Turkey, 2004.
7. Regional Initiatives (RCC 1 and 2)		
	7.1. Asian Regional Conference (RCC 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC prepared concept paper on “Organizing of Asia Regional Multi-stakeholder Conference on Disaster Reduction and Support to National Conferences” and tabled at RCC2. • Dialogue with potential cooperating partners (ISDR, UNDP, WHO) underway. • Held Asian Regional Conference on Best Practices on Disaster Mitigation in September '02. • Held 2nd and 3rd “Southeast Asia Disaster Management Practitioners Workshop” in 2001 (Danang) and 2004 (Bangkok). • Organized, in collaboration with ISDR, “Asia Partnership Special Sessions on Asia” in WCDR. • Offered support to RCC members to assist in planning for national conferences.
	7.2. Asian Regional Report on Disaster Reduction (RCC 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC prepared concept paper on “Asian Regional Report on Disaster Reduction” and presented it at RCC2. • Review of Disaster Risk Management Practices in South East Asia. • Constitution of ARRDR Advisory group/editorial panel. • Preparation and presentation of a framework for analysis. • Identification of national partners for compilation of information.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC contributed to the ISDR Global Report on Disaster Reduction
7.3.	Vulnerability Atlas for Asia: Development of Risk Maps and Local Level Referencing for Countries in the Asian Region (RCC 1 and 2)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC tabled concept paper on “Vulnerability Atlas for Asia: Development of Risk maps and Local Level “Referencing” for countries of the Asian Region” at RCC2. • Development of guidelines for Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam to undertake risk mapping at the national level. • Joint implementation of Pilot National Hazards and Vulnerability Atlas’s for Vietnam and Thailand with Pacific Disaster Center since 2004.
8. Flood Management and Mitigation (RCC 2 and 3)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular “Urban Flood Mitigation” and “Flood Risk Management” courses conducted annually. • Flood preparedness and mitigation projects implemented in India, Cambodia, Lao, Vietnam, Thailand. • Consultation initiated for dialogue between neighboring provinces of Cambodia and Vietnam. • Trainings on “Flood Preparedness Planning at Provincial and District Level” developed and conducted (in local languages) in collaboration with MRC in Cambodia and Vietnam. Plans for replicating the training in Lao in 2005. • The same course will be delivered in Lao under ECHO-MRC-ADPC Capacity Building project Phase II (2005-06). • “Primer on Integrated Flood Risk Management” developed under AUDMP with USAID and UNDP support.
9. Drought Management and Mitigation (RCC 3)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Drought Management and Livelihood System” pilot projects in Rajasthan, India and Bali, Indonesia with IRI (2004). • RCC 3 recommended ADPC to link with ongoing programs of UNDP, INCRISAT, IUCN, ESCAP and ISDR
10. Urban Disaster Risk Management (RCC 4)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-going “Asian Urban Disaster Mitigation Program (AUDMP)” since 1995 in Bangladesh, Cambodia, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Nepal, Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand. • Dialogue with RCC member countries on needs identified through presentations in RCC 4. • “Urban Flood Mitigation” course developed and delivered regularly. • “Land-use Planning” course developed and delivered in Lao and Sri Lanka. • Held regional workshop on “Best Practices in Disaster Mitigation” in Bali Indonesia, from 22-24th September 2002.

11. Building Capacity for Management of Man-made Disasters (RCC 2)		
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NBC course with FOI, ARC and EMA. • Cooperated with Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Royal Thai Government and Australian Government in organizing one session in Prevention of Terrorism workshop on 17-19 April 2002 (presentation by ARC on “September 11 American Red Cross Responds”). • Cooperate with UNEP-DTIE and ROAP on APELL program. • Held the first “Seminar on Emergency Planning and Enhancing Safety in Large Buildings’ in collaboration with National Fire protection Association on 4th February 2002. • Mine risk education trainings in Mae Hong Son and Chiang Mai (2004).
12. RCC Mechanisms (RCC 1 and 2)		
	12.1. Periodic Information Dissemination/ Sharing in the Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC sends newsletter to all RCC members and will develop email/ list serve. • Widely circulated RCC report as well as the soft copy of the report posted on the ADPC website. • Presented outcomes of RCC at annual ADPC Board of Trustees meetings and other regional meetings.
	12.2. Role and Function of RCC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADPC to continue as convener and secretariat.
	12.3. Expansion of RCC Membership and Observers Base	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During 2001, Pakistan, Indonesia, Malaysia and Kazakhstan confirmed their membership. During 2004, Afghanistan accepted membership and during 2005 Maldives accepted membership. • Representatives from ISDR, World Bank, SIDA, EWC, ADB, UN Agencies and bilateral donors invited to 2nd, 3rd and 4th RCC meetings.

ANNEX F: ADPC PLANS TO SUPPORT THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HYOGO FRAMEWORK OF ACTION

(As presented to RCC 5 and submitted to the ISDR Secretariat as input to the 11th meeting of the UN Inter Agency Task Force (IATF) of Disaster Reduction, 25-26 May 2005, Geneva)

ADPC is committed to play its role as a regional organization to support implementation of HFA. These plans arise from our responsibilities of being:

- a.) A regional entity member of the IATF since 2000;
- b.) A longstanding supporter of IDNDR, since the start of the Decade;
- c.) A founder member of the ISDR Asia Partnership(IAP) and;
- d.) The Secretariat of one of the first post WCDR partnerships, the RCC program on mainstreaming Disaster Reduction into development.

These plans are based on discussions and decisions of our Board of Trustees at its 5th meeting held on 5th April 2005, as well as articulated expectations by the member countries of the ADPC Regional Consultative Committee on Disaster Management, and the discussions at the 5th RCC meeting held in Hanoi from 18 to 20 May 2005.

1. Support to countries of the region in planning and implementation of HFA

This would involve supporting National Governments in convening national workshops of all key stakeholders, namely, concerned Government ministries and departments, scientific and technical institutions, NGOs, UN Agencies, donors and the private sector, especially those who have an active interest in disaster management. It is expected that such a workshop would identify the current national actions being taken by various stakeholders in each country, identify priorities from HFA that are most urgent to work on, and try to set consensual goals on closing gaps in these priority areas. Outcomes anticipated from this national workshop are harmonization of these priorities with ongoing programs and projects, and establishing a task force to meet periodically to review progress.

2. Support to establishment of national platforms for disaster reduction in interested countries

Based on the concept of national platforms in the HFA and other ISDR documents, support would be given to those countries requesting it, to take steps to set up such platforms. In other cases, where such a platform or committee already exists, support would be given to making its functioning and proceedings more result oriented.

This is envisaged as an activity where ADPC will work with UNDP country offices in their capacity as head of the UN System country teams, ISDR Regional Advisers, UNDP-BCPR regional advisors and others who are interested. A major partner would be the members of the ISDR Asia Partnership, and the Partnership itself.

3. RCC program on Mainstreaming DRM into Development policy, planning and implementation (MDRD)

The RCC program on MDRD has already been registered prior to the Kobe conference as a post WCDR partnership with the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD). The activity is under way with Priority Implementation Projects (PIPs) planned in several RCC member countries.

The PIPs cover mainstreaming into both national development processes, as well as specific initiatives by NDMOs to work with partner ministries on mainstreaming DRM into specific sectors (Agriculture, Infrastructure and Housing, Health, Education, and Financial Services).

This work will also include mainstreaming into country Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), country Assistance Strategies of the World Bank and ADB, and the UN System Common Country Assessment and UN Development Assistance Framework (UN CCA and UNDAF). In this part of the RCC program, active partnerships are being built with the Banks, and UN Agencies - particularly UNDP and ISDR.

4. Joining with other regional agencies and regional offices of UN Agencies to develop a system of structured cooperation and technical assistance to countries of the region on HFA implementation as well a system of monitoring progress and creating platforms for sharing of lessons learned.

In this we see great potential for the role of the ISDR Asia Partnership, the ISDR Asia Informs newsletter, and a possible institutional convening of the Regional IATF. This will build on past efforts to develop coordination among these regional partners, such as the first three meetings of Regional Organizations and Regional Offices of UN Agencies held in Kathmandu (July 2001), Bangkok (June 2002) and Manila (February 2004); co-organized by ADRC, ADPC, UN-OCHA and WHO.

Safer communities and sustainable development through disaster reduction



Asian Disaster Preparedness Center

P.O.Box 4 Klong Luang, Pathumthani 12120, Thailand

Tel (66-2)516-5900-10, Fax (66-2) 5245360

www.adpc.net

E-mail: adpc@adpc.net