



International Federation
of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies



REPORT

Disaster Risk Reduction
Practitioners Workshop

Bangkok, Thailand
13-14 November 2013

Supported by



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	2
2. Workshop Report	5
Theme 1- Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability	6
Theme 2- Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach.....	8
Theme 3- School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction	11
Theme 4- Early Warning, Early Action	13
Theme 5- DRR and Livelihoods	15
Theme 6- Urban DRR	17
3. Conclusion and Evaluation	15
Annex	19
Agenda	19
Participants List	21
Workshop Evaluation	24

1. Executive Summary

A Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Practitioners Workshop was organized by the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) South East Asia Regional Delegation in Bangkok, Thailand on 13-14 November 2013. This workshop is supported by the European Commission for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection through IFRC's regional project entitled *"Enhancing Red Cross and Red Crescent Capacities to Build Safer and More Resilient Communities in South-East Asia"*.

This is the seventh DRR Practitioners Workshop which brought together 60 DRR practitioners to share experience and promote cooperation among international and local non-governmental organizations, Red Cross, governmental organizations, communities, and regional and international agencies working in South-East Asia.

More specifically the workshop aimed to:

- Understand and identify the good practices, lessons learned, gaps, skills, challenges, tools and methods and share experiences in community-based risk reduction initiatives to enhance integrated community-based programming.
- Identify inclusive areas and approaches toward community resilience linking the grass roots with national, regional and global level initiatives.

The workshop focused on six themes:

- Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability
- Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach
- School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction
- Early Warning, Early Action
- DRR and Livelihoods
- Urban DRR

The table below provides a summary of the key points and recommendations under each theme.

Theme	Key points and recommendations
Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A joint-advocacy approach is effective in pooling resources and making impact, although the sustainability of such consortiums is a challenge. • Awareness and advocacy should be embedded in all activities in projects, contributing to national strategies and linking to priorities in the Hyogo Framework for Action. • Investments for DRR awareness and advocacy should be prioritized for promoting champions, strengthening DRR practitioners' capacity in awareness and advocacy, and building scientific and quantitative evidence to inform policymakers. • To maximize impact, awareness and advocacy initiatives should be targeted at specific audience group using a consistent message across multiple media, and using a language understood by the specific audience group. • Awareness and advocacy do not necessarily need to be a long process. Some projects have been able to change mindsets within one year. There needs to be a well thought-out advocacy strategy and key principles or guidelines to increase the effectiveness of awareness and advocacy initiatives, as well as an inventory of the various tools used at different levels (regional, national, local).
Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DRR is usually inclusive only in the risk assessment process. It is therefore important to promote inclusiveness in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, in capacity building initiatives and in early warning systems (EWS). • National level advancement in developing a framework for inclusive DRR should be linked with local/community level understanding of this framework. • Key challenges that need to be addressed include explaining and developing a clear

	<p>understanding of the difference between participation and inclusiveness, the multiple agencies involved when incorporating an inclusive approach to DRR, and ensuring that they are committed and well-coordinated. DRR agencies may not regard inclusiveness as their business, and that it should be the responsibility of the education ministry, women's ministry, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A considerable amount of awareness raising and advocacy is required in this area of inclusion and one of the action points for the way forward is to conduct an inter-agency / multi-stakeholder workshop. Other action points including capacity building, development of standardized tools and methods, and provision for the special needs of vulnerable groups for their active engagement in DRR activities.
<p>School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • School safety initiatives remain ad hoc and project-based. There is a need for a common model for school safety, an inventory/collection/library of information resources and tools for school safety, and the mapping of school safety initiatives. The Asian Coalition for School Safety recognize these priority needs and IFRC is taking the lead to fulfil them, and requests the collaboration of organizations working on school safety. • When implementing a school safety programme, it is important to consider multiple aspects. For instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Target interventions not only at children but also teachers and headmasters, parents and community groups. ○ Incorporate health, hygiene, water and sanitation, livelihood and other aspects, not just DRR. ○ Focus on education policies and practices at both national and local levels, involving DRR and education stakeholders. ○ Promote an inclusive approach to school safety and reach out to out-of-school children, children with disability and other vulnerable community groups. ○ Do not just make schools safe but ensure safe access to schools.
<p>Early Warning, Early Action</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community-based EWS is an area that should be prioritized in programming to create effective models and strategies for implementation, to establish linkages with national and regional EWS, and to provide guidelines and tools. • Guidelines and tools are especially needed in the crafting of warning messages that are useful and relevant to different groups of people, and in the dissemination of warning message through different channels. • An inclusive approach to EWS is essential e.g. ensuring that those who are colour blind can understand the colour coded warning. • Some of the key requirements for early warning and early action include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ordinances and laws to sustain community-based EWS. ○ Memorandum of Understanding or similar agreements to clarify roles and responsibilities of local government and community. ○ Training of communities in observation, analysis and issuance of advisory. ○ Incorporation of indigenous knowledge and practices in EWS. ○ Include operations and maintenance in the EWS planning process
<p>DRR and Livelihoods</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Livelihood improvement and diversification is a good entry point for promoting resilience building. By strengthening and diversifying livelihoods, it helps individuals and communities better cope with and respond to stresses and shocks from a variety of hazards. • For initiatives that incorporate DRR and CCA in livelihoods, it is important to develop an effective coordination mechanism with stakeholders in relevant sectors. • It is also important to incorporate DRR and livelihoods in national and local development policies and plans, and even in risk assessments. • Strengthening the capacities of practitioners on the application of sustainable livelihoods into DRR practice is a priority. • Knowledge sharing events and documentation of good practices and lessons learned will also be helpful for advancement and innovation in this area.
<p>Urban DRR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DRR practitioner plays an important role in shaping safe and sustainable towns and cities by facilitating the assessment and treatment of disaster risk within the processes used to manage urban areas.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• DRR in urban areas need to consider the complexity of the urban environment, including issues related to informal settlements, and social networks that are different from rural communities.• In urban areas, the incorporation of DRR in building regulations, land use planning, and critical facilities management are vital.• Tools, skills and experience in urban DRR need to be developed and systematically documented in guidelines and case studies.
--	---

Overall, the workshop participants found the event a very useful learning and networking opportunity to engage with other DRR practitioners, and expressed that the DRR Practitioners Workshop should be a regular annual event.

2. Workshop Report

The International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) South-East Asia Regional Delegation has been implementing a regional initiative on disaster risk reduction (DRR), entitled “*Enhancing Red Cross and Red Crescent Capacities to Build Safer and More Resilient Communities in South-East Asia*”. This project is supported by the European Commission for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) through its Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO). The project aims to reduce the vulnerability of communities in seven countries- Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Philippines, Timor Leste and Viet Nam- by strengthening the capacity of National Societies. In this connection, a DRR Practitioners Workshop was organized by the IFRC South East Asia Regional Delegation in Bangkok, Thailand on 13-14 November 2013. This workshop is in line with the project’s intention to promote knowledge sharing and enhance cooperation with DIPECHO partners.

This is the seventh DRR Practitioners Workshop which brought together 60 DRR practitioners from the seven targeted countries with hands-on experience in the implementation of community-based DRR activities under the DIPECHO Action Plan. The workshop participants were comprised of representatives from international and local non- governmental organizations and their local partners, Red Cross, governmental organizations, communities, and regional and international agencies including ADPC, ECHO, FAO, UNICEF, UNISDR and USAID. The participants list is attached in the annex.

This workshop is a continuation of a series of workshop since 1999, as below:

1 st Workshop	2 nd Workshop	3 rd Workshop	4 th Workshop	5 th Workshop	6 th Workshop
Hosted by APS in Hanoi, Viet Nam in October 1999. This meeting of the regional DRR Working Group and DIPECHO partners aimed to establish a regional network among DRR practitioners in South-East Asia	Hosted by Viet Nam Red Cross in Da Nang, Viet Nam in November 2001. The objective was to share information and experiences and strengthen linkages between organizations working in the field of disaster management.	Held in Bangkok, Thailand in May 2004, with the theme “ <i>Institutionalizing Community-Based Disaster Risk Management in Government Policy Making, Planning and Program Activities</i> ”	Held in Bangkok, Thailand in March 2006 with the theme “ <i>Learning from Community-Based Practices: Strengthening Policy and Partnership</i> ”	Held in Phnom Penh, Cambodia in April 2008, with the theme “ <i>Sustaining Partnerships: Meeting the Challenges of Scaling up Community-Based Disaster Risk Management Programmes</i> ”.	Hosted by Thai Red Cross and co-organized by IFRC and ADPC in Phuket, Thailand in September 2009, with the theme “ <i>Building Safer and More Resilient Communities in Asia and Pacific</i> ”.

As most projects under the current DIPECHO Action Plan were coming to an end, it was a timely opportunity to discuss the key learnings and persistent challenges, and identify the gaps that can be collectively tackled with future interventions.

More specifically the workshop aimed to:

- Understand and identify the good practices, lessons learned, gaps, skills, challenges, tools and methods and share experiences in community-based risk reduction initiatives to enhance integrated community-based programming.
- Identify inclusive areas and approaches toward community resilience linking the grass roots with national, regional and global level initiatives.

The workshop focused on six themes:

- Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability
- Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach
- School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction
- Early Warning, Early Action
- DRR and Livelihoods
- Urban DRR

An independent consultant facilitated the workshop sessions. The agenda is attached in the annex.

The first part of the workshop focused on identifying the learnings, challenges and gaps in five of the six themes.¹ The session for each theme started with two to four presentations that aimed to provide a varied perspective on the theme to prompt discussions. This was followed by discussions in a plenary on the key learnings and challenges, as well as the identification of any gaps where future actions are required. The plenary in each session provided the opportunity for participants to ask presenters questions, share their own experience on the particular theme, and deliberate on the key learnings, challenges and gaps.

In the second part of the workshop, participants went into six small groups. This allowed the participants to have a more in-depth knowledge sharing and discussion session on the specific themes in order to come up with future actions that can be collectively taken. Participants were asked to sign up for one of the six theme sessions that they would like to contribute to.

The subsequent sections give a summary of the learnings, challenges, gaps and future actions for each theme.

Theme 1- Awareness, Advocacy and Accountability

This theme remains at the heart of many DIPECHO partners' work because even though national policy and legal frameworks for DRR may be in place, DRR, in reality, is side-lined during normal times. People forget about considering risk issues.

Advocacy and awareness raising are therefore important for motivating, learning and sustaining interest. It is important to raise awareness so that people know an issue exists and know how to deal with it. Advocacy is crucial for commitment, support and funds to take action in resolving the issue. Accountability is essential for monitoring the actions taken, for example when citizens have the capacity to hold their government accountable to decisions made related to DRR, or when systems are in place to ensure that the local and international NGOs are answerable to their actions, and multiple channels are available to provide feedback, report problems and make a complaint. This session focused predominantly on the awareness and advocacy aspects.

This session had three presentations. There were two presentations from Viet Nam. One focused on a joint-advocacy approach by JANI group, and the other on DRR awareness and advocacy in the



¹ The Urban DRR theme was discussed in the second part of the workshop only. The discussions were facilitated by Michele Cocchiglia from UNISDR.

housing sector by Development Workshop (DW). A presentation from Myanmar looked at DRR awareness and advocacy at the community level by Myanmar Red Cross.

In summary, participants generally agreed that a joint-advocacy approach is effective in pooling resources and making impact, although the sustainability of such consortiums is a challenge. Awareness and advocacy should be embedded in all activities in projects, contributing to national strategies and linking to HFA priorities. Investments for DRR awareness and advocacy should be prioritized for promoting champions, strengthening DRR practitioners' capacity in awareness and advocacy, and building scientific and quantitative evidence to inform policymakers. To maximize impact, awareness and advocacy initiatives should be targeted at specific audience group using a consistent message across multiple media, and using a language understood by the specific audience group.

In the session, participants discussed the challenge of advocating the institutionalization of DRR in government and the changing of mindsets being constrained by the short project implementation period, since they both require a longer period of time before results and changes are evident. However, it was pointed out that awareness and advocacy do not necessarily need to be a long process. Some projects have been able to change mindsets within one year. There needs to be a well thought-out advocacy strategy and key principles or guidelines to increase the effectiveness of awareness and advocacy initiatives, as well as an inventory of the various tools used at different levels (regional, national, local).

Learnings

- Need for champion for DRR awareness raising and advocacy initiatives
- Important to align initiatives, projects and programmes with national government programmes.
- Multiple entry points are available depending on opportunities available, including through education, training, and demonstration/showcasing of models and projects.
- Important to handover initiatives to government
- Working groups and task forces are useful to design, select and standardize tools
- The set-up of a project unit inside government structure is a useful strategy to take if you are considering the institutionalization of DRR in government processes.
- Make use of Red Cross volunteer to mobilize community
- Use one message consistently, across many media
- Start from the local culture and traditions, and their capacity, and adapt the tools and methodologies to meet their needs, and not the other way around (i.e. community adapting to tools)

Challenges

- For joint advocacy – coming up with a consensus on the way forward
- The lack of a champion hampers awareness and advocacy
- Obtaining funds from government and donors for the sustainability of awareness and advocacy networks, and initiatives
- The institutionalization of DRR in government organizations and the changing of mindsets takes time, but is constrained by short project implementation periods
- When new national policies and laws are passed, local governments are not automatically aware of them and understand their implications. The process of creating this awareness and understanding takes time
- Despite agreement that it is important to link DRR and climate change adaptation (CCA), linking them in reality is a challenge when countries are treating DRR and CCA separately, with ministries for environment looking after CCA, and disaster management offices taking responsibility for DRR
- Involving communities, including women and other groups in an inclusive and truly participative manner
- The long process required to change mindsets
- Building scientific and quantitative evidence to inform policymakers
- Being transparent on the project/programme and budgets to stakeholders, which is important in advocacy.

Gaps

- The importance of linking DRR with CCA framework. DRR and CCA have very similar aims in terms of promoting resilience in the face of hazards. They both focus on reducing vulnerability by improving the ways to anticipate, cope with and recover from their impacts
- The inclusion of an exit strategy in project designs is fundamental to support the sustainability of the investments made, ensure continuity and help stakeholders to take over the project
- Awareness and advocacy do not necessarily need to be a long process. Some projects have been able to change mindsets within one year. There needs to be a well thought-out advocacy strategy and key principles or guidelines to increase the effectiveness of awareness and advocacy initiatives
- Not only coordination among implementers, but also donor coordination is required to increase the effectiveness of awareness and advocacy initiatives
- There needs to be global agreement and minimum standards for shelter construction
- The use of scientific knowledge and research and translating them to a language understood by a layperson for awareness raising and advocacy
- How is the advocacy process linked to HFA priorities
- How is the advocacy process contributing the national strategies
- Inventory of the various tools used and at what levels (regional, national, local, etc.)
- Policies committing financial resources for DRR by the national governments based on the AMCDRR Declaration, and how it is monitored
- Assessment of HFA implementation especially at the local and community levels, and its use as an advocacy process
- How to incorporate awareness raising and advocacy in DRR implementation and in community empowerment initiatives
- Translation of DRR policy in a simple and understandable language for the government officials and communities

Action Points

- Promote advocacy champions
- Build advocacy capacity among practitioners
- Create networks to promote DRR
- Promote humanitarian diplomats at all levels—invest on skills
- Identify lead agency/actor for advocacy work and link them with field experiences and evidences
- Document the evidences systematically and disseminate widely
- Advocacy embedded in all actions/projects at all levels

Theme 2- Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach

An inclusive approach to community-based disaster risk management (CBDRM) ensures that services and systems are adapted to meet the diverse needs of community members, and that all individuals are empowered to take action to reduce their own risk.

This session had three presentations. Myanmar Consortium for Community Resilience (MCCR) led by ActionAid presented an approach to promoting inclusion at all levels—from national down to the community. The Indonesia project led by Handicap International focused on incorporating an inclusive approach in the local planning and budgeting process. Thailand wrapped up the presentation portion with a community perspective, where we heard from the sub-district head about how he mobilized the community, and mobilized resources to reduce disaster risk in his community.



Discussions in the workshop clearly showed the importance and need for incorporating an inclusive approach in all aspects of DRR. In practice, CBDRM is usually inclusive only in the risk assessment process, and the workshop participants generally agree that there is a need to promote inclusiveness in planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation, in capacity building initiatives and in early warning systems. A concerted effort is required to standardize tools and methods for inclusive community-based DRR (CBDRR). An approach that has worked for MCCR is having technical experts (e.g. in women/gender, children, disability, elderly) supporting implementers. At the same time that tools and methods are being standardized, it is important to allow for flexibility in different contexts (e.g. of inclusive assessment methods, simulation methods).

In the session, participants discussed the various entry points for incorporating inclusive DRR, and the importance of linking national level advancement in developing a framework for inclusive DRR with local/community level understanding of this framework. Some of the challenges discussed include explaining and developing a clear understanding of the difference between participation and inclusiveness, the multiple agencies involved when incorporating an inclusive approach to DRR, and ensuring that they are committed and well-coordinated. DRR agencies may not regard inclusiveness as their business, and that it should be the responsibility of the education ministry, women's ministry, etc.

A considerable amount of awareness raising and advocacy is required in this area of inclusion and one of the action points for the way forward is to conduct an inter-agency / multi-stakeholder workshop. Other action points including capacity building, development of standards and guidelines, and provision for the special needs of vulnerable groups for their active engagement in DRR activities.

Learnings

- Possible approach to incorporating inclusive CBDRR is: Training => Assessment => Forming village disaster management committees or task forces => Simulation exercises (approach of the MCCR)
- There are various entry points for incorporating inclusive CBDRR: in planning and policy reviews; in training for women, children, elderly, people with disabilities to develop their capacity to participate in DRR activities; in training for NGOs to train others; in training government staff to incorporate inclusive CBDRR in their work
- When a new government body is established for DRR, when there is a new head of department, or for a new planning cycle, they are also opportunities for incorporating inclusive DRR
- Inclusive DRR needs to be mainstreamed at all levels, not just at the community level.
- It is important to have dedicated technical experts for each speciality (e.g. women/gender, children, disability, elderly etc.)
- An approach that has worked for MCCR is having technical experts supporting the implementers
- It is important to set standards for inclusiveness (both quantitative and qualitative) and quotas (e.g. minimum number of women represented in risk assessments)
- It is important to link national level advancement in developing a framework for inclusive DRR, with local/community level understanding of this framework
- Standardize methods and tools through development of handbooks and toolkits
- The testing of methodologies in training, field visits, drills and awareness raising events should lead to development of guidelines to standardize methods and tools
- Develop leadership skills in women and others to advocate for inclusive CBDRR, and take the lead as change agents
- To effectively mobilize community, community agreement and regular sharing of information are critical
- The commitment and persistence of community leaders is one of the crucial success factors for community mobilization
- Provide incentives for communities to motivate them to participate

Challenges

- Creating an optimal balance between standardization and flexibility in different contexts (e.g. of inclusive assessment methods, simulation methods)
- Explaining and developing a clear understanding of the difference between participation and inclusiveness
- Often initiatives are inclusive up to risk assessment. The challenge is incorporating inclusiveness in planning, implementation and monitoring.
- DRR agencies may not regard inclusiveness as their business, and that it should be the responsibility of the education ministry, women's ministry, etc.
- There are many agencies involved when incorporating an inclusive approach to DRR, creating problems in coordination
- There is a mismatch between promoting inclusiveness in the national agenda and funds available to roll-out inclusive DRR initiatives
- In reality, many countries are still relief-focus, particularly at the local level. Dealing with the different levels of understanding of DRR is a challenge.
- Ultimately, we want to reduce vulnerability and build resilience. While implementing inclusive DRR, how do we ensure that we are also addressing the root causes of vulnerability? How can we address the social systems, community structures and power relations that keep some groups vulnerable?



Gaps

- The qualitative aspect of inclusive DRR. It is important to develop indicators to address needs and concerns and measure change.
- The need to develop tools to engage people with disabilities
- The need to link inclusive DRR with sustainable development
- The need to move from ad hoc projects to strategic long-term programmes

Action points

- Conduct inter-agency / multi-stakeholder workshops to:
 - Agree on definitions
 - Standardize tools, guidelines and indicators
 - Integrate inclusiveness in programme/project cycle
 - Identify the technical expertise required and see how they can complement each other
- Raise awareness and develop the knowledge and skills of different stakeholders in adopting an inclusive approach for DRR
- Provision of the special needs of vulnerable groups for their active engagement in DRR activities
- Bring out the confidence and capacities of vulnerable people to become involved in DRR activities
- Integrate inclusive DRR in development plan
- Develop programmes that focus on increasing the economic assets of vulnerable people

Theme 3- School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction

Risk sensitive education beginning in the earliest school grades, continuing through secondary and higher education is important for children and youth so that they understand and incorporate risk issues in all aspects of development from an early age. Children and youth are future leaders as well as change agents in educating the wider community on risk issues.

Since children and youth spend a good part of their time in educational institutions, schools must be safe and able to withstand hazards. Often, schools are also community centres and evacuation shelters.



An Asian Coalition for School Safety was established on 19 September 2012. The founders of the Coalition are ADPC, Plan International, Save the Children, UNESCO, UNICEF and IFRC. The purpose of the coalition is to create a space at the regional level for information sharing on school safety issues, and collectively promote school safety at country and regional levels. The shared framework for understanding and acting to bring about comprehensive school safety is the Comprehensive School Safety Framework that is based on three pillars: (1) safe school facilities, (2) school disaster management, and (3) DRR/CC education.

This session had four presentations. Timor-Leste Red Cross (CVTL) presented their youth empowerment initiative. Handicap Indonesia showcased how people with disabilities can build the resilience of schools. UNICEF presented the comprehensive school safety framework, and the Plan Cambodia case looked at the application of this framework for school safety on the ground.

In summary, school safety initiatives remain ad hoc and project-based. There is a need for a common model for school safety, an inventory/collection/library of information resources and tools for school safety, and the mapping of school safety initiatives (e.g. on Google Map). The Asian Coalition for School Safety recognize these priority needs and IFRC is taking the lead to fulfil them, and requests the collaboration of organizations working on school safety.

When implementing a school safety programme, it is important to consider multiple aspects. For instance, interventions should be targeted not only at children but also teachers and headmasters, parents and community groups. School safety should incorporate health, hygiene, water and sanitation, livelihood and other aspects, not just DRR. The programme or project should also focus on education policies and practices at both national and local levels, involving DRR and education stakeholders.

In the session, participants discussed some of the good practices and lessons learned in school safety initiatives. For example, the need to be sensitive to the school calendar and children's attention span. It may be more effective to consider short daily activities than infrequent activities of long duration. Promote an inclusive approach to school safety and reach out to out-of-school children, children with disability and other vulnerable community groups. Do not just make schools safe but ensure safe access to schools.

Learnings

- Be sensitive to school calendar and time when planning school safety initiatives
- Create working groups. They are critical to generating ideas and solutions, and coming up with a consensus on the way forward
- Involve the Ministry of Education in school safety initiatives
- Raise the DRR awareness of teachers and headmasters as well, not just children
- Incorporate health, hygiene, water and sanitation, livelihood and other aspects in school safety initiatives, not just DRR

- Integrate school safety initiatives in regular / extra-curricular activities so that we do not overload children with information
- Introduce DRR issues in Geography classes
- For children, consider short daily activities (10-15 minutes a day) rather than infrequent activities of long duration, as children tend to have shorter attention span
- Incorporate school plans into CBDRR plans, and not create separate plans
- Develop activities that link schools to communities
- Make use of the school safety framework to implement projects
- Promote an inclusive approach in school safety projects/programmes (e.g. girls and boys with disability)
- Link DRR and CCA in schools and education systems
- Do not just make schools safe but ensure safe access to schools



Challenges

- Sustaining the dynamics generated in schools and among youths, constrained by short project implementation periods
- Lack of coordination between DRM body and education ministry
- Linking CBDRR and school-based DRR activities, in terms of people's involvement, e.g. how can we involve girls and boys and women and men in both types of activities
- Hampering performance of school children and overloading them with information
- The integration of DRR in national curriculum
- Reaching out to children who are not in schools
- Families being overprotective of people with disability, preventing their participation in activities
- Incorporating DRR in the agendas of organizations working on disability, youth, women's issues, etc.
- Promoting the safe school concept
- Government acceptance of assessment results developed by external agencies such as NGOS and UN agencies

Gaps

- DRR in national curriculum
- Budget for school safety

Action Points

- Consider DRR, CCA and school safety in an integrated manner:
 - Develop policy and guidelines to integrate DRR, CCA and school safety
 - Integrate DRR, CCA and school safety into education curriculum
 - Provide orientation of DRR, CCA and school safety to schools and communities
 - Include in government budgeting, resources for DRR, CCA and school safety initiatives
- Establish national level DRM in education working group
- Organize workshops, trainings and meetings for stakeholder and partners in the education sector
- Train education stakeholders and partners on DRR, CCA and school safety concepts and methods
- Set up multi-stakeholder task force to develop DRR, CCA and school safety policies, guidelines and school safety curriculum

Theme 4- Early Warning, Early Action

This theme is about translating early warning systems (EWS) that exist at the national or state level into an effective people-centred system at the community level. Where systems are not in place it may mean developing a new system for the community utilizing local resources and monitoring systems. This is so that communities and individuals can act early to reduce personal injury, loss of life, damage to property and the environment, and loss of livelihoods.

This session had two presentations. The first presentation by the Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical & Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA) looked at a national government initiative to develop community-based flood EWS. The second presentation by the Indonesia Red Cross (PMI) provided the findings from a joint review undertaken by staff and volunteers from PMI, the Aceh Provincial Disaster Management Agency, American Red Cross and Canadian Red Cross, after the earthquakes on 11 April 2012. The review assessed the effectiveness of the tsunami EWS and the preparedness of governments, communities and humanitarian organizations.



In summary, workshop participants generally agreed that community-based EWS is an area that should be prioritized in programming to create effective models and strategies for implementation, to establish linkages with national and regional EWS, and to provide guidelines and tools. Guidelines and tools are especially needed in the crafting of warning messages that are useful and relevant to different groups of people, and in the dissemination of warning message through different channels.

In the session, participants discussed some of the key requirements for early warning and early action. For instance, ordinances and laws are needed to sustain community-based EWS. Memorandum of Understanding or similar agreements needs to be developed to clarify roles and responsibilities of local government and community. Training communities in observation, analysis and issuance of advisory, and the incorporation of indigenous knowledge and practices in EWS are important, and leads to ownership. Consider operations and maintenance in the EWS planning process. A contingency plan should be in place. An inclusive approach to EWS is essential e.g. ensuring that those who are colour blind can understand the colour coded warning. To improve linkage with national-level EWS, develop a communication scheme to show the flow of information from the national warning centre to the individual in a community, and back (two-way communication with feedback mechanisms is vital).

Learnings

- Sustain community-based EWS through ordinances and laws
- Incorporate indigenous knowledge and practices in EWS
- Involve communities in observation, analysis of data and issuance of advisory that leads to ownership
- Provide training to communities on data observation, warning protocols and EWS standards
- Develop Memorandum of Understanding or similar agreements to clarify roles and responsibilities of local government and community in EWS
- Develop a communication scheme to show the flow of information from the national warning centre to the individual in a community
- Consider operations and maintenance in the EWS planning process
- Share information regularly

- Involve children as volunteer observers to raise awareness
- Ensure that guidance is available between the time when warning is issued at the national level and when warning is issued at the community level
- Agree upon the contingency plan for all levels (national to community). The contingency plan for the community should be simplified for ease of understanding
- Use different communication channels to issue and relay the warning messages

Challenges

- Differences in political affiliations, priorities and agenda prevent sharing of information
- Conveying scientific knowledge and making it relevant to lay person
- Turnover/changes in community leadership (technical leaders and local leaders)
- The lack of incentives to retain observers
- Linking different community-based EWS initiatives
- Unclear roles and responsibilities

Gaps

- An inclusive approach to EWS e.g. ensuring that those who are colour blind can understand the colour coded warning
- Specific guidance on how to relay warning messages to people
- National government needs to advocate to other stakeholders to include in their planning “how to support the government to further disseminate warning information to community people”
- Use of social media to disseminate warning
- Ensuring the robustness of technologies
- The use of GIS for community-based EWS
- Integration of the four components of EWS (risk knowledge, warning services, dissemination of warning messages and response capability)

Action Points

- Regional level: Improve technical linkages and collaboration between regional organizations (e.g. MRC, AHA Centre, RIMES, etc.)
- National level:
 - Improve transboundary technical linkages and collaboration, e.g. improve transboundary monitoring of hazards and sharing of data
 - Increase advocacy for EWS legislation and reinforce existing legislation
 - Strengthen multi-hazard, multi-sector EWS mechanisms at all levels (with tools, methodology, training and IEC materials)
 - Ensure clear roles and responsibilities are developed, understood and committed at all levels
 - Put in place risk communication strategy
- Local level:
 - Integrate all local EWS initiatives under an overarching national strategy
 - Ensure that warning messages are relevant and understandable by layperson
 - Collaborate on inclusive approaches to make EWS sensitive to the needs of different sectors, genders and ages
 - Raise public awareness, including conduct of drills based on risk assessment
 - Develop two-way communication with feedback mechanisms
 - Periodically review and update end-to-end EWS

Theme 5- DRR and Livelihoods

Studies show that mortality associated with floods, winds, drought and other hydro-meteorological events seem to be trending downward. However, the economic and livelihood losses associated with damaged and destroyed housing, infrastructure, public buildings, businesses and agriculture have

been rising at a rapid rate.² By strengthening and diversifying livelihoods, it helps individuals and communities better cope with and respond to stresses and shocks from a variety of hazards.

This session had two presentations. The first one was a joint presentation by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in Cambodia and the Philippines showcasing initiatives that integrated DRR in the agriculture sector. In the second presentation, the Swiss Red Cross shared some practical experiences and lessons learned from working with the Viet Nam Red Cross in enhancing livelihoods opportunities in some highly disaster prone provinces.



Workshop participants generally agreed that livelihood improvement and diversification is a good entry point for promoting resilience building. It is therefore important for initiatives that incorporate DRR and CCA in livelihoods to develop an effective coordination mechanism with stakeholders in relevant sectors. It is also important to incorporate DRR and livelihoods in national and local development policies and plans, and even in risk assessments, and strengthen the capacities of practitioners on the application of sustainable livelihoods into

DRR practice. Knowledge sharing events and documentation of good practices and lessons learned will also be helpful for advancement and innovation in this area.

Learnings

- Develop climate information products for end users e.g. for farmers produce information bulletins with good practice options and introduce farmer field schools to demonstrate these practices
- Incorporate DRR in Ministry of Agriculture plans then link them with provincial and community plans
- Train local farmers to monitor climate effects
- Link technical solutions with social processes (hardware and software)
- Adopt a multi-stakeholders approach for wider impacts
- Clear impacts and sustainability of livelihood projects take time
- Advocate for donors to move from a project-based approach to a programmatic approach that focuses on longer-term development and sustainability
- Pilot models then replicate to minimize failures
- Strategy development should be done by implementers. INGOs and UN agencies should play a facilitator role rather than implement themselves

Challenges

- Farmers have no access to seedlings during dry season
- Integration of tools/options in the plan of actions
- Coordination of multiple stakeholders (Mekong River Commission, UNDP, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water Resources, etc.)
- Lack of contribution from local community
- How many mistakes can we afford?

² Allan Lavell and Andrew Maskrey, "The Future of Disaster Risk Management: An Ongoing Discussion," Draft synthesis document, meeting notes, background papers and additional materials from a scoping meeting for GAR 2015, Latin American Social Science Faculty and UNISDR, San Jose, Costa Rica, 18-19 April 2013.

Gaps

- Guidebook for farmers focusing on agriculture for community-based planning and local governance including and enabling policies
- Sharing practices with the Ministry of Agriculture
- Institutionalize lessons learned so that new-comers can take them into consideration when planning new projects

Action Points

- Strengthen climate information systems and services, including dissemination and utilization
- Integrate top-down support with bottom-up initiatives
- Mainstream DRR in sectoral policies and programme planning at all levels
- Strengthen the coordination and integration mechanisms among key relevant sectors (DRR, CCA, livelihood, etc.)
- Promote risk transfer mechanisms, e.g. crop insurance
- Advocate to donors for flexible funding and long-term programming
- Create cross-sectoral projects to deliver DRR at the country level
- Strengthen capacities of practitioners on the application of sustainable livelihoods into DRR practice
- Develop policies for CBDRR implementation e.g. the national CBDRM programme in Viet Nam
- Further promote seasonal weather forecasting for cropping options
- Integrate scientific and local knowledge on climate forecasting
- Enhance the development and dissemination of relevant climate information to farmers
- Identify stakeholders and develop roles and responsibilities of stakeholders
- Allocate resources for incorporating DRR in livelihoods or livelihoods in DRR
- Incorporate DRR and livelihoods in national and local development plans
- Link DRR to sectoral policies and plans
- Facilitate dialogues on DRR and livelihoods, catalyse discussion to identify the advantages of incorporating DRR in key sectors
- Establish coordination mechanism

Theme 6- Urban Disaster Risk Reduction

Urban areas across Asia have experienced tremendous growth and are currently among some of the fastest growing and most dynamic in the world. At the same time, the region has suffered an increasing number of urban disasters. The impact of these disasters on urban communities, economies, infrastructure and systems have been immense. A lack of adequate urban management has resulted in urban development taking place in hazard-prone areas, using construction methods and materials that are not hazard-resistant. The DRR practitioner plays an important role in shaping safe and sustainable towns and cities by facilitating the assessment and treatment of disaster risk within the processes used to manage urban areas. This session was facilitated by UNISDR.

In the session, participants discussed the complexity of the urban context, including issues related to informal settlements, and social networks that are different from rural communities. In urban areas, the incorporation of DRR in building regulations, land use planning, and critical facilities management are vital. Tools, skills and experience in urban DRR will need to be developed and systematically documented in guidelines and case studies.

Learnings / Challenges / Gaps

- Community mobilization and inclusion is a bigger challenge in urban areas where in slum communities for example, migrants may be from different areas. There is a need to assess the social networks that are in place.
- Need to adapt tools and methodologies
- High percentage of risk is infrastructure related (cascading effect, urban planning)
- Highly complex issue (land use planning, eviction, resettlement, etc.)

Action Points

- Invest in comprehensive risk assessments, partners mapping, etc.
- Focus on disaster planning and response (community-based EWS, contingency plans, etc.)
- Focus on risk transfer by working with the private sector and insurance companies
- Advocate for more funding for urban DRR
- Identify urban networks and communities of practices to tap their knowledge and resources and strategize on ways to incorporate DRR in urban areas
- Promote awareness raising in urban schools and communities
- Conduct in-depth scoping study to identify social fabric and social capital, and build on existing urban DRR programmes
- Ensure multi-stakeholder engagement, particularly private sector and local businesses
- Undertake PDCA (plan, do check and action)

3. Conclusion and Evaluation

To wrap up the sessions, Michele Cocchiglia from UNISDR presented the consultation process for the post-2015 DRR framework (HFA2) and discussed how DIPECHO partners can contribute to this process. Phase 1 that ended in May 2013 involved a series of consultations at the regional, sub-regional, national and local levels. There were also stakeholder group consultations with mayors/local government, parliamentarians and vulnerable groups. Phase 2 for the Asia Pacific region will focus on consultations in seven key areas and coordinators have been identified for each area as follows:

1. Building community resilience - turning vulnerability into resilience (IFRC)
2. Integration: Sustainable development, climate change and disaster risk reduction (ADPC)
3. Local level action (ADRRN)
4. Women as a force in resilience building, gender equity in DRR (Duryog Nivaran)
5. Reducing exposure/underlying risk factors (Kyoto University)
6. Strengthening risk governance and accountability (ADRRN)
7. Incentivizing DRR in the private sector (ESCAP, ADPC)



DIPECHO partners are encouraged to incorporate their experiences and learnings in the seven study areas, and contribute to the national consultation process.

Overall, the workshop participants found the event a very useful learning and networking opportunity to engage with other DRR practitioners, and expressed that the DRR Practitioners Workshop should be a regular annual event. All the comments from workshop participants on the learning points that they are taking home, missed opportunities and contents, and areas for improvement are in the annex.

The workshop was documented live on Storify at <https://storify.com/SM4Resilience/practitioners-workshop-on-disaster-risk-reduction>. All the presentations, documents, photos and tweets about the workshop are available as a permanent link on the Storify site.

ANNEX

Agenda

Day 1: Wednesday 13 November 2013

08:15-08:45 Guests arrival and registration

Opening Remarks

08 :45- 08 :55 Welcome by Ms. Indira Kulenovic, the IFRC's South East Asia Regional Delegation

08 :55- 09 :05 Opening Remarks by Mr. Edward Turvill, ECHO DRR Advisor

09 :05- 09 :15 Inaugural Address by Dr. Amnat Barlee, the Thai Red Cross

Opening Session

09 :15- 09 :30 Overview of ECHO intervention in South East and East Asia, by ECHO Regional Office

09 :30- 09 :45 Workshop Introduction and Expected Outcomes, by IFRC South East Asia Regional Delegation

09:45- 10: 15 Coffee Break

10:15- 12:00 **Session 1: Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability**

Session Moderator: Christine Apikul

- How Advocacy can influence DRR Agenda in Viet Nam- by JANI Viet Nam
- Advocacy at community level in risk reduction planning and implementation- experiences from South Dagon, Yangon, Myanmar
- From pilot model to integration in government safer housing program in Viet Nam- by DWF Viet Nam

12:00- 13:00 LUNCH

13:00– 15:00 **Session 2 – Community Mobilization and Inclusive Approach**

Session Moderator: Christine Apikul

- Inclusive Approach (Elderly, Children, People with Disability and Women)- the case of Myanmar- by Myanmar Consortium for Community Resilience (MCCR)- Action Aid Myanmar
- Integration of inclusive DRR into the government planning and budgeting- by Handicap Indonesia
- Mainstreaming of inclusive CBDRR into local development planning process- by Action Against Hunger Philippines
- Community Mobilisation- by Thai Red Cross

15:00-15:15 Coffee Break

15:15-17:15 **Session 3: School Safety & Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction**

Session Moderator: Christine Apikul

- Youth empowerment in risk reduction- the story from Timor Leste- by Timor Leste Red Cross

- Encouraging the effective participation of people with disability in DRR activities at community and school- by Handicap Indonesia
- Safe School- Three Pillars practices from Cambodia- by Plan Cambodia
- Child-Centered DRR and Education- by UNICEF

18:30 Welcome Dinner Reception in Panorama 1

Day 2: Thursday, 14 November 2013

08:45-09:00 Synthesis of Day 1 by Christine Apikul

09.00– 10:15 Session 4: Early Warning- Early Action

Session Moderator: Christine Apikul

- From piloting to establishment of Early Warning System- by Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical & Astronomical Services Administration (PAGASA)
- Tsunami alert in Indian Ocean- Case study from Indonesia Red Cross

10:15- 10:30 Coffee Break

10:30- 12:00 Session 5: DRR & Livelihoods- Session Moderator: Christine Apikul

- Enhancing Capacities for DRR in Agricultural Production- Case study from Cambodia and the Philippines- by FAO
- Lessons learned from the implementation of Livelihoods in Viet Nam- by Swiss Red Cross in Viet Nam

12:00-13:00 Lunch Break

13:00-16:00 Areas for future direction

Session Moderator : Christine Apikul

- Advocacy, Awareness and Accountability
- Inclusive Approach and Community Mobilisation
- School Safety and Youth Empowerment in Risk Reduction
- Early Warning, Early Action
- DRR and Livelihoods
- Urban Disaster Risk Reduction

16:00-17:00 Evaluation and Closing

Session Moderator: Hung Ha Nguyen

Participants List

No.	Name	Position	Organisation	Country (office)	Email
National Societies (South East Asia)					
1	Mr. Bounyong Phommachak	DIPECHO Project Manager	Lao Red Cross	Laos	yong_phom@yahoo.com
2	Ms. Bevita Dwi	Head of DRR sub division	Indonesia Red Cross	Indonesia	bevita.dwi@gmail.com
3	Mr. Narcisu de Jesus Brites	DIPECHO Project Manager	Timor Leste Red Cross	Timor Leste	narcisobrites_cvtl@redcross.tl
4	Mr. Augusto Noel Sila	Youth Leader	Timor Leste Red Cross	Timor Leste	vidianaxareal_cvtl@redcross.tl
5	Ms. Moe Thida Win	Urban DRR Program Coordinator	Myanmar Red Cross	Myanmar	moegis73@gmail.com
6	Mr. Aye Lwin	Community Representative	Ward No. 21, Dagon-South Tsp	Myanmar	-
7	Ms. Mon Mon Soe	Community Representative	Ward No. 71, Dagon-South Tsp	Myanmar	-
8	Mrs. Surangrat Na Lampang	Acting Head of Red Cross Health Station No. 3	Thai Red Cross, Chiangmai Province	Thailand	nasurangrat@hotmail.com
9	Mr. Jun Nantamane	Village Leader	Tambon Baan Pao, Amphur Mae Tang, Chiang Mai Province	Thailand	lun081@hotmail.com
10	Mr. Kien Vaddanak		Cambodian Red Cross	Cambodia	vaddanakien@redcross.org.kh
11	Mr. Uy Sam Onn	Health Officer	Cambodian Red Cross	Cambodia	samonn_uy@yahoo.com
12	Ms. Nguyen Kieu Trang	Programme Officer	Viet Nam Red Cross	Viet Nam	nguyenkieutrangvnrc@yahoo.com.vn
Partner National Societies					
13	Ms. Sanna Salmela Eckstein	Regional DM Delegate	Finnish Red Cross	Malaysia	sanna.salmela@finrc.fi
14	Mr. Paul Vanderlaan	Country Representative	Netherlands Red Cross	Vietnam	paulvanderlaan@nlrc.org.vn
15	Mr. Herve Gazeau	DRR Regional Coordinator	French Red Cross	Thailand	drr-asia.frc@croix-rouge.fr
16	Mr. Drew Strobel	Regional Representative	American Red Cross	Thailand	drew.strobel@ifrc.org
17	Ms. Saisuree SENGPRASAN	Programme Assistant	American Red Cross	Thailand	saisuree.sengprasan@ifrc.org
18	Mr. Kongmany Kommalien	DRR Manager	French Red Cross	Laos	dpr-r-lao.frc@croix-rouge.fr
19	Mr. Shesh Kafle	DRR Program Coordinator	French Red Cross	Myanmar	drr.myanmar.frc@gmail.com
20	Mr. Ton That Khanh	Field Project Officer	Swiss Red Cross	Vietnam	bentrepo.srcvn@gmail.com
Organisations					
21	Mr. Phung Sila	Program Officer	DCA/CA	Cambodia	po.cambodia@dca.dk
22	Mr. Guillaume Chantry	Project Coordinator	Development Workshop	Vietnam	Guillaume.chantry@dwf.org

			France		
23	Mr. Loek Sothea	National Project Coordinator/ Technical Adviser	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Cambodia	Sothea.Loek@fao.org
24	Mr. Lorenzo Alvina	DRR - CCA Focal Person	Department of Agriculture Field Unit 5	Philippines	alvinapotoy@gmail.com
25	Ms. Phounvieng Thansengsouvanh	Project Officer	Health Poverty Action	Laos	b.wang@healthunlimited.org
26	Mrs. Fannie Fronda	DRR Program Quality Manager	Oxfam	Laos	ffr@oxfamsol.be
27	Ms. Syviengkeo Bounlutay	DRR Project Manager	Oxfam	Laos	sbo@oxfamsol.be
28	Mr. Bounmy Bounsoume	DRR Program Assistant	Oxfam	Laos	bbo@oxfamsol.be
29	Mr. Bounna Khun	DRM Project Coordinator	Plan	Cambodia	Bunna.Khun@plan-international.org
30	Mr. Yusra Tebe	Urban Safe School Coordinator	Plan Indonesia Country Office	Indonesia	Yusra.Tebe@plan-international.org
31	Ms. Anne- Laure Hallaire	Deputy Country Director	HelpAge	Myanmar	anne.hallaire@helpagemyanmar.org
32	Ms. Sarah Woodcock	Consortium Manager	Action Aid	Myanmar	Sarah.Woodcock@actionaid.org
33	Mr. Aloysius James	Emergency Preparedness	Action Aid	India	aloysius.james@actionaid.org
34	Ms. Ei Ei Yi Mon	DRR Project Manager	Oxfam	Myanmar	eiieym@gmail.com
35	Mr. Eric Debert	DRM Program Manager	Care International	Viet Nam	eric@care.org.vn
36	Mr. Dao Van Minh	Official	Disaster Management Centre- MARD	Viet Nam	minhdv.wru@gmail.com
37	Ms. Sheila Roquitte	DRR Advisor	USAID Regional Development Mission Asia	Thailand	sroquitte@usaid.gov
38	Ms. Amelie Yan Gouiffes	DRR Technical Advisor	ECHO	Thailand	Amelie.Yan-Gouiffes@echofield.eu
39	Mr. Thearat Touch	DRR Program Assistant	ECHO	Thailand	Thearat.Touch@echofield.eu
40	Mr. Edward Turvill	DRR Advisor	ECHO	Thailand	Edward.Turvill@echofield.eu
41	Ms. Rosalie S. Pagulayan	Weather Specialist II	PAGASA	Philippines	oyiep@pagasa.dost.gov.ph
42	Mr. Roby Lay	Disability Thematic Officer	Handicap	Indonesia	hiindo_drrdo.kupang@gmail.com
43	Mr. Ari Kurniawan	Research & Advocacy Division	Disabled Persons Organisation	Indonesia	arigoing@yahoo.co.id
44	Mr. Mark A. Cervantes	Technical Coordinator	Action Against Hunger (ACF)	Philippines	mcervantes@ph.acfspain.org
45	Ms. Maya Igarashi	Emergency Officer	UNICEF	Thailand	migarashiwood@unicef.org
46	Mr. Devashish	Youth and	UNICEF	Thailand	ddutta@unicef.org

	Dutta	Adolescent Specialist			
47	Ms. Teija Vallandingham	Peacebuilding Specialist	UNICEF	Thailand	tvallandingham@unicef.org
48	Mr. Ihwana Mustafa	Project Manager	Oxfam	Indonesia	IMustafa@oxfam.org.uk
49	Mr. Andre Krummacher	Regional Director	ACTED	Thailand	andre.krummacher@acted.org
50	Mr. Stephan Baas	Technical Lead Officer	FAO		Stephan.Baas@fao.org
IFRC					
51	Ms. Indira Kulenovic	CSRU Coordinator		Thailand	indira.kulenovic@ifrc.org
52	Mr. Sanjeev Kafley	DRR Advisor		Thailand	sanjeev.kafley@ifrc.org
53	Mr. Hung Ha Nguyen	DRR Program Manager		Thailand	hungha.nguyen@ifrc.org
54	Mr. John Halder	DM Delegate		Myanmar	john.halder@ifrc.org
55	Ms. Rommanee Klaetanong	DRR Program Officer		Thailand	rommanee.klaetanong@ifrc.org
56	Ms. Christine Apikul	Workshop Facilitator	Freelance	Thailand	christine_apikul@yahoo.com
57	Ms. Nutchapang KHOWINIJ	CSRU Program Assistant		Thailand	nutchapang.khowinij@ifrc.org

Workshop's Final Evaluations

Learning points	Missing opportunities/contents	For future improvement
Sharing multi-sector perspectives in inter-agency meetings are useful in highlighting the common ground and challenges to be tackled jointly in the future	More discussion on how to improve institutional memory on DRR works and effectively share guiding principles of the work done	More group work
DRR in agriculture	More government representatives since the workshop discussed about roles and responsibilities of the key stakeholders.	More community representatives from various countries
Linking DRR and Livelihoods	More in- depth discussion on how to enhance CBEWS	More time for cross cutting issues to be discussed and clarified
CBEWS	Institutionalisation of DRR	More engagement between the facilitator and participants
Good facilitation and organization	Integration of DRR in the development perspectives	The facilitator should be more lively and speak louder to ensure participants' attention
Different contexts with different experiences and challenges	Self introduction to know each others	More ice breakers to be introduced
Great opportunity to learn practices and challenges on various issues such as advocacy, school safety, EWS and livelihoods	More donors should be present such as AusAID; JICA; ADB and private sector	More regular event
Urban risk reduction even though it is a huge topic but some concrete action points identified which can guide us in the programming	Representation should be beyond ECHO/DIPECHO partners	More representation from vulnerable groups such as people with disability, children and elderly etc.
Very practical examples from the EWS and Tsunami alert case study from Indonesian Red Cross where can be replicated in my project's areas.	Recommendations of previous workshops should be followed up and discussed	More case studies on advocacy at community level in risk reduction planning and implementation
Good summary of each session which help us to link up with action points in final session	Insurance scheme for DRR	Improve the quality of the facilitator
Practices, lessons learned and challenges shared by presenters help us on how to apply in our community based works	Reading materials should be available before the presentations	More representation from senior management level to ensure follow- ups to be carried out
Community people played key roles in observation, analysis and issuance of early warning information	Field visit for specific topic learning should be included	Ask the presenters to think of 3-5 key messages they want to bring across so that the presentation should be focused and elaborated around those messages
Empowerment of community to involve in early warning actions		Two presentations per topic so that more time to be allocated for discussion
Advocacy at various levels through multi stakeholder approach makes the difference		What are we going to do with the action points from the groupwork in final session? And expected follow up to this two day workshop.
EWS should be multi- hazard and		Facilitation more "mobile" and

integrated with other issues such as food shortage, animal disease, pandemic, agriculture production etc.)		supporting the wrap up and the capturing up ideas
Community voices from Myanmar and Thailand are very important		Invitations should be sent out more in advance for adequate preparation
CBEWS is part of CBDRR		Improved time management and increased “intension” and “attention” in the presentations- impose the learning points; challenges; and gaps for all presenters.