

Summary Report

DIPECHO National Consultative Process on Disaster Risk Reduction in Cambodia

Background & Overview

- The present report reflects the outputs of a National Consultative Meeting (NCM) organised jointly by the European Commission and the National Committee on Disaster Management. It also includes feedback from various meetings and discussions held between May and October 2009, as part of the programming process of the European Commission Disaster Preparedness Programme (DIPECHO) for South East Asia.
- The report will be used to define priorities for the upcoming DIPECHO South East Asia 7th Action Plan (2010-2011). However, it should not be considered as the Guidelines for applicants themselves. Also, the present document does not reflect the official position of the European Commission or the Government of Cambodia.
- It was the fifth NCM organised in the country (2004, April 2005, November 2005, 2007), and for the second time jointly with the Government of the Kingdom of Cambodia.
- The rationale behind the NCM is to: carry out a multi-stakeholder dialogue on current Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) issues in the country; identify priority actions for DRR advocacy; disseminate lessons learned, in particular on community-based DRR (CBDRR); discuss DIPECHO's proposed orientations in Cambodia for the period 2010-2011; use participant's experience to refine priorities, gaps and actions identified.
- The next Call for Expression of Interest for the 7th Action Plan for DIPECHO South East Asia will have the following timeframe:
 - Publication of a Call by January 2010 - Deadline end of February 2010
 - 15 month projects to start as of May 2010 at the earliest
- The Meeting was well attended, with 85 participants in the opening, down to around 40 by the end of the day. Stakeholders from the Government, donors, international organisations, UN agencies, consultants, local and international NGOs participated, with a majority however from the latter group.
- All through the Meeting, interaction between implementing agencies and the NCDM representative was lively and appreciated. Some issues were clarified, while it was agreed that there was a need to follow-up on some of the recommendations made, for instance through the DRR Forum.
- We would like to give a particular thank to the National Committee for Disaster Management, all the agencies and individuals who have helped preparing and facilitating presentations and working groups, as well as Action Aid for their support staff during the Meeting.

Opening Remarks

- H. E. Dr Nhim Vanda, Senior Minister, First Vice President of the National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM), highlighted the relevance of investing in DRR to improve lives of the poorest, as per the Rectangular Strategy's objectives. Community-Based DRR is still a major challenge due to lack of physical infrastructure, social service basis and extreme poverty which keeps vulnerability levels high. There is a need to build safer and more resilient communities, as well as to strengthen partnerships and coordination. More support is required to enhance mechanisms such as the DRR Forum.
- The recent approval of a Strategic National Action Plan (SNAP) for DRR was appraised, while the emphasis was put on the need to turn it into action. DRR is a multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder issue requiring more efforts and the involvement of all.
- The effects of the global financial crisis, of floods and drought, as well as lack of water resources on the rice production are being witnessed in an accrued trend.
- There is a need for transparency on the actions implemented, even if some programmes do not directly build the capacities of the Government. Actors are requested to avoid overlaps and local authorities are called in to coordinate with NGOs and others.
- The European Commission representative, Michelle Labeeu, highlighted the recently approved European Union DRR Strategy for assistance to third countries, as well as upcoming funding for Climate Change initiatives in Cambodia. She called for a take over of the models developed over the last 10 years under DIPECHO. Since 1998, some €8 mln have been allocated through 40 CBDRR actions in Cambodia. DIPECHO will continue in the country but with enhanced standardisation and modeling approaches.

Session 1: Strategic DRR Framework, Lessons Learned, Key Recommendations

Disaster Risk Reduction formula– Snapshot

- Main hazards: floods and drought but lightning and storm more and more an issue.
- Vulnerabilities: 90% vulnerable people in rural areas; one third of the 1,621 communes are vulnerable to disasters (553 with 260 to flood, 293 to drought).
- Capacities: improved frameworks and numerous pilots, but need for action planning and implementation, improved guidance on standardised tools and methodologies. So far, improved capacities are noted only where projects have been in place.

DRR Framework at national level – Commitments and Opportunities

- The approval of the SNAP for DRR, its process, the preparation of the Disaster Management (DM) Law, the UNDAC emergency preparedness mission (process and recommendations), the DRR Forum process, the HFA reporting (by Government and civil society), increased DRR awareness etc. are as many signs of commitments and improvement, as well as opportunities for putting DRR into practice.
- The DRR Forum has grown into a promotion and exchange platform, with increased coordination mechanisms and regular dialogue among the NCDM and implementing

agencies. Some sub-working groups have emerged from the Forum. The Forum could play a role in Cambodian DRR national platform.

DRR Framework at national level – Constraints and Challenges

- The SNAP needs to be institutionalised and put into action through planning, prioritisation (in terms of timing, sectors, CBDRR) and clear guidance and means. This also implies institutional capacity-building.

Suggestions were to advocate, raise awareness and train, in order to obtain an action plan. This would include improving inter-ministerial cooperation and selecting one or two line ministries out of the six priority areas or components (in addition to MoP). Answering a question on the level of commitment of the Government, the NCDM explained that the SNAP Task Force was still in place and will continue meeting on a regular basis. It was recommended that the Task Force Member list is made available and that materials developed during the SNAP process are shared.

- The ongoing revision of the National Socio-economic Plan (extended to the period 2008-2011) by the Government might become a missed opportunity for DRR integration.
- The absence of regular DRR funding mechanism is an obstacle. At this stage, there is no consideration to define a percentage of funding or additional sources for DRR initiatives, in particular at national level.
- There is also no DRR mainstreaming systematisation or methodologies. DRR needs also to be better integrated into Commune Development and Investment Planning processes, through the existing financing mechanisms ie as part of the decentralisation process.
- DRR is a multi-sectoral matter:
 - Build on the recognition that high-level and inter-government coordination mechanisms are critical in this process. Integrate DRR into policies, plans and programmes of relevant ministries. Build strong network and coordination structures.
 - As far as mechanisms foreseen in the Avian Influenza preparedness programme are concerned, there are useful cross-cutting issues in the animal and human health response plans. Need for a harmonised emergency response. Human pandemic preparedness involves many sectors and interests beyond those under the Health and Agriculture line Ministries.
 - Need for higher levels of involvement from voluntary and private sectors, from as academies and universities. Need to develop more child-friendly approaches and to involve personnel from line departments identified as core to the processes (teachers, nurses etc.) in the present context. This could be done through developing skill-building and awareness raising tools on DRR in sectors.
- The draft DM Law, based on the experience of Thailand and Indonesia, is being reviewed by the Parliament and could possibly be approved soon. However, the NCDM indicated that it might be too soon and there would be scope to delay the processing of such a document, in order to receive more inputs from the DRR Forum and other stakeholders. There is also a need to clarify the DRR terminology. The text is partially translated and it was recommended to make the draft available for comments and contributions.
- The DRR Forum should clarify its modus operandi, role, status so to be more reliable and efficient. The review should look at overall both DRR and emergency preparedness.

- The UNDAC report's recommendations need to be prioritised and followed-up.
- Expertise of various skills and experience is still needed to enhance and assist processes.
- DRR awareness or interest from some donors is still limited.

DRR at sub-national level & CBDRR Framework – Summary of discussions

- Some CBDRR pilots are considered completed and various organisations are working on lessons learning and documentation process. This is however not systematized. Information is not always made available. This makes the integration of lessons learned and the development of joint promotional and knowledge transfer tools difficult.
- Over the last couple of years there have been increased linkages between actors and programmes, with positive experience (for instance with PSDD; World Bank taking over some planning models; efforts to harmonise IECs and training methodologies, provincial level coordination etc.). There are still high needs for: documentation and dissemination of the models, including at regional level; improved linkages with new and planned initiatives. This will require clearer guidance from the Government and improved overall coordination mechanisms.
- Some coordination mechanisms have been developed at local level (through the DRR Forum as well as in a few Provinces). This experience should be reviewed and consolidated, in particular given the decentralised approach to DM in the country.
- Looking at the few positive examples of provincial level coordinations, as well as the upcoming Phase II of the World Bank GFDRR¹, there is now scope for provincial modeling of DRR integrated approaches (in planning, sectors etc.).
- Need to focus on capacity-building of local actors and setting up of systems, on impact assessment and measurement. The institutionalisation and “strategisation” of CBDRR is not complete and further work should use methodologies & documents already developed.
- Need to clarify roles, functions, training systems and guiding tools (including for performance measurement) for all the CDM structures. At local level, VDCM/VDMC has still not been addressed in the overall structure. Some PCDMs have taken active part in project implementations, with effective results – this should be built upon.
- DRR should officially be integrated into community development plans, in particular at commune/sangkat level. Budgets to CDM levels should be provided in a timely manner.
- There is a lack of preparedness planning consistent to CBDRR processes at sub-national levels. DRR is addressed as an issue wider than emergency response/planning and integrated into commune development and investment plans mostly where projects have been implemented.
- The Ministry of Planning has been an active supporter and implementer of DRR. Support from local authorities is also crucial. Guidelines for commune development planning are being developed and it should be ensured that they include DRR in a standardised way.

¹ The new WB GFDRR phase is presently being negotiated. It will focus on drought and flood preparedness in 5 pilot provinces at PCDM level for development of provincial risk map, preparation of resilient investment plan for key sectors, PCDM capacity analysis and training need assessment, pilots for communities and EWS.

- Training systems and methodologies should look at locally-adapted needs, capacities, content relevance in terms of recipient and targeted level, as well as sustainability. The system should include options for master training and for refresher courses.
- Material and financial support to official structures and personnel needs to be more thoroughly approached, looking carefully at local standards, harmonised approaches, roles and responsibilities, sustainability of approaches, as well as donors' requirements.
- Gender as a cross-cutting issue in DRR approaches still needs work, in particular in livelihood and DRR/CCA.

Session 2: Thematic Discussions

- Rationale of the working groups: use experience from stakeholders participating in the Meeting to: build on lessons from experience and ongoing projects; build on existing coordination mechanisms; consider new developments (SNAP, draft DM Law, potentials for linkages with new programmes etc.). The groups were to come out with a few practical recommendations for DIPECHO's next Action Plan as well as if possible for other identified stakeholders, in terms of area selection criteria, target groups, activities, priorities, transfer of knowledge and promotional tools etc.
- Topics: 1) SNAP and UNDAC Recommendations follow-up: planning at national and sub-national levels; 2) DRR & Education; 3) DRR & Health; 4) DRR & Climate Change Adaptation at national and sub-national levels; 5) Advocacy.
- **See all materials, recommendations and outputs in tables in annex.**

Planning at national and Sub-national Levels

- Overall the issue is of utmost importance given the decentralisation process. There is a need at this stage of the DRR and CBDRR process to map the gaps and priorities and to develop a set of guiding and implementing tools.
- The selection criteria for provincial models and for the level of working should be thoroughly reflected upon, looking at complementing ongoing or planned actions, or starting up in other provinces but with accrued coordination mechanisms.

DRR and Education

- The group proposed very concrete and well targeted measures, addressing four gaps (by order of priority and feasibility): DRR in development planning process & implementation; Limited children involved in DRR; Not clear funding from government to support DRR implementation; Private sector contribution /involvement in DRR.
- Proposed actions are mostly through the ongoing working group on education: advocacy measures & tools; advocacy during the DM Law preparation process; training and awareness; working through existing WG & coordination mechanism.
- At national level, there is still a low understanding on the methodologies for child-participatory processes.

DRR and Health

- Avian Influenza preparedness remains a strong focus on the Government side. However, to a certain extent it is still handled in parallel to other DRR and CBDRR actions.
- Given the large funding for Avian Influenza preparedness programme, which includes fully relevant components on the NCDM structure, DM legislation framework, Disaster Management Committees capacity-building and training, there is an urgent need to better integrate the DRR and AI preparedness agendas and experience.
- There is so far one model (tested by CARE) for community-based avian influenza preparedness. It is presently being linked with CBDRR and integrated into rural development and local planning programmes. The model is being advocated for replication and dissemination, including through the Cambodian Red Cross.
- Most agencies which have developed CBDRR models have included human or animal health components.
- DRR outputs and experience could be used in the development of the new National Law on Public Health (2010).
- The group proposed very practical recommendations for national and sub-national levels, and for enhanced coordination and cooperation between sectors.

DRR & Climate Change Adaptation

- The two groups elaborated some very practical and useful recommendations, which will be shared with key CCA stakeholders for further discussions and promotion.
- There is still some confusion on the concepts and approaches. The overall feeling is that Cambodia “is a victim, not a cause” of climate change – this statement might be too limitative and it should not elude the responsibilities and the complexity of the issue.
- There are few or no pilots or sufficient experience developed so far, no baseline surveys – these would be needed before a strategic planning is made. At the same time, there are some understanding and knowledge at local level – this should be documented.
- The level of understanding of both DRR and CCA (and of their linkage) by the Government is not clear. There is the risk that the two agendas might run in parallel, in particular given the separate funding sources and programmes. The NAPA action plan is not yet enforced, pending new initiatives. It is recommended that the DRR Forum agencies are kept involved in the process.

Advocacy

- The group discussions used the example of a DIPECHO Joint Advocacy Network Initiative in Vietnam. Looking at the logframe of this project and the present context in Cambodia, it was felt that the time is ripe for joint advocacy actions addressing mostly national level in a first phase.
- Proposed advocacy measures and groups, by order of priority: 1) Systematic integration of DRR in development plans; improved knowledge & reporting of media representatives; information systems, sharing of information, availability of documents; interaction process, coordination; development of communities; 2) limited children

involvement in DRR; 3a) no sub-/national funding for DRR implementation & involvement of all sectoral Ministries; 3b) need to increase private Sector involvement (but also public companies).

- Practical actions were proposed, although not all priorities were deemed feasible in the immediate future, in particular for 3b).
- The NCDM informed that a website is being prepared, although it still needs support. Should such a website be established, it could become a virtual coordination and information sharing platform, with possibly a repository for CBDRR practices as was done in Vietnam.
- The NCDM representative highlighted that the proposed advocacy plans targeting the Government might be too ambitious and that implementing agencies have a stronger impact and mandate at local level.
- The involvement of the private sector, although important, was deemed difficult at this stage. However, some examples of working with public and private companies were given by the CRC and other agencies, eg for impact assessment, some IEC materials, work with the Chamber of Commerce and religious associations, the private media, communication companies for EWS. The draft DM Law mentions this stakeholder and the need for inclusion.

Session 3: Drought Preparedness

- Rationale:
 - There are various actions at national and local levels, but is there a comprehensive drought preparedness framework?
 - DIPECHO in Cambodia has been piloting drought preparedness measures at local level² - how to build on these?
 - There is a need to define clearly the concept of drought in Cambodia (conceptual framework, meteorological, agricultural and socioeconomic drought) and the subsequent actions needed³. Drought preparedness in Cambodia is often associated with water management for rice cultivation – how to improve a broader understanding of the drought concepts and focus on innovative and alternative measures?
 - Drought preparedness often encompass a complex range of issues, while DIPECHO can focus only on limited types of activities – how can DIPECHO continue promoting drought preparedness measures while keeping its piloting aspect?

² CBDRR, capacity-building, training of farmers, promoting enhanced livelihoods options, workshop on CCA, IEC material development; coordination with provincial department of agriculture or specialised NGOs to provide technical support and training on drought resilient agricultural techniques as innovative strategy for DRR, small scale mitigation projects, local level drought information systems

³ See definition of drought in "[Investing in Drought Preparedness](#)", Agriculture and Rural Development.

- Rural development and food security projects/programmes do not systematically integrate DRR – what are the reasons and how to improve on this? There are also some upcoming climate change adaptation initiatives, including at local level and for rural areas – how can the piloted actions be used by these new initiatives?
- A series of questions was developed, in order to fuel discussions⁴. It is well understood that the Meeting’s working group on drought preparedness was only an initial stage in a wider effort to better approach drought preparedness in Cambodia. Therefore, further work on the topic will be needed. It was positive to see that after the Meeting, some agencies reflected on various options to follow-up the issues identified.
- Overall drought preparedness concepts need more work and review. In particular, mapping of drought prone areas, capacities & vulnerabilities, or of drought cycles are not available or not accurate (this is also due to changing environment). While potentially most provinces could be subject to drought – ie there is a national aspect to it, drought (or and dry spells) are often an issue at “village/commune cluster” or “agro-ecological areas” level. It was suggested to carry out more studies at village level, possibly by taking experience from the CBDRR/Avian Influenza/drought preparedness piloted areas.
- Systems at local level need to be developed and linked with national systems being implemented or planned (FAO EWS/Food Security Monitoring System, Meteorological department to pilot pre-notification systems etc.).
- Drought preparedness is closely interconnected with DRR and livelihoods, including livestock rearing aspects. The DRR components are however not always easy to identify, compared to “common sense” approaches and “good livelihood development” practices.
- There should be more pooling of efforts for: information system building at various levels (and linkages), DRR integrated agricultural practices (including crop diversification and production practices, research/studies on these, testing of drought-resistant crops, seedling and seed bank systems, contingency planning and crop calendar adjustment, handling of water resource management, livestock rearing in relation to disasters, improved management of flood and drought combined patterns, development of relevant types of local EWS and training methodologies, studies of development patterns and trends including CC etc.)
- Coordination mechanisms will be enhanced, including through FAO-Government lead thanks to a recent [€ 11.2 million EC grant](#) from the Food Facility. This foresees an improved participatory process within a future National Committee and its Steering Committee. The UN is also setting up a database to compile documents related to CCA ([should be on-line soon](#)).

⁴ Topics: good practices, potentials for CCA; assessing impact at local level; documentation and promotion; drought preparedness at national and sub-national levels; risk and vulnerability assessment; capacity and skill building.

Overall Recommendations

- Need for a “timely” adoption of the DM Law through participatory process. It seems that there is scope to review the timing of the process, looking at the relevance of fast adoption versus longer but more comprehensive process. It is also recommended to advocate for budget allocation or references to financing mechanisms or benchmarks.
- The Government/NCDM should provide guidance on effective human resource, capacity-building and training systems addressing various levels and actors of the DM structure.
- Cooperation with the MoP and MoI should be continued and enhanced as far as formal DRR mainstreaming into local development and general planning is concerned. A limited number of line Ministries could also be selected for piloting DRR integration.
- Mechanisms to sustain the DRR Forum should be created, as part of the development of a DRR National Platform.
- The DRR Forum could establish or enhance *ad hoc* working groups on relevant issues supporting the development of policies, guidance, tools and methodologies on DRR related issues.
- DRR stakeholders and in particular the Government should ensure that communes covered by DRR and CBDRR actions expand as per a strategic framework which would ensure appropriate multi-hazard or *ad hoc* hazard-related approaches, as per relevance.
- More research and promotion should be carried out on low-cost, affordable, genuinely community-resources options and mechanisms, as well as impact assessment.
- Participation of the most vulnerable groups or people should be ensured through inclusive approaches.
- Open space for children and their involvement in DRR should be considered.
- The entry into force of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response, as well as the upcoming work plan on Disaster Management will be opportunities for enhanced DRR actions at regional and national levels.

Conclusions, Follow-up Actions / Other Comments

- The NCDM highlighted the lack of structure and means, present economic problems, but also the hard work carried out in planning work in particular through DIPECHO and other DRR implementing agencies. The SNAP is a priority to be supported.
- The DIPECHO Programme will continue its support to Cambodia, with more or less the same level of funding (pending the selection of complementary proposals). Priority will go to standardisation and harmonisation of approaches, capacity-building of local DM structures, consolidation of pilots and documentation of the impact and models.
- The present report will hopefully contribute to coordination processes and discussions. It was agreed with the NCDM that some of the outcomes can serve as continued discussion through the DRR Forum, ad hoc working groups.

- Since DRR integration into sectors has been highlighted as an issue, it is also recommended that DRR implementing agencies use the opportunity of the Sectoral/Thematic Working Groups as well as donor groups which gather on a regular basis to present key recommendations on the DRR side.
- Some agencies requested more information on the draft Disaster Management Law, as well as the upcoming World Bank Global Facility for Disaster Risk and Recovery programme, the various Climate Change Adaptation initiatives and the Avian Influenza implementation plan. Overall this relates to coordination and information exchange and needs to see transparency information sharing mechanisms on these issues through various vectors involving the NCDM, the DRR Forum, the UN etc.
- The Meeting and prior/subsequent interactions show a high interest from a series of agencies to apply to the next DIPECHO Action Plan in Cambodia. This means a potential for more applications compared to the past, while the budget will remain more or less the same. Agencies are therefore strongly encouraged to consolidate their actions so they are complementary, realistic and looking at modeling, systems, scaling up measures and improved linkages. Joint actions are also strongly encouraged.
- A series of agencies are presently developing lessons learned exercises from their own projects. These are expected to be published within the next few months. It is recommended to make these easily available through existing web-bases.
- Numerous agencies are working with local NGOs (or building their DRR capacities). This could be looked at in a more comprehensive way through local NGO networks.
- Various actors in neighboring countries (eg Lao PDR but not only) have expressed interest for experience sharing in drought preparedness approaches. This should be taken into consideration when designing projects.

Should you have any comments on this report, please send them by email to Cécile Pichon at drrc@echo-bangkok.org.

Annexes

- Consolidated Strategic Priorities for DIPECHO in Cambodia
- Compiled materials from the NCM: presentations, agenda, list of participants, speeches, press release
- Outcomes of Working Groups including background and reference documents
- [DRR Donor overview](#) (prepared for the 2007 NCM)

Consolidated Strategic Priorities for Natural Disaster Risk Reduction and Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction in Cambodia (as identified by practitioners, government agencies, and donors *inter alia*)

	Priority Need/Actions	Priority Actions relevant for DIPECHO in Cambodia
1	Hazards	<p>Multi-hazard approaches will be continuously encouraged, targeting floods (river floods, flash floods), drought, fire, lightning and storms.</p> <p>Drought will be addressed through 1) multi-hazard approaches or 2) <i>ad hoc</i> approaches but with a refined focus.</p> <p>Hazards such as fire, lightning and storms have been so far little addressed since a lower priority. Some additional activities (eg IEC materials, construction practices) could be considered.</p>
2	Vulnerabilities & capacities	<p>So far mostly rural areas have been addressed and this will be a continued priority. There could be scope for <i>ad hoc</i> pilot actions in urban environment as part of the upcoming Safe Cities Campaign but mostly considering the integration of Safe Schools and Safe Hospitals components in urban environments.</p> <p>There could be some additional studies on vulnerabilities, coping mechanisms, in particular for vulnerable groups or targeted groups, for drought concepts, for coping mechanisms, for linkages between DRR and CCA at community level (perceptions and local practices), as well as part of impact assessment.</p> <p>Given the high number of communes prone to disasters (one third), modeling and system building will be a priority, with documentation of methodologies, cost-benefit and impact analyses etc.</p>
3	DRR Forum, coordination	<p>The Forum has grown into a large information sharing platform. DIPECHO is keen to continue contributing to the DRR Forum and any other mechanisms felt relevant (DRR Platform, DRR related coordination etc.). There should however be efforts to clarify the roles and methodologies, to make the Forum and Working groups more regular and documented, as well as to make the information available. Any action in support to this objective will be encouraged and welcomed.</p> <p>There will be compulsory requirement for elaboration of standardised approaches and most often this can be achieved through <i>ad hoc</i> working groups.</p> <p>The reinforcement and efficiency improvement of any coordination mechanisms considered appropriate will remain a priority.</p>
4	SNAP	<p>Actions to raise awareness, train, develop sectoral methodologies will be encouraged in coordinated frameworks.</p> <p>It will be strongly encouraged to select 1 or 2 Line Ministries for sectoral work, in addition to continued work with the Ministry of Planning and NCDM.</p> <p>There might be needs for advocacy measures at national level, building on the actions already developed (mostly through DIPECHO) in the health and education sectors at national level (advocacy kits, training, infrastructure</p>

		standards, risk assessment methodologies etc.).
5	DRR Funding mechanisms	At national level, should be part of any advocacy measures. At sub-national level, should be part of local planning systems, with scaling up of CBDRR pilots etc.
6	DRR integration into local planning, capacity-building of CDMs	These topics and in general planning at sub-national level will remain strong priorities, but with an increased focus on standardised approaches for training, guidelines, IEC materials etc. This will require guidance from the NCDM and Line Ministries and accrued interactions between DIPECHO partners and other interested agencies with these stakeholders..
7	Disaster Management Law	Scenario 1: adoption of the Law in the near future – the priority will be to assist the development of implementing regulations, as well as the socialisation of the Law. Scenario 2: postponing of the Law – the priority will be in the participatory process with engagement of the DRR Forum Members and other relevant stakeholders, as well as in the linkages with other legislations or processes (eg AI preparedness). DIPECHO would be favorable to support these processes.
8	UNDAC report recommendations	Many recommendations are relevant to the type of actions DIPECHO can support. However, a review of the recommendations and their prioritisation into an action plan (along with the SNAP process) should be carried out.
9	Expertise provision, skill and experience building	This will remain a priority through DIPECHO, however focusing on systems, documentation and dissemination. Priority should be for locally acceptable and replicable methodologies.
10	Donors' involvement See also 4.	<i>Ad hoc</i> advocacy measures from the Government and groups of agencies would be necessary. Need for improved DRR integration into sectors or programmes (rural development, environment, CCA, education etc.) by agencies themselves but also through tools, guiding principles, benchmark definition etc. Some work has been done already in the education, health and agriculture sectors, as well as through the decentralisation process. These could be the sectors to focus on, looking at accrued linkages with PSDD, WB GFDRR, ADB Flood and Drought Risk Management and Mitigation initiatives etc. Upcoming large grants on CCA (including at local level) should be strong entry points for disseminating CBDRR experience.
11	CBDRR piloting and modeling, incl. coordination, guiding tools, inclusive approaches, cross-	The models considered completed should now be documented better and disseminated through adequate approaches (tools, up-scaling, advocacy). The models not yet completed can continue, with a strong component of documentation. The two above should in any case aim at standardised approaches for IEC materials (criteria for “good” IEC, targeting, gap and need analysis, key messages, standards for materials and their vectors etc.), training (ToT

	cutting issues See also 6.	<p>systems, standardised modules for P/D/CCDM etc.), cost-benefit analysis and impact assessment.</p> <p>CBDRR models should continue improving through more comprehensive approaches: children & education, linkages between various community-based approaches (CBDRR, AI, CCA, environment protection), inclusive approaches (elderly, handicapped, gender – considering that these are not necessarily mostly vulnerable but can greatly contribute to processes), ethnic group particularities, cross-border issues, etc.</p> <p>There should be some sub-national modeling, trying to pool efforts of DP and development agencies, with local authorities and for DRR integrated approaches. In this context, there is no particular encouragement for large expansion of the CBDRR pilot coverage – on the contrary, agencies should pool efforts.</p> <p>Projects should include a component of capacity-building or institutionalization or advocacy aiming at the institutionalisation/’strategisation’ of CBDRR.</p> <p>DIPECHO agencies should assist the Government in developing guiding tools and methodologies for well defined actors, levels and issues.</p>
12	Village level DM	So far this has been little addressed, in the absence of a formal structure. There could be more documentation and some suggestions for appropriate approaches at that level.
13	Support to official structures and personnel	While DIPECHO cannot support directly the Government and cannot fund Government officials, appropriate and eligible measures to support institutions and capacity-building should be identified. DIPECHO implementing agencies, jointly with other relevant organisations, should streamline their approaches while working with officials, in order to maintain coherence and sustainability.
14	Education See also 4.	<p>Pilots related to the education sector, schools, children, teachers, extra-curricular activities, drop-out children etc. should continue and be enhanced.</p> <p>Joint approaches will be more than encouraged, including the MoYES at national level as well.</p> <p>All recommendations of the Working Group are considered fully relevant.</p>
15	Health See also 4.	<p>There should be stronger linkage between the Preparedness and DRR components in the health sector and the other DRR and sector aspects. There is need to further work on this at all levels, through well coordinated approaches.</p> <p>Training and approaches need to be adapted to the local context and based on capacities.</p> <p>Agencies are strongly encouraged to look at the components of the large AI preparedness programme, as well as the outcomes of the WHO-MoH DIPECHO project, in order to define a relevant action plan that could be proposed to DIPECHO.</p>
16	Climate Change Adaptation	Given the large initiatives that are upcoming, including at local level (World Bank, EC), stakeholders should look at how the CBDRR and DRR methodologies developed could be transferred, used and usable. There should also be

	<p>See also 4., 10., 11., 18.</p>	<p>improved linkages between the two initiatives (eg in components related to HVCA, training, IEC materials etc.) There could be advocacy measures to push for a combined agenda, in particular at national level. Actions could start with better studying of CCA concepts and perceptions, in particular at local level. See outputs of the working groups, which provide a very good overview of the problems to be addressed.</p>
17	<p>Advocacy See also 3., 4., 5., 7., 10., 11., 14., 15., 16</p>	<p>It is considered that the Example of DIPECHO in Vietnam (Joint advocacy Initiative Network - JANI) is ripe for Cambodia. This does not mean it should go through one joint project. Agencies will be requested to look at joint results or activities related to: advocacy to well identified groups, work with media, CBDRR methodologies, information management etc. the JANI logframe can give a good idea of the type of actions that could be implemented. The outcomes of the working group are considered fully relevant.</p>
18	<p>Drought preparedness See also 1., 4., 11., 16.</p>	<p>Compared to past DIPECHO priorities, and as indicated in the previous guidelines for applicants, the focus for drought preparedness should be refined into: better reviewing and assessment of drought typologies and situation in Cambodia, physical mapping looking at “eco-areas” or “drought clusters”, mapping of vulnerabilities and capacities, innovative and alternative pilots. Partners should widen their perspective outside the frame of simple irrigation measures or direct water provision, into more innovative and alternative methodologies. Drought preparedness actions, tools and practices could be: improvement of water information delivery systems and water conservation practices, strengthening capacities for drought monitoring, including user-friendly local EWS (linking with national and regional level systems incl. these dealing with food security); data and information collection on previous and existing drought preparedness; lessons learned and documentation on good practices (to be defined); training and capacity-building of local actors on issues related to drought preparedness EWS, alternative disaster-resilient agricultural and cultivation practices (in drought and flood contexts); development of guidelines for handling drought preparedness in Cambodia (including Climate Change components and as part of HVCA processes); studies, research, documentation or implementing measures related to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> key drought indicators (eg definition of the most relevant considering the different types of drought; action planning); understanding of variability factors so to define benchmarks, thresholds and mitigation triggers stakeholder analysis (including definition of levels, roles and responsibilities), identification of capacities and resources, drought impact assessment; (if already existing) action planning for drought risk reduction measures economic and social indicators related to drought impact and information systems improvement of crop irrigation efficiency at system or crop levels appropriate monitoring systems for water availability, soil moisture etc. safety net and insurance measures at various levels (eg functioning of rice banks)

		<p>Livestock rearing (disaster preparedness and management measures).</p> <p>In all drought preparedness actions, there should be a strong focus on documentation and promotional tools, training systems, research.</p> <p>There should be more work with the relevant Ministries and departments, local institutes and universities, local NGOs.</p> <p>Priority is for action at sub-national level (decentralised context and drought in a localised context, although ad hoc measures at national level, in joint initiatives, networks or partnerships, can be considered (eg for mapping systems, policy or guidance tool development, training systems, advocacy, linkage with relevant institutions including these dealing with environment and climate change etc.).</p> <p>Drought preparedness actions should be part of piloting of DRR integration into the agriculture, environment and water management sector.</p> <p>Coordination leads should be well identified.</p>
19	EWS	<p>Drought EWS: see 18.</p> <p>Flood EWS: Consolidation of local level EWS; improved linkages between local, national and regional systems; increased collaboration with other stakeholders (including business & communication sectors); towards more comprehensive modeling and pilot transfer / hand-over to local actors; improved links between flood and drought preparedness measures; cross border and regional components.</p>
20	Regional issues	<p>As indicated in the past, actions focusing on national level should be addressed through country-projects or country-presence.</p> <p>Regional components could include improved EWS, support to ASEAN Disaster Management priorities, sharing of experience and good practices (eg on drought preparedness, education, advocacy), cross border issues, implementation of international or regional DRR priorities and agendas. A strong focus should be on sub-regional issues related to Lower Mekong countries as well as Burma/Myanmar (and Thailand to a certain extent).</p>
21	Joint actions, lessons learning See also 17., 20.	<p>Will be prioritised, whether through joint proposals, or through joint activities related to IEC materials, methodologies, coordination, communication, public campaigns and events etc.</p>

Outcomes of Working Groups

Working Group - SNAP and UNDAC Recommendations: follow-up at national and sub-national levels	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic National Action Plan for Disaster Risk Reduction 2008-2013, NCDM and Ministry of Planning, 2008 • Stock-taking template for implementing DRR and HFA commitments; Capacity development in support of the SNAP • HFA monitoring reports, 2009 (government and civil society) • United Nations Disaster Assessment & Coordination (UNDAC) Disaster Response Preparedness Mission to Cambodia, March 2009, report, OCHA • WB GFDRR Phases I & II • Draft DM Law • IDRL state of play report for Cambodia, 2009 • PSDD local planning guideline • MRC Programme Documents (planning tools) • National Committee for Disaster Management, Report of the Capacity of NCDM; 5-year institutional development strategy of NCDM; 2-year plan of action for NCDM development, May 2001 • World Bank Study on NCDM capacities (draft) • CBDRR Strategic planning (documents) • Guideline on C/S Development Plan and C/S Investment Program, Prepared by Inter-ministerial Working Group, July 2007, Kingdom of Cambodia 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>Looking at</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The PSDD – Increased number of pilots and models (Flood Management and now multi-hazard planning) – Increased cooperation between agencies and in particular among non DRR actors – Interest for this topic from Government (priority action) and donors (support decentralisation and local governance) – Ongoing and planned actions, in particular WB GFDRR Phase II (with possibly model provinces for flood and drought preparedness) – Taking over part of the experience from other projects including MRC/ADPC <p>➔ Identify a set of (project-related or joint) actions that DIPECHO could support as a priority, to propose a few recommendations (to well-identified targets) on ways-to-go in terms of sub-national level planning.</p>
<p>Outputs</p> <p>National Level - Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthening sub-national level with <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ capacity building to PCDM, CCDM, DCDM ➤ strengthen mechanisms on DRR and disaster response 	<p>Interest for this topic from Government and donors in supporting decentralisation and local governance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding allocation for DRR assessment, planning and implementation of actions should be available at sub-national level.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping on capacity and vulnerability • Making measures or guidelines by NCDM to all sub-national level implementing actors • Support DRR forum functions and working modalities • Sustainability • Expand DRR coverage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotion of sectoral planning process • Administration and management at sub-national level is one of priority component – need for improvement • Role & responsibility of sub-national levels (PCDM, DCDM, CCDM) on DRR should be regularly enhanced and reviewed through learning process
<p>Sub-National Level - Proposed Set of Actions for DIPECHO:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National guideline in place and orientation to sub-national actors. • Ensure understanding on national guideline to implement sub-national plans. • Provide sufficient capacity building for sub-national DRR actors. • Awareness raising on DRR among sub-national line actors and other development actors, e.g. PSDD. • Strengthening of institutions and mechanisms of P/D/C-CDM. • Ensure mainstreaming of DRR into sectoral plans at provincial and district level and CDP/CIP 	<p>Sub-National Level – Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the existing model provinces (4) and promote sharing experiences and learning to other provinces in order to replicate. • Institutionalise DRR coordination mechanism within PCDM with support from PSDD. • Promote and enhance partnership and networking between DRR actors and non-DRR actors (e.g. PSDD etc.) • Set up monitoring mechanism to ensure that DRR is being integrated in all level of plans and implemented

<p>Working Group – DRR & Education</p>	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe School Campaign • Guidance Note on Safe School Construction, Global facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, ISDR, INEE, World Bank, 2009 • Mainstreaming DRR in the Education Sector in Cambodia, NCDM, MoEYS, UNDP, ADPC (DIPECHO) • DRR Forum & IEC Working Group, Curricula development, IEC materials for children and schools, games and child-focused approaches, pilot projects in Cambodia. 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowing key players • Understanding what is happening in education Sector on DRR (Government, NGOs, UN and bilateral organisations). • Identifying DRR concerns in the educational sector in Cambodia • Discussing key agendas for common action (advocacy, capacity building, IEC materials, coordination etc.) • Promoting synergy and Integration – exploring opportunities and possibilities

Outputs (DRR&Education)			
Key point to advocate for (gaps)	Target Groups	Proposed Action	priority
DRR in development planning process & implementation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy maker (MoP, MoI, donor community, and developmental NG) • Local authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organise DRR integration & need training into development frameworks • NCDM to coordinate with Min. of Planning & Interior to ensure DRR is integrated systematically in devt planning process • Advocacy package 	1
Limited children involved in DRR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local authority • MoEYS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For education working group to deal with 	2
Not clear funding from government to support DRR implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ministry of finance • Parliament • Each operational ministry 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop DRR requirement advocacy kit. 	3
Private sector contribution /involvement in DRR <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource contribution to DRR action • Organisational safety framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication (EWS) • Construction & line company 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop advocacy kit • Involve them in the DRR forum • Include their role in the DM Law 	4
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ These idea can be considered as a project on DRR advocacy ❖ Should this be a separated project or a joint project among all DRR actors in Cambodia or only DiPECHO partners? ❖ Some of these might have been addressed in the DM law, but it is still a gap so we need to advocate to reinforce it. 			

Working Group – DRR & Health	
<u>Documents of Reference & Sources</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avian and Influenza Control and Preparedness Emergency Project, World Bank • Address by Samdech Hun Sen, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Cambodia, at the launching of the Avian and Human Influenza Project and the DRR Strategy, 17th March 2009 	<u>Background</u> Looking at <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The World Bank Avian and Human Influenza Control and Preparedness Emergency project ➤ The experience of some agencies (eg CARE) in community-based Avian and Human Influenza preparedness measures ➤ Discussions on health preparedness and contingency planning

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safe Hospital Campaign, WHO and MoHs/NDMOs, with regional and local tools, including for Cambodia (will be available in early 2010). • Community-based DRR & Avian/Human Influenza pilots and lessons learning 	<p>measures at various events and fora (incl. DRR Forum)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Approach to human and animal health in CBDRR projects and methodologies (eg IEC materials) <p>Taking as a basis for discussion a short list of measures, extracted from the WB Project</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Identify what actions DIPECHO or other targeted actors could support to contribute to coherence between programmes
<p>AI Emergency Project priorities (extracts): activities relevant to DRR and for linkages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modification of the NCDM ToRs to better include pandemic preparedness (incl. inter-ministerial coordination); formulate a draft legislation; and upon its approval, support issuance of appropriate sub-decrees mandating that NCDM facilitate inter-ministerial coordination. • Review of NCDM’s organisation structure and develop its new staffing and capacity-building requirement, staff training needs; create a human resource development strategy and training programme. • Establishment of an NCDM emergency management system and M&E system. • Inclusion of pandemic preparedness, response and recovery activities into the existing CBDRR programmes. • Strengthening of training system and ToT, strengthening capacity of provincial and municipal offices. • Capacity-building of relevant structures for project management and good governance. • Education and training of health workers, in particular Village Health Volunteers. Development of materials. • Training of provincial level staff to prepare pandemic preparedness plans, simulation exercises. • Training of province, district and health center/hospital staff and Rapid Response Team. • Epidemiological studies on animal health, strengthening of the animal health IEC programme. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Ensure global DRR approach; advocacy or at least multi-stakeholder consultations? ➤ Interaction with GFDRR; interaction with other training programmes and resources? ➤ How to cascade down or ensure top-down/bottom-up approach? ➤ How can DIPECHO contribute? Linkage. ➤ How can DIPECHO contribute? Linkage ➤ How can DIPECHO contribute? Linkage ➤ IEC Working Group; link with health, livelihood issues; standardisation and methodologies ➤ Interaction. DRR integrated. ➤ IEC Working Group

Outputs (DRR & Health)	
<p>National Level</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model & approaches for AI can be used for other EIDs and emergencies • Health sector (AH-HH) is equipped/experienced in emergencies, structures in place • Strong technical support in Cambodia (WHO, FAO etc.) • Regional network exists • Government is supportive <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undefined role of health sector (AH-HH) in DRR • Cross-sectoral coordination needs improvement, in particular at technical level. 	<p>National Level</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ SPHERE standards for DRR, in particular for capacity-building: messages standardisation, role of NCDM, PCDM members & line Ministries, of communities, civil society; knowledge and skill assessment per target group; develop a capacity-building framework ❖ Use AI model/structure for integrating DRR roles within ministry ❖ Formalise a DRR mechanism for coordination; surveillance, response, communication and partnerships etc. <p>DIPECHO</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Support formalisation of coordination mechanism ❖ Technical support to developing legal mechanising ; DRR law, through DIPECHO partners ❖ Human-animal vector interface-support
<p>Sub-national Level</p> <p>Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decentralisation increases potential to partner at provincial to lower level • Coordination is better at lower level • Good reporting system AH-HH • Empowered sub-national levels • Pilot of PDD has lessons, approach etc. • IEC very effective and popular • High level of awareness • All provinces have completed trainings (emergency, outbreak etc.) <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conflicting structure by health sector makes coordination and reporting difficulties 	<p>Sub-National Level</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Guidelines for use of models developed in pilot – need to be given to province ❖ Institutionalise DRR mechanism through PCDM <p>For DIPECHO and Partners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Resource mapping and gap analysis ❖ Technical support to legislation (MoH law, DRR law) ❖ Guidelines (national to local) ❖ Support projects that strengthen volunteer networks ❖ Study potential to support health services as part of DRR ❖ Advocate to other donors to long term ❖ Look to fund roll out of effective pilot/models

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of resources to roll out to commune-down 	
<p>Community-based Level Strengths</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cross sectoral model is developed (animal-human vector) • Health sub-group within CCDM • Community based DM planning exists • Village level volunteers • Preventive measures (bio-security) have increased in practice <p>Weaknesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not all villages have local structures • NGO led most of the time • Community initiative depends on leadership structure • Traditional practitioners and privated sectors are not engaged • Affordable services village 	<p>Community-Based Level Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ❖ Volunteers should receive comprehensive combined training (as identified in priorities; AH-HH- Sanitation etc) ❖ Invest in refresher trainings ❖ Skills guiding <p>Other Issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended stakeholders: MOH-Center for Disease Control, DAHP/NAVRI, FAO and CRC, NCDM ; role of DRR Forum? • Advocacy measures to AI project coordination group & to national Influenza IEC committee? • Safe hospital campaign – use and disseminate tools • How to address new threats

Working Groups – DRR & Climate Change Adaptation at national and sub-national levels	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty reduction • National Strategic Development Plans 2006-2010 and 2011-2013 (in preparation) • Decentralisation process: PSDD • SNAP for DRR • Strategy for Agriculture and Water • National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan • National Forest Programme • (policy level) UNFCCC, IPCC, Kyoto Protocol 	<p><u>Background - DIPECHO & CCA</u></p> <p>Climate change adaptation cannot be the sole focus of a specific and <i>ad hoc</i> DIPECHO project. However, projects can integrate components reflecting the necessity to raise awareness on evolving trends and looking at links between DRR and climate change (CC), always in a natural disaster context.</p> <p><u>Non exhaustive examples</u> (where scientific data has confirmed the impact of CC on natural disaster trends):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased awareness raising on integration of CC adaptation into programming and planning (ad hoc target groups); • Reinforced vulnerability and risk assessments, early warning

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Adaptation Programme of Action to Climate Change (NAPA) • World Bank Climate Investment Fund & PPCR • EU: Global CC Alliance 	<p>systems, land-use planning and building codes, institutional and legal capacities;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development/dissemination of guidelines and tools on how to communicate CC better in a DRR context; • Improving and adapting practices/behaviours affecting environment and livelihoods (in a DRR context).
<p><u>Background - CCA Key Stakeholders</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Climate Change Committee (NCCC), Ministry of Environment • National Disaster Management Committee • Other Ministries and Institutions: MEF, MoE, MAFF, MOWRAM), MoH, MRD, MOP, MPWT, Public Expenditure Review (PER), NCCC • Local authorities (sub-national levels) • Communities in coastal, urban and rural areas • Others: UN (UNDP, UNEP), INGOs, local NGOs, donors (WB, ADB, EU etc.), media, research institutes etc. 	<p><u>Background - NAPA objectives</u></p> <p>(1) understand the main characteristics of climate hazards in Cambodia (flood, drought, windstorm, high tide, salt water intrusion and malaria);</p> <p>(2) understand coping mechanisms to climate hazards and climate change at the grassroots level;</p> <p>(3) understand existing program and institutional arrangements for addressing climate hazards and climate change; and</p> <p>(4) identify and prioritise adaptation activities to climate hazards and climate change.</p>
<p><u>Background - Global Climate Change Alliance</u></p> <p>Starting fund of EUR 50 mln for 2008-2010 in selected pilot countries. Priorities: implementing concrete adaptation measures; reducing emissions from deforestation; helping poor countries take advantage from the global carbon market; helping poor countries to be better prepared for natural disasters, integrating climate change into development cooperation and poverty reduction strategies. Systematic climate risk assessment and mainstreaming of climate change into development strategies and programmes (“climate proofing”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ In Cambodia: as of 2010 ? <p><u>Other CCA initiatives</u></p>	<p><u>Background - WB Climate Investment Fund, Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USD 500 mln in grants and loans for a dozen countries • Mainstreaming CC resilience into development planning and budgeting • Expected outputs of PPCR: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Strengthen a country’s ability to plan and implement resilient development programs, particularly focusing on highly vulnerable sectors such as agriculture and water, and through strengthening institutional processes and structures. ➤ Possible approaches include: combining existing engineered coastal protection approaches in a country with nature-based adaptation through restoration of vast coastal mangrove areas; enhancing flood

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP, DANIDA: support to the Climate Change Coordination Office • UNDP: NAPA 2009-2013 project to improve MAFF capacity to manage agricultural and water resources and develop locally appropriate adaptation options • GEF Natural resource management projects • NGO projects • Other? (studies, reviews?) eg MRC CCA review 	<p>forecasting systems and community-based risk reduction measures; increasing food security by shifting cropping patterns and varieties in response to changed rainfall patterns.</p> <p>➤ USD 50 mln for Cambodia (50% grant, 50% loan)?</p>
<p>Outputs (DRR & CCA)</p>	
<p>Climate Change at Sub-national Level</p> <p>Challenges/gaps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affected areas • New concepts and terminologies • Guideline for integration of DRR-CCA to CDP • Technical and financial assistants • Limited involvement of local stakeholders • Early warning system • Limitation of partnership among stakeholders • Rapid development and high technology <p>Potentials</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ People understand the seasonal calendar trend ✓ System of rice intensification (SRI) ✓ Existing local natural resources ✓ New structure (provincial and district councils) ✓ Community skill land knowledge on CC 	<p>Good practices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forming and functioning of existing groups in the planning process • Developing DRR plan <p>Expectations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Guideline and resource to sub-national level ➤ Allocate budget • Donors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Technical and resources
<p>Climate Change at National Level</p> <p>Challenges/constraints of integration of DRR & CCA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient understanding of the full range of potential impacts of CC on sustainable livelihoods and disaster risk for different 	<p>Challenges/constraints of mainstreaming DRR-CCA into development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Climate change is seen as something for which Cambodia is not</u>

<p>communities and at all levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CC tends to be seen purely as an environmental issue, and the links to sustainable livelihoods and food security are not fully understood. • The fact that responsibility for climate change rests with the Ministry for Environment is a barrier to effective integration of CCA with DRR. • Insufficient coordination between those who gather meteorological and hydrological data and those who could utilise the information for development, such as agricultural extension services 	<p>responsible. There needs to be a greater understanding of the responsibility we all have to mitigate climate change, and of the opportunities Cambodia has to contribute to more sustainable development, for example through promotion of sustainable agriculture, energy policy and urban development. Climate change adaptation and mitigation are often mutually reinforcing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate change seems to be contributing to greater geographical and temporal variability of climate (particularly rainfall). This greater variability is a huge challenge for integration of CCA into development programmes. Much more data needs to be gathered and analysed to identify trends at local level which can inform adaptation programmes. Need local level data, longitudinal studies, and expert capacity for effective analysis.
<p>Policy action and coordination needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use planning must take on board CCA and mitigation. • NCDM must play a coordinating role across government ministries to ensure that DRR-CCA are addressed as crosscutting issues. • Need a ‘climate forum’ to share experiences of current initiatives and best practice in relation of DRR-CCA. • RGC must take a lead in developing and implementing more sustainable policies/legislation • We need better policies and resources to support more effective and sustainable natural resource management to support agriculture and fisheries. Much better coordination between relevant government ministries. • More commitment and resources required for research for policy development if we are to avoid ill informed assumptions about the potential impacts of CC and ensure appropriate CCA and effective DRR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promotion of conventional models of agriculture (high external and chemical input, mechanisation and focus on production for export) is eroding farmers’ resilience in the face of shocks and stresses and undermining local knowledge of more sustainable techniques that could contribute to CCA and food security. • Poor natural resource management is having similar effects and undermining the availability of resources for CCA at local level. Need much more commitment to sustainable management of water, fisheries and forest resources to preserve the natural resource base that provides a buffer for rural communities faced with shocks and stresses including climate stress

<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JANI & DANI logframes and project outcomes (Joint Advocacy Network Initiative, DIPECHO Vietnam) • Samples from other countries (IEC etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Advocacy package “We cannot wait for Another Disaster to Happen: A Call for DRR Policies and Programs in the Philippines” ➢ Safe Hospital Campaign (WHO) media and advocacy kit ➢ DRR mainstreaming guidelines (targeted groups, sectors) ➢ The Development of a Public Private Partnership Framework and Action Plan for DRR in Asia. ➢ etc. • Why Advocate for DRR?, Tearfund Guidelines 	<p><u>Background</u></p> <p>Looking at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ The topics discussed in DIPECHO coordination meetings, DRR Forum, various WGs or events (harmonisation of training methodologies, of IEC materials, of curricula; DRR integration into local planning; CCA; EWS etc.) ➢ Various DRR frameworks such as SNAP, CBDRR strategy, ASEAN PDM ➢ The DIPECHO experience in Vietnam with a project focusing purely on joint advocacy targeting the Government <p>Identify:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ What advocacy actions on CBDRR could be undertaken by agencies in a coordinated or joint manner (in general) and how this could be done by DIPECHO (in particular) ➢ The priority target groups (Government line ministries? Donors? Media?) ➢ A set of coordinated actions and/or a set of joint actions, in particular for DIPECHO.
--	---

Outputs			
Key point to advocate for (gaps)	Target Groups	Proposed Action	priority
Systematic integration of DRR in development plans (so far only on case-by-case basis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall Government issue • Donors • Implementing agencies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue involving MoP • Advocacy for implementation of SNAP • Training & awareness raising of officials 	1
Improved knowledge & reporting of media representatives: Better understanding & reporting; help advocate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media associations • All media (TV, newspaper, radio) • Private and public media • MoInfo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At national level, use existing channels (Government, CRC etc.) • Work with small pool of media repr. 	1
Information systems, sharing of	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCDM 		1

information, availability of documents. Interaction process, coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC • Implementing agencies 		
Development of communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementing agencies 		1
Limited children involvement in DRR	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children • MoEYS • Local Authorities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Being worked upon (education WG) • Raise awareness on child issues at all levels 	2
No sub-/national funding for DRR implementation Involvement of all sectoral Ministries		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address in DM Law • Take 1 or 2 sample sectors for DRR mainstreaming • Address decision-makers 	3
Need to increase private Sector involvement (but also public companies) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial contributions • Organisational capacities • Communication companies (for EWS) • Construction companies (for standards) • Messages 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large public and private companies • Private business • Media • Sector companies (construction, communication) • Officials (for public companies) 	Not an immediate priority	3
<p>Priorities No1 (2 year timeframe)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Involve media for improved knowledge (improved reporting) and consequently as advocacy medium <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Training of media representatives (from media associations, pool of journalists, editors) ➤ Interactive workshop for media repr. to provide communication experience as much as for them to receive knowledge 	<p>Priorities No2 (2 year timeframe)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Education <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Continued work through TWG and other working groups ➤ Continued work on IEC materials ➤ Promotion at national and sub-national level of child-friendly methodologies 	<p>Priorities No3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-national funding • Involvement of Private (and public company) sectors <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Difficult at this stage ➤ If delay in DM Law, possibility to advocate for clear instructions and mechanisms (to Government, legislators and decision-makers) 	

➤Field visits for reporting as much as for knowledge-sharing (as part of training)		
--	--	--

Drought preparedness	
<p><u>References</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ARD (Agricultural and Rural Development) Notes: Investing in Drought Preparedness • Linkages between Flood and Drought disasters & Cambodian rural livelihoods & food security • Study on Livelihood Opportunities for vulnerable communities affected by frequent disasters in the provinces of Kratie and Svay Rieng, Crossroads to Development, Action Aid DIPECHO project, June 2008 • Report on Livestock Care Awareness Raising for Flood and Drought Conditions (Pursat & Svay Rieng), Agronomes et Vétérinaires sans frontières, March 2008, Danish and Cambodian Red Crosses DIPECHO project • Food Security and Nutrition Information System, Cambodia • CEDAC Study on DRR mainstreaming in the Agricultural Sector • SNAP Action Plan • DIPECHO pilots: all partners • EC-FAO EWS projects; FIVIMS • Rural development, food security, environment programmes and drought preparedness actions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NAPA • World Bank GFDRR & Mainstreaming Flood and Drought Mitigation in the Eastern Mekong Delta • ADB Drought and Flood Risk Management Mitigation Project • MRC Drought mitigation programme • CCA programmes (upcoming eg WB CIF PPCR, GCCA) • Avian Influenza Programme (animal health components) • Summary matrix (template) developed for the Working group <p><u>Rationale</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Various actions at national and local level, but is there a comprehensive framework? • DIPECHO in Cambodia has been piloting drought preparedness measures at local level (relatively unusual for DIPECHO): how to build on these? • A series of questions is proposed through various groups • All groups will identify as a cross-cutting issue which role DIPECHO could play
<p>Questions</p>	<p>Outputs</p>
<p>Group 1 - Good practices, potential for CCA- What exists and what can be done?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the advantages / added-value of DP / DIPECHO measures for rural development / food security future interventions. • What can DP/ DIPECHO types of interventions offer to CCA initiatives at local level • Give a few examples of good practices of DP actions in a drought preparedness projects in Cambodia: more precisely, what has not 	<p><u>Good Practices</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DIPECHO project could mobilize grass-root vulnerable groups to air their voices in local planning process (HVCA etc.) ▪ DIPECHO could provide venue to documents scale up traditional mechanism to complement DRR measures ▪ Electing VDMCs to address DRR with their capacity building ▪ Coordination among line entities such as VDMC, CCDM, DCDM, PCDM and NCDM

<p>worked and should not be repeated; what has worked well and why.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are non governmental organisations the best vector / channel for drought preparedness projects at a level other than community or commune? Why? For instance, can NGOs be the vehicle of a regional / multi-province training programme? • Give some concrete ideas for tools and products for promoting good practices and drought preparedness methodologies (the outputs of the advocacy working group could also be looked at to give ideas). (question for group 2 also) • Some coordination mechanisms exist (food and nutrition network; IEC materials for DIPECHO partners): what other coordination mechanisms could be set up? At which level? How to use existing mechanisms? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support seed banks and continue supporting food storage systems ▪ Integration into RDP Projects ▪ Harmonised approaches in networking, collaboration and cooperation among partners, local and sub-national authorities along with like-minded NGOs or agencies ▪ Drought EWS should be promoted ▪ Drought adapted crops to be improved in collaboration with research/agriculture dept. <p><u>Potentials for CCA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DIPECHO should complement Food security programmes ▪ Water interventions to support lives & livelihood at risk time ▪ NGOs can be the vehicle of multi-province trainings
<p>Group 2- Drought impact assessment at local level; documentation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A lot of experience on drought preparedness has been developed – how can this be promoted (through which vector or tool) and who would be the principal target? • Individual project evaluations and the general DIPECHO evaluation (2006) have shown a high impact of drought preparedness projects on the lives of households. Is this being documented? Is the impact assessed? How could such assessment be improved or undertaken in the future. Suggest a few ideas for documenting impact assessment through projects or in joint actions (eg a few agencies in one area or for one topic)? If one takes the next programming cycle (April 2010 – end 2011), when could such an exercise be done so to maximise the use of the findings. • Has there been a review of existing studies and drought analyses, in particular in areas where projects are implemented? Are they used for project formulation? • Give some concrete ideas for tools and products for promoting good practices and drought preparedness methodologies (the outputs of the advocacy working group could also be looked at to give ideas). 	<p>Some general ideas:</p> <p>In the group no one had a lot of experience in drought preparedness; it was not known, whether this was documented nor if this was been evaluated (it was assumed there were some individual project evaluations done already).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A remark: the definition of drought is different between the experts and local farmers!! What is for the Cambodian government the definition of drought? • It would be very useful to assemble and review all the different assessments and evaluations on drought preparedness in order to identify the gaps and weaknesses; this need to be done preferable before the end of the year so the different organisations could develop their project according to the findings. Up till now the majority of projects propositions are not based on such studies. • Different types of data need to be collected in order to do a good evaluation and the estimate the impact of drought and drought preparedness programs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scientific data: like rainfall, temperature, soil types and environment, aquifers...

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some coordination mechanisms exist (food and nutrition network; IEC materials for DIPECHO partners): what other coordination mechanisms could be set up? At which level? How to use existing mechanisms? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline data on livelihood, household economy (population census) with a differentiation between income groups and areas. • Partnerships and collaboration with research institutes and universities • The expansion of the current DRR forum to a real network where also non DIPECHO stakeholders, universities and other research institutes have access. • Irrigation systems have a big impact and are a part of drought preparedness and have influence on the definition of drought by local farmers • DIPECHO can play a role in the data collection and sustainability through project formulation
<p>Group 3 - Drought Preparedness at National and Sub-national Levels</p> <p><u>At National level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is Cambodia well prepared for recurrent, local level droughts? It there a need for actions at national level? Are there funding mechanisms for this? • Is there a specific drought preparedness policy? If yes, does it specify the national, provincial & local levels? • Is there a nationwide comprehensive and in-depth study of “Drought in Cambodia”: impacts (social & economic), preparedness? • Is a stakeholder analysis for drought preparedness available? If not, is there not a need and added value for that? • What is the role of the universities: for studies, for training, for evaluation? <p><u>At Sub-national level</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Cambodia, drought is often a localised event. Would EWS be more appropriate at sub-national level (province?): would this be an appropriate option? Which type of EWS has been tested or could be set up? 	<p>Sub-national level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Drought EWS tested but not reliable (short term forecast, localize event) <p>Recommendations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provincial EWS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Provincial EWS ➤ Improve/establish drought contingency plan ➤ Stock piling (fuel, seeds of appropriate varieties) ➤ Advocacy to government to subsidize fuel to farmer ➤ Improvement of dissemination of existing information ➤ Building linkages of community-provincial level 2. Community EWS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Improve consciousness of community of drought preparedness/mitigation/adaptation ➤ Rain water management (community and house hold levels) <p>Geographical priorities</p>

- What s feasible at provincial level to improve EWS. How could DIPECHO contribute?
- What would be the role of DIPECHO partners and in particular NGOs in a provincial drought preparedness system?
- Looking at geographical priorities (see map), what would be an ideal province for testing provincial modelling on drought preparedness? Why? If no province name, what would be the main criteria?
- There are a few initiatives ongoing or planned at national and sub-national level (see slides): what are the major gaps? Is there reliable information system? If yes, how can it be improved; if no, is it realistic (or needed?) to build one? What would a realistic drought information system look like in the Cambodian context?

- The proposed map of drought-prone areas is considered not actual
- Drought is a very localised phenomenum; reviews are scarce; drought can happen in any area
- Discussions showed that more study needs to be done on mapping drought vulnerabilities

Group 4 – Risk and Vulnerability Assessments

- Have drought risks been evaluated in-depth? For each of the agro-ecological systems identified in Cambodia? Are agro-ecological systems /areas well identified?. Would that require further mapping and study? Who should do the job?
- What is the role of the newly established office of DAALI, responsible for determining zones in terms of agricultural land use.
- Where crop calendars at commune (or district?) levels have been designed and used, how can these be improved and shared within similar agro-ecological zones?
- Are there studies on local vulnerabilities and coping capacities of people to drought? Is a list available? Are they used by DP practitioners?
- Is indigenous knowledge related to drought forecast or to identification of drought indicators documented?

1. Drought risk have never been evaluated in-depth; There were some assessments/surveys by agencies in Cambodia with a smaller-scale.
2. Drought areas were identified by WFP (Agriculture related issues)
3. Drought need to be mapping and study by NCDM
4. Role of newly established DAALI:
 - Improve seed variety, trial technology generation to adaptation to the drought situation and dissemination
5. Crop calendars at commune (district) levels have been designed and used by some agencies but not widely shaved with others.
 - How to share?
 - a) Any agency already established website – include crop calendar (MAFF)
 - b) Strengthen agriculture extension worker at village level.
6. Study on local vulnerabilities and coping capacities of people to drought have been done by some agencies (CRC, ADPC, Action Aid). They are not widely used by DP practitioners.
7. Indigenous knowledge on drought forecast indicators are available at community level but not documented.

Group 5 – Skill and Capacity improvement

- How to address the need to reinforce capacities of farmers to adapt their production systems to natural conditions (and changing patterns)?
- How to standardise training packages for improving farmers' skills and knowledge on disaster-resilient (or –receptive) agricultural production systems including innovative practices? What could DIPECHO partners proposed to assist in the development or dissemination of such a package (using available experience)?
- Have there been studies on crop irrigation efficiency? Are farmers trained in the appropriate water management practices and conservation irrigation practices?
- Have models for multi-purpose farms been disseminated? Are they sufficiently known?
- Which crop diversification practice(s) has(ve) been successful? Why?
- How could projects transfer knowledge to large extension programmes to support adaptation and innovation measures integrating disaster resilient practices?
- How can DP programmes contribute to the recommendation to integrate disaster preparedness (floods and drought) into relevant offices (research and development, seed production; planting area selection etc.). Examples: early rice seed production, research on production technique with better tolerance with flood and drought, determining specific crops and crop calendars relevant for specific areas (floods, drought and both). What could DIPECHO do?

Agriculture - Technique/skills training for farmers on

What?

1. Short term rice cultivation
2. Drought adapted rice variety/crope
3. Change crop patent/crop diversification
4. Soil management
5. Pest management

How?

- Training
- Farmer exchange visit
- Dissemination of learning experiences
- Networking/Forum

Success factors

- Irrigation system function
- Participation of farmers
- Monitoring mechanism/review feedbacks
- Market interaction/meet market demand