**11ᵗʰ Annual South-East Asia Red Cross Red Crescent Leadership Meeting 2014**

# Minutes of the 11ᵗʰ Annual South-East Asia RCRC Leaders Meeting

**Minutes: South-East Asia leaders meeting/<span style="color:red">Singapore</span>/ 24-26 March 2014**

## Recommendation /Action points

| Session/Issue | Recommendations |
|---|---|
| **1 Introduction to the 11ᵗʰ SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting** | <ul><li>Chairman, Singapore Red Cross (SRC) welcomed all the delegates to the Meeting and to Singapore. He also extended a special welcome to President Tadateru Konoe and Secretary General Bekele Geleta and thanked them for taking time to attend the Meeting and lend their thoughts to the discussions. He expressed confidence that the SEA RCRC NSes could work together to better meet the challenges ahead.</li><li>President Konoe then addressed the Leadership Meeting. He noted that the role of the SEA RCRC was important to IFRC. In particular with the experience SEA RCRC had in disaster management, disaster risk reduction and health, SEA RCRC played a critical role in the Movement's global and regional humanitarian diplomacy efforts. The full text of President's address is at <u>ANNEX 1</u></li></ul> |
| **Humanitarian Diplomacy in Action: Opportunities and Challenges for South-** | <ul><li>The discussion also drew from the speech by Mr Bekele Geleta, Secretary General of the IFRC,</li></ul> |

| East Asia | |
|---|---|
| • Movement Perspectives: plenary discussions based on keynote address with a focus on the auxiliary role: <br>    o Auxiliary role and negotiating humanitarian space: Thai and Cambodian RC <br>    o RCRC positioning and influence through National platforms (DDPM, Health, DRR): Myanmar RC and PMI <br>    o Movement Cooperation mechanisms: Philippines RC and IFRC <br> • Open discussion & submission on key outcomes of the session: Chairman, Singapore RC | "Humanitarian Diplomacy in Action – the RCRC Perspective". A copy of the speech delivered by Mr Bekele is attached as <u>ANNEX 2</u> <br><br> • The <u>Thai Red Cross (TRC)</u> shared on its experience with the incidents of the incorrect use of the emblem during the on-going civil demonstration in Bangkok. The examples showed that the people had the impression that as long as they were providing medical services they could use the Red Cross emblem. The people also understood that displaying the Red Cross symbol would offer them protection and the people using it for this purpose were reluctant to give it up even after the use of the emblem was explained to them. <br> • There was also the case of an army bunker, with armed personnel in it, that had Red Cross emblems placed around it. This was a clear misuse of the emblem. TRC had taken up the matter through the Judge Advocate's office. A solution offered was for all armed personnel to leave the bunker and to change the sign to indicate that it was only for the military medical corps. Although the TRC had written to the military high command, however the misuse continued. <br> • TRC had taken the opportunity of these incidents to use the social media to explain the right use of the emblem. <br> • Aiming at youths (16 years old), a cartoon was being created to simplify difficult issues and convey the right message of proper use of emblem. <br> • <u>Cambodian Red Cross (CRC)</u> noted that it did not get the recognition for the work it had done. In fact some opposition groups had trained under CRC for first aid. And during demonstrations, the opposition had sent these teams of first aiders to serve the demonstrators, while at the same time criticising the CRC for inaction. <br> • CRC had also been identified with the ruling party, and had been criticised for discrimination in the selection of beneficiaries. In truth, there was no such thing, but CRC had operated in strict adherence to the fundamental principles. CRC had to embark on an effort to explain the auxiliary role of the CRC and the fundamental principles to the masses. <br> • CRC noted that it had received great support and protection from Government, especially in fund-raising, yet they were independent in all their financial decisions and the government had never pressurized them. |

- **Timor Leste Red Cross (CVTL)** noted that there was a positive understanding of the work of Red Cross. However, people were not able to distinguish between the roles of National Society, IFRC, and ICRC.
- There were some issues with the Government with regards the fundamental principles of Red Cross, especially independence.   However after explanation, the Government had endorsed the Constitution which reflected the fundamental principles.

- **Lao Red Cross (LRC)** noted that it had been successful in getting a law passed on the Lao Red Cross, and there was now plans to present a law to the Lao Parliament regarding the protection of the emblem.  LRC agreed that we need to do more in social media.

- **Myanmar Red Cross (MyanmarRC)** also had problems with the misuse of the emblem by medical establishments.  However after representations, the Myanmar Government had instructed all medical institutions to stop using the Red Cross emblem.
- Myanmar RC was trusted by the government.  Hence it was invited to sit on many committees dealing with humanitarian issues, including health matters or even the release of political prisoners.  The danger was that Myanmar RC would become too involved.
- MyanmarRC also noted the importance of building up the capacity of volunteers and staff.  In order to be able to deliver on its services and thereby prove credible.  MyanmarRC also highlighted the use of modern technology to promote an understanding of the Red Cross and its auxiliary role.
- Myanmar RC highlighted the importance of the fundamental principles and noted that often even Red Cross volunteers did not understand it.
- Myanmar RC noted that it was important for the RCRC Movement to engage external partners and get them to recognize and understand the role of the Red Cross.  In this context ASEAN came to mind.  Since Myanmar was Chairman of ASEAN, Myanmar RC will approach the Myanmar Foreign Ministry to lobby it to support the MOU with ASEAN.

|  |  |
|---|---|
|  | <ul><li>**Indonesia Red Cross (PMI)**, noted that success RCRC would depend on three criteria; leadership, trust, and capacity. With strong leadership, we can work with the government in times of disaster or outside of the country.  Trust of the government and people was vital.  PMI recounted its experiences in Myanmar (Rohinga) and Philippines (Typhoon Haiyen).</li><li>PMI reiterated the importance of working with the Government.  Example, after the 2004 tsunami, there was a consensus among the people and the government that there was a need for strong disaster response.   PMI worked in close collaboration with the Government, filling in the gaps where PMI had the resources.</li></ul><br><ul><li>**Phillipines Red Cross (PRC)** highlighted its experience of Movement cooperation, first following Typhoon Bopha and more recently after Typhoon Yolanda.  There was a need for strong Movement coordination, under the "leadership" of National Society.   Only then can we work together, 189 societies, and exert our combined ability to help the vulnerable.</li><li>PRC noted that we could only be an auxiliary if we were given the opportunity to do so. We can be called upon but not dictated.</li><li>PRC also highlighted the need to build capacity, especiallyleveraging on the Youth.  The Movement also had to position it self correctly and had to ensure transparency.  He highlighted PRC's motto;always first, always ready, always there.</li></ul><br><ul><li>**Vietnam Red Cross (VRC)** made several points about how VRC would enhance the position of the VRC within Vietnam.<ul><li>Engage in policy advocacy activities, with support from Vietnam Government;</li><li>Build relations with other organisations, mass media, including other humanitarian actors;</li><li>Increase its profile by getting prominent people in society to join the VRC;</li><li>Education and information about the Movement;</li><li>Develop strong relations with other external Regional and global actors, especially ASEAN;</li><li>Encourage high-level visits by leaders of the Movement to Vietnam.</li></ul></li></ul> |

Chairman (SG/SRC) summarized the discussions, both from the humanitarian lecture as well as the first plenary discussions, as follows:

- Uniqueness– the Movement was unique, whether it was our auxiliary role, our emblem or the fundamental principles. We needed to protect them and cement the importance of our movement and its components with the government and our partners. There was a need to build understanding and education on these aspects of the Movement. In this the use of all tools, including social media and new technologies was critical. We also had to engage the youth.

- Willingness to play this role. We must not abrogate the role we had to play viz to meet the needs of the vulnerable. We need to define our roles in our respective societies and focus on meeting the needs of the vulnerable. That was the key to our existence.

- Leadership – we need to exercise leadership in the humanitarian sector. This would include being recognised by the government, that the RCRC could and is ready to play an important role in areas like disaster management, disaster risk reduction and building resilient communities. There must also be recognition by the community, including partners, other humanitarian actors and beneficiaries of the leadership of the RCRC in humanitarian action. We need to build relations and grow our leadership.

- Trust, cooperation, credibility and accountability. Trustworthiness was important, not only by the government but also by non governmental parties. The community must also trust the RCRC. We must build trust with businesses and CSOs. Building trust amongst the Movement partners was also critical.

- Capacity. We need to build capacity within on respective NSes and as a Movement, both amongst our staff and our volunteers. If we do not have the capacity to deliver results, we would be like toothless tigers. Taking advantage of the new technologies and potentials of the youth, we can strive to move forward.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Building regional capacity and collaboration for community resilience in Southeast Asia (C3R)** | Head/SEARD presented the aims of the C3R Project which had been supported by the Canadian Red Cross. She highlighted the outcomes of workshop held in Dec 2014, in Bangkok, which was attended by all the SEA NSes (except PRC).<br><br>The C3R Project seeks to reduce the impact of natural disasters on vulnerable communities in Southeast Asia communities in SEA. It also focuses on enhancing the skills of the NSes and builds on achievements in disaster risk reduction (DRR) so that NSes can advocate more strongly at national and regional levels for the needs of vulnerable communities. Issues considered would include gender equality and the environment.<br><br>It was highlighted that for the success of the Project, the commitment of the Leaders was crucial, including providing information for the baseline surveys. The information gathered would be useful for all NSes.<br><br>The Project was endorsed by the Leaders. The Leaders approved the Work Plan for the Project, as well as, the Annual Implementation Plan. |
| **Confirmation of Minutes of 10th Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting 2013** | The Minutes of the 10th SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting was endorsed by the Meeting. The copy of the Minutes is at <u>ANNEX 3.</u> |
| **Endorsement of ToR of Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting** | The Leaders endorsed the TOR for the <u>SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting</u>. The Leaders agreed that the term in the name of the meeting should be "Leadership", reflecting the participation of Chairmen, Presidents, and SGs, andnot use the term "Leaders". The endorsed TOR is attached as <u>ANNEX 4</u> |
| **Proposal for Community Safety and Resilience Forum Concept &ToR** | Ariffin (PMI) representing all the WGs presented the proposed concept for the formation of the Community Safety and Resilience Forum. The CSRF sought to bring together the work of the DM, Health and OD & Youth WGs under one umbrella. This would allow for a more integrated approach in pursuing cooperation in these areas within SEA. The team likened the CSRF to building a strong house, which was supported by 12 pillars. Each pillar representing a priority within the NSes. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Supporting the concept, PRC highlighted the need for the SEA RCRC NSes to learn from each other's experiences, for example in disaster management.  PRC also noted that we could learn from the experience of the "Great Influenza", i.e. the flu pandemic that killed millions in 1914.   Working together, the SEA RCRC could be a key to being prepared for such pandemics.<br><br>Malaysian Red Crescent (Malaysia RC) expressed caution at proliferating new working groups and meetings in SEA Region.  He highlighted the existence of many mechanisms within the Movement both at the global (Geneva) level as well as the Asia Pacific level.<br><br>Chairman noted that the proposed Technical Working Groups under the CSRF were already existing Working Groups.  The formation of the CSRF would serve to facilitate better coordination and integration of the cooperation and collaboration in these areas with the SEA region.<br><br>TRC noted that it would not participate actively in all the 12 areas mentioned but would pick and choose areas of interest to it, given its specific interest.<br><br>Ariffin clarified that the 12 pillars were not mandatory for all NSes.  Each NS could choose which pillar is more in line with its priorities and focus on it.<br><br>Myanmar RC noted that this same concept was being adopted in Myanmar and he would strongly support the integrated approach being proposed under the CSRF. |
| | |
| **Reports of Technical Working Groups:** | The Leaders received the reports of the three Working Groups; RDMC, Health and OD&Youth.  The Leaders endorsed the recommendations as follows:<br><br>**RDMC**<br>• Session of Principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance should be incorporated in NDRT and RDRT training. |

- Flyers and other teaching materials should be developed at different national languages to provide the information on scope of principles and Rules for Red Cross and Red Crescent Humanitarian Assistance volunteers and staff members.

- Annual regional desk top simulation to find the areas and mechanism for improvement to contribute regional cooperation and peer to peer cooperation.

- Strengthen and expand the NDRT. Pre-disaster agreement should consider NDRT as well as possibility of RDRT deployment as part of the agreement.

- Urban Risk Reduction and School Safety/School Based Risk Reduction should be included in region wide cooperation programme.

**Health**

Technical
- Support health initiatives for healthy lifestyle promotion (NCD prevention), climate sensitive diseases
- Promote health priorities to partners and relevant stakeholders.
- Fortified partnership and linkages with the academe and relevant organizations including UN agencies and the ASEAN.
- Better exchange of information on the institutionalization of VNRBD.
- Development of an active regional cooperation model at both normal and emergency times:
  - Common framework for emergency blood support
  - Implementation of cross border programming as per common interests and needs of neighboring National Societies

Integration/Resilience
- Guidance and support for health departments in pursuing integrated planning to maximize

resources
- Support Integration as an approach for program harmonization, not structural change
- Increase Health participation in resilience agenda
- Support for pro-active collaboration among OD, Health, and DM sectors

**OD & Youth**
- Better integration of OD capacity building plan into RC programmes and support to allocate budget from ongoing and new RC programmes along with intensified fundraising efforts. (Head/SEARD also noted that there could be further fundraising done for specific OD projects.)

- Endorsement to the ToRs of OD and Youth Working group

- SEA RCRC Leaders would give due consideration to appoint appropriate representation from their respective NSes for the OD & Youth TWG

**Community Safety and Resilience Forum (CSRF)**

Overall with regards the future of the CSRF and the TWGs the Leaders agreed on the following conclusions:
- The CSRF could proceed.  However the TOR need to be modified and the purpose stated clearly.  The members of the interim CSRF could have a first meeting to modify the TOR. This would then be circulated to all the Leaders.  However there was no need to wait for the next Leaders Meeting.  The CSRF could then proceed to carry on its work.
- The understanding was that no new working groups were being created;
- these were working groups and hence not about making policy or creating new mechanism;
- the TWGs and CSRF would take directions from the SEA RCRC Leaders and help the implementation of the directions provided;
- the TWGs served two purposes; one to serve as a platform for SEA RCRC NSes to

| | |
|---|---|
| | exchange information and experiences, and two, to work on concrete regional cooperation based on the directives of the Leaders.<br>- This will lead to a consolidation of meeting and not an increase in meetings;<br>- And all the TWGS should look to focus on 2 or 3 specific areas of regional cooperation, e.g pandemic preparedness; disaster assessment and disaster management, etc.<br>- With regards members of the CSRF and TWGs, the Chairman/President/SG of the respective SEA NSes should be approached to nominate the representatives. The request should not be made directly to specific members directly.<br><br>**Participation of ICRC in CSRF & TWGs**<br>At the request of ICRC, it was agreed that ICRC could be included in the work of the CSRF and TWGs as it had much expertise and experience to share. The request to be included in specific TWGs can be made to Head/SEARD, who would also keep all the Leaders informed. |
| **Endorsement of Terms of Reference for Working Groups** | The Leaders endorsed the Terms of Reference of the following Technical Working Groups:<br>- Disaster Management (DM)<br>- Regional Health (RH)<br>- Organizational Development and Youth (OD &Y)<br>They as attached as ANNEXES 4 to 6. |
| **Presentation on the Global Disaster Preparedness Centre** | Rebecca Scheurer/ American RC gave a presentation on the Global Disaster Preparedness Center, that was officially launched in October 2012, with particular emphasis on how SEA RCRC NSes could benefit from it.<br>The presentation is attached at ANNEX 7.<br><br>Director/ AP Zone of IFRC, Jagan also agreed to circulate to all SEA RCRC NSes the information concerning the various Knowledge Centers. |
| **Discussion on Youth** | Mr Azmi Tajudin (Malaysia RC) presented a report on the work of the recently established SEA Youth Network (SEAYN) on behalf of its Chairman. Noting that the SEAYN was already operational |

and that it represented a good forum for our youth to engage one another, the Leaders endorsed and approved the proposed TOR of the SEAYN, which is attached as <u>ANNEX 8</u>.

The goal of the SEAYN is to ensure improved positioning and representation of youth structures in NS management, governance and service delivery, through their participation in decision making. The key objectives for 2014 are the following:
- better positioning and increased representation of youth in existing RC programmes through the YABC tool;
- stronger peer cooperation through youth exchange programmes and joint events;
- more effective SEAYN, including capacity building of members, and promotion of youth success stories through online and face-to-face meetings.

The Leaders endorsed the recommendations of the SEAYN as follows:
- support from leadership to promote stronger mainstreaming of youth into all RC programmes;
- the TOR of the SEAYN ;
- to support peer cooperation between regions or sister NSes, and promote greater investment in youth activities and events, including the having representatives of SEAYN members in Regional, Zonal and Global RCRC events.

In addition the Leaders noted that the SEA Youth should champion the development of a strong online community amongst the RCRC youth to facilitate greater sharing of information, success stories and learning experiences.

With regards the Project Proposal on Regional Youth Empowerment - 3NS C. Youth+ SEAYN; it was agreed that the SEARD would circulate the project proposal to all the SEA RCRC Leaders. All NSes will provide their response promptly so that the project can be implemented.

| Cooperation/ Partnership in SEA: working together | Head/SEARD noted that the revised Principles and Rules (P&R) had been endorsed at the General Assembly in Sydney in December 2013.  Head/SEARD then briefed the meeting on the major progress towards regional cooperation for Response Mechanisms in particular:<br><br>- Revision of Global tools (RDRT, FACT, ERU)<br>- RDRT – facilitate effective mobilization and operation by standardizing the tools and procedures like the SoPs, training packages, roster update and refresher courses.<br>- RDMC, ERU to look into SOPs, RDRT and pre disaster agreements<br><br>**Update on ASEAN**<br>- The draft ASEAN MOU (draft 6) will be taken up in ACDM meeting in Brunei, in May 2014;<br>- All NSes can make an effort to promote this with their respective Ministries/Depts of Foreign Affairs;<br>- The Leaders noted Myanmar RC's offer to raise this issue with the Myanmar Foreign Ministry as Myanmar is the current Chairman of ASEAN;<br>- PMI noted that he had received feedback that it is not easy to sign an agreement with ASEAN.  The cooperation with AHA Center should first be enhanced, and we can build on that.<br>- Leaders agreed that while we keep the ASEAN MOU in sight, we continue to build up the cooperation with AHA, as well as, participate actively in the HA activities (exercises, etc) of ASEAN.  In this way we will slowly build up our relations with ASEAN and perhaps enhance our value with ASEAN as the institution. |
| --- | --- |
| **Engagement with ICRC: Chair**, Alain Aeschlimann, ICRC | ICRC Head or operations presented an update on current developments in the region, ICRC operations and collaboration with NS of SEA.  Three topics where then put for the discussion, focusing on increasing collaboration amongst the three components of the movement.<br><br>Firstly, on the use of social media and related reputational challenges, participants agreed that the borderless modern media pose a challenge to all movement components. Close consultations and cooperation between NS, Federation and ICRC is very important. Malaysian RC commented on the |

| | |
|---|---|
| | ICRC mobile app, asking for more comprehensive information on SEA. The observation was made, that many NS were still working in the old world, and adaptation to new communication had still to take place. Singapore RC noted the need for speed and transparency as the essential components to protect from accusations and showing NS have nothing to hide.<br><br>A second discussion evolved around regional migration, with a focus on labor migration to Gulf Council countries. A regional workshop for selected NS from South Asia, SEA and MENA hosted by Qatari RC will be held in May to look into issues of labor migration.Frustration was expressed that the Movement was still more talking rather than acting. At the same time, some NS still feel delicate to address issues related to irregular migration in their own countries. PMI asked for strong collaboration with ICRC and Federation to address such issues in Indonesia. PRC asked ICRC to intensify its efforts to visit migrants detained in the Gulf Countries.<br><br>Thirdly, ICRC expressed its wish to build on the positive experience of HR collaboration in the Haiyan response and to further such collaboration both for short term and long term responses globally. It was further agreed that a SEA IMPACT training should be held. |
| • Discussion on Safer Access for National Societies | A second part of the session was focused on Safer Access, with a short introduction of the resource pack launched in Sydney 2013 (see www.icrc.org/saferaccess). A key message throughout the discussion was that it is not a new tool, but a structured approach to safety and access, and that it is closely related to existing processes and tools for NS development. National Societies of Philippines, Myanmar, Cambodia and Indonesia shared their experiences in approaching the issue, emphasizing its value and integration into NS processes. NS were encouraged to further share with their peers, and invited to further discuss possible support with the relevant ICRC delegations. |
| **DAY 2** ||
| **SEA Plans and Budget- Chair: Mr Hisham (MRC)** | Head/SEARD gave a presentation on the Long-Term Planning Framework for 2012-2015. The detailed presentation is attached as <u>ANNEX 9</u>. |

| | |
|---|---|
| | As an overview, she noted the following:<br>- **Need to diversify the income sources with a goal sustainable funding;**<br>- **Better support for the regional NSes;**<br>- **The four-planning cycle is to provide a better strategic focus to the financial planning framework, even though the budget is normally only approved for two years;**<br>- **There is also an operational plan for a yearly basis, in order to get the funding approval.**<br><br>It was noted that the budget should also include provision for the implementation of projects that the various TWGs had been mandated to work on. Head SEARD advised that SEA RCRC should provide feedback in order to make adjustments to the budget in order to provide funding for regional wide programmes as indicated above.<br><br>Risk Management – The Chair noted that the SEA RCRC leaders should consider this issue of Risk Management as a priority, noting that IFRC had already recognized it as so. MRC proposed to put it on the agenda for the next Leadership Meeting. Head/SEARD proposed a Workshop on Risk Management. **The Leaders strongly endorsed the holding of such a Workshop and noted that it should be held later this year. We could also invite Ms Kathryn Forbes of the Audit Review and Vice-Chairman of Finance Commission, IFRC to make a presentation at the Workshop.** |
| | |
| **Calendar of Movement events hosted/organized in the region** | The Calendar of RCRC and related events in the region, jointly put together by IFRC and ICRC, was circulated to the Leadership Meeting. The calendar is attached as <u>ANNEX 10</u>. |
| | |
| **Follow up on 2013 General Assembly and Council of Delegates** | <u>General Assembly 2013</u><br>The key focus will be on being a part of framing the post 2015 Development Agenda<br>RCRC actively involved in framing the post 2015 Agenda to ensure that rights and needs of the vulnerable peoples are included in the agenda.<br><br>Furthermore the agenda will also dictate the focus that would be adopted by other humanitarian |

players and funders. Hence RCRC has to make sure our own priorities are included.

RCRC is especially concerned about the following areas:
- Reducing risks and strengthening resilience
- Food and Nutrition Security
- Healthier lives
- Water and Sanitation
- Migration
- Violence

Consultations in SEA will take place in second quarter of 2014 and the hope is that the leadership of the SEA NSes will take an active role in these consultations.

Council of Delegates
The ICRC Regional Cooperation Delegate updated the meeting on the process of reviewing Movement Coordination & Cooperation as launched in Sydney Council of Delegates in 2013. While the overall process is guided and organised by the two international components (ICRC and IFRC), there are three ways for NS to engage in the consultation process. However, representation from the SEA region should be stronger.

First, a NS reference group (leadership level) has been set up, and Myanmar Red Cross who already signed up for participation expressed its willingness to speak collectively on behalf of the SEA NS. Four technical workstreams have been created (on strengthening leadership and coordination; on operational preparedness and response, on resource mobilization; and on internal and external communication), but thus far no SEA NS have declared their interest to participate. If there was such interest, NS should inform both bpommier@icrc.org and simon.eccleshall@ifrc.org.
Lastly, regional consultations are envisaged to seek leaders' views on recommendations developed over the year by the workstreams and NS reference group. The question was asked how leaders would suggest organising this regional consultation. It was agreed that a side session should be organised at the AP Conference to update and seek input from SEA RCRC leaders.

| | |
|---|---|
| | The International Federation Director of Zone also strongly urged NS to participate in the discussions in order to ensure that their views were taken into account.  <u>The Leaders also agreed to discuss this on the margins of the Asia Pacific Conference in Beijing in October 2014.</u><br><br>ICRC and IFRC would send a reminder on SEA NSes to be actively involved in providing feedback, including registering to participate in the work streams, as well as, future regional consultations.<br><br><u>At the request of the Leaders, ICRC agreed to organize a workshop/briefing session in KL for SEA NSes to understand and brainstorm around the issues of the protection of the emblem, the fundamental principles, and the auxiliary role of the RCRC Movement.</u> |
| | |
| **Preparation of the Asia Pacific Conference– Beijing, October 2014** | Director/AP, IFRC noted that China Red Cross would be the host of the next Asia Pacific RCRC Meeting in Beijing in October 2014.<br>Logistical arrangements were being made and all the information will be available 90 days before the Conference.  Budget has been established and appears to be sufficient.  It had been decided that the funding from NSes would be the same as it had been for the AP Conference in Jordan in 2010, i.e. each participant will be required to pay a fee of US$500.  Over and above that, any contribution from NSes would be voluntary.<br>Inputs from most NSes for the substantive agenda hadbeen received and the agenda was being finalized.<br>Youth Conference – The Asia Pacific Youth Conference would take place before the Asia Pacific Meeting. |
| | |
| **Update on Resource Mobilization** | Nathan Rabe presented the Federation-wide Funding Strategy.  The three key priorities are as follows:<br>- **Maintain leadership in RM for emergencies**<br>- **Grow non-emergency (development) funding for domestic and international programs;**<br>- **Increase RM capacity of National Societies** |

| | |
|---|---|
| | Some issues that we need to be concerned<br><br>- NSes may be too internally focused;<br>- There was insufficient prioritising.  NSes need to make significant investment and must take fund raising seriously (Zone, HQ, Delegations, and NSes);<br>- Many other HA organizations were more focused, whereas NSes and IFRC ambiguous;<br>- There was also the issue of internal competition within the Movement.<br><br>SG/PRC gave a an update on the work of the Asia-Pacific Fundraising Network (APFN).  It was noted that some SEA NSes were not yet members of the APFN.  She also noted that both IFRC and a number of NSes have developed partnerships with various corporations, like Coca Cola.  It would be useful for NSes to share information on this, so that other NSes could also learn and benefit from their experiences.<br>Chairman encouraged all SEA NSes to appoint representatives on the APFN and be members of the Network.  Members of the APFN benefit from the knowledge and experiences of each other. |
| | |
| **Minutes of the 11th SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting** | The Meeting reviewed and approved the Minutes of the 11th SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting. |
| **Handover of Chairmanship/Date of next Meeting** | The Chairman thanked all delegates for the participation in the 11th SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting. He also thanked the Cambodian Red Cross for accepting the responsibility of the chairmanship of the SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting for the next one year, and to Chair the 12th SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting in 25-27 Feb, Phnom Penh.<br><br>The next steering committee meeting to prepare for the 12th SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting will be held in Phnom Penh after August 2014.  CRC will also coordinate with Head/SEARD to arrange a meeting of the SEA RCRC Leaders on the margins of the AP Conference in Beijing in Oct 2014.<br><br>PMI agreed to assume the Chairmanship of the SEA RCRC Leadership Meeting in 2015. |

| | The Steering Committee for the period 2014-2015 will include: Cambodia RC, IFRC, ICRC, Singapore RC and Indonesia RC. |
|---|---|