Luang Prabang View Hotel, 25-27 March 2013

**Recommendation /Action points**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Session/Issue | Recommendations |
| Humanitarian ambition for the 21st century  New humanitarian challenges/trends in SEA such as New actors notably from the private sector, involvement of armies in disaster relief and inter-armies cooperation, Lack of will of states to coordinate, misinterpretation of the auxiliary role of NS by states (“NS as humanitarian arm of the government”), new regional bodies related to humanitarian activities (ASEAN: AHA, IOC:ICHAD) and limited funding.   * Increasing frequency and complexity of disasters * Slow process of formalizing relations with ASEAN secretariat | * Keynote Address by Dr Makarim Wibisono, Executive Director, ASEAN Foundation. The key points raised: * Dr. Makarim Wibisono recognised the work of the RCRC and stated, "It has achieved remarkable results in saving thousands of lives every year by harnessing its network of volunteers to prepare for and respond to disaster"; * climate change had generated more droughts, floods, cyclones, earthquakes, wildfires, and other hazards in Southeast Asia; * increased urbanisation and widespread environmental degradation exacerbated existing vulnerabilities limiting people's capacity to cope with and recover from disaster; * ASEAN Leaders attach great importance to the efforts in addressing the humanitarian challenges. Therefore, all related ASEAN bodies such as ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) Partnership Group (APG), ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM), ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance (AHA) Centre, Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR), ASEAN Health Ministers Meeting (AHMM), and Senior Officials Meeting on Health Development (SOMHD), among others, are mandated to do their utmost in addressing these humanitarian challenges; * Dr. Makarim Wibisono expressed his expectation that this Leaders Meeting could mobilise all stakeholders from governments, private sectors, to civil societies to work hand in hand in a vibrant partnership to fully address the humanitarian challenges in Southeast Asia. * This followed by speeches from Mr Jagan Chapagain (IFRC) and Alain Aeschlimann (ICRC). Main messages delivered : * SEA is a region which faces many disasters, with an increasing frequency and complexity. There are also potential situations of man-made crisis and issues related to environmental changes. * The region also should be aware of the possibility of serious outbreaks of diseases, like bird flu, SARS and dengue. * South-East Asia (SEA) RCRC National Societies (NSs) should set an ambitious agenda on how we can work together to be better prepared for such disasters/crisis. * SEA RCRC Movement could be an agent for the creation of a « *culture of peace* » in the region. * The number of players and expertise in the disaster response is growing. The RCRC needs to explore how we can best work with the other players and to leverage on the expertise and innovation available. * There is a significant growth in the capacity at different levels - NS, local communities, governments and the private sector. * We need to engage our youth – both in terms of education and promotion of our values, as agents of change, as well as to mobilise them as volunteers for disaster response. Youth must be given a chance to speak and be heard. * In the face of these changes and developments, RCRC cannot remain still. It needs to adapt and to demonstrate an integrated approach. * We need to pursue and “prove” together the neutral, independent and impartial approach, to ensure a more effective and predictable “red response” in the face of any disaster/crisis in the region. * We need to make the difference in emergencies as first responders. * We need to capitalize in our diversity: adapt to diverse situations, advocate more support from Asian states, strengthen ICRC protection activities, neutral and independent intermediary role. * Increase partnerships while remaining “principled”. Primary partnerships to remain within the Movement. * In SEA, we need to be prepared to work together to build the necessary expertise for effective disaster response within the SEA RCRC NSs. * Each NS also needs to have an integrated programme when building up such expertise and developing an approach for disaster response, e.g having a meaningful programme to engage volunteers in between disasters. * SEA NSs can build on the experience of working within ASEAN. We can develop common understanding, standards, SOPs, etc. * SEA NSs need to map out the strengths and resources available in each NS and capitalize on them to have a better response. * We need to share information and strengthen capacity of each NS (e.g. disaster response capabilities, domestic fundraising capacity, Restoring Family Links (RFL) expertise, etc) * There is a need to keep skilled staff within the Movement (accent on training, rotation and integration of staff). * While developing new tools of disaster response, we should bear in mind that many of these have been already developed on a global or regional level within the RCRC Movement. Hence, instead of creating new tools and mechanisms, we need to look how we can tailor existing tools for our specific needs and conditions. * We need a better framework to work together with ASEAN, e.g. in evaluating the situation, having a common understanding, common standards to provide more comprehensive relief for the survivors. * Various Working Groups (WG) should bear in mind the above in their respective work plan. For example – Regional Disaster Management Committee (RDMC) should continue to engage the ASEAN Committee of disaster management (DM). RDMC can also help to develop some of the elements of how the SEA RCRC can work together, e.g in developing standard operating procedures (SOPs), etc. The Health Working Group can look at how we can work together on health crisis situations, like cross border pandemics. * **There was a general consensus amongst** the Leaders that SEA RCRC should move forward to enhance our cooperation and collaboration in disaster response and communicate better as a Movement. * **All also agreed** that while SEA RCRC strengthens cooperation, we should always continue to work with ICRC, IFRC and other NSs. There is never the intention to develop an exclusive disaster response model for the region. |
|  |  |
| Confirmation of Minutes of 9th Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting in Myanmar, July 2012. | Minutes of the 9th Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting in Myanmar were unanimously endorsed and confirmed by the Leaders. |
|  |  |
| Draft Agenda for the 11th Annual RCRC Leaders Meeting | * The **first day** of the meeting should focus on SEA NSs working together, with support of IFRC. **Half of the second day** will be given over to a dialogue on the engagement with ICRC among the SEA RCRC Leaders. This would institutionalise dialogue on the engagement with ICRC within the SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting. Afternoon of the second day would be for round up, recommendations and conclusions. * To ensure Agenda reflects needs of NSs – The Steering Committee comprising 3 SEA NSs (past, present and next Chairman), and representatives from ICRC and IFRC will meet 2-3 months before the Leaders Meeting to draft the agenda and set out the format of the meeting. |
| Endorsement of ToR for Annual SEA Leaders Meeting | * The SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting is essentially a meeting amongst SEA NSs, supported by the SEA IFRC Secretariat. * It was agreed that IFRC and ICRC will be invited to attend the meeting and to participate under the same conditions as before. * Overall, the ToR should be a simplified document, serving as guidelines rather than as a legal document. * Secretariat (IFRC) will update ToR in line with comments and recommendations of the 10th Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting and share with 11 NS for their feedback. * NSs are expected to provide their feedback within **30 days** after distribution of the revised ToR. |
|  |  |
| Endorsement of ToR for regional working groups | * Working Groups will revise their respective ToRs during upcoming regional meetings. * The TORs should have a connection to the Strategy 2020 and to the priorities established by the SEA RCRC Leaders. * The ToR for the RDMC should include RFL activities. * The Leaders agreed to finalize all the ToRs during the Sydney Meeting. |
| Presentation of Working Groups Reports | * RDMC should develop a common understanding about the needs of each country and to enhance the ability of SEA NS as a whole to respond to an increasing number and more complex disaster situations. SEA NSs Leaders are encouraged to read and consider the RDMC road map developed and agreed since the 16th RDMC meeting. * RDMC needs to focus on tangible ways of better cooperation. * The way forward is mapping of available resources and strengths in SEA NSs, developing a common training syllabus for disasters response and preparedness, and SOPs. We should also enhance the information sharing system in the region. * The Working Group on Health should also consider how the SEA RCRC can be better prepared to play a valuable role in the event of a health crisis in the region, e.g. SARS, Bird flu, etc. * All Working Groups should report better on progress of their work based on the priorities that had been set by the SEA RCRC Leaders. * Essentially, reports for SEA RCRC Leaders should **focus on the key areas of developments and outline the support, directions and decisions** required from Leaders. The report should be concise and focused. * The more detailed reports of the Working Groups will be posted on the Leaders meeting website and FedNet . |
| Partnership with ASEAN | * All SEA NSs support the idea of further cooperation with ASEAN and the need to continue to pursue the goal of concluding a Cooperation Framework (CF) with ASEAN. * It is important that the RCRC Movement should maintain its unique status and not be considered as a normal NGO. Neither is it a dialogue partner, but a body with a legal status within all ASEAN countries. * NSs need more support from SEARD IFRC in terms of better advocacy/humanitarian diplomacy tools/communication plans so as to facilitate their engagement with governments. This will help ASEAN to get a better understanding of what RCRC is about and its auxiliary role to the government. ASEAN should also be welcomed to visit any NS to see progress and get better understanding of RC. * IFRC SEARD will continue to engage with the ASEAN Secretariat; at the same time SEA Leaders will further engagement with their respective ASEAN Permanent State Members. * RDMC Members, with support of IFRC SEARD, will continue to engage in ASEAN Secretariat meeting as well as to strengthen their position within their national platforms (Health, DM, and DRR) and reinforce their relationship with Ministerial counterparts. * SEA RCRC Leaders **agreed to form a small interim Working Group** to continue the process of engaging ASEAN. Leaders agreed that this group will consist of Thai, Singapore, Malaysia and PMI RC societies. * This group will engage ASEAN Secretariat and other ASEAN officials to obtain a better understanding of an approach to pursue *vis a vis* our engagement with ASEAN. * SEARD will have to follow up with the working group, leaders as well as with IFRC Legal department on the informal comments provided by ASEAN Secretariat on Draft 6 of CF (comments made at the 21 ACDM opening session in January 2013) * Working Group will then apprise the SEA RCRC Leaders on the proposed way forward. However the way forward has to align with RDMC road map and NS priorities. * Working Group also to recommend our approach to move forward, (eg. Should we approach ASEAN as SEA NSs or as the IFRC; should we have a general CF or is it better to focus on disaster response and then build on the cooperation; etc) * Meanwhile, all SEA NSs will also approach the relevant departments in their respective Foreign Ministries to press the case for a CF between SEA RCRC and ASEAN. * IFRC will continue to pursue cooperation with different bodies of ASEAN, as part of the process for ASEAN to better understand and appreciate what the RCRC is about and what RCRC brings to a cooperation framework. |
|  |  |
| Engaging ICRC. | * Taking note of the presentations made by Head of Operations, East Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific, ICRC and Secretary General of PMI (to access please click [Presentations: Engaging ICRC](https://sites.google.com/site/seardbkk2013/documents-for-the-meeting)) , comments made by other SEA RCRC Leaders, the meeting agreed on the following: * There was a need to better understand the scope of ICRC work by SEA NSs. * Communication between NS and ICRC should be further improved to help understand each other better. * In this regard, Leaders encouraged ICRC cooperation delegates in the region to continue their engagement of the respective NS and to provide elements for discussion for the next agenda. * Relations between ICRC and SEA NSs should be based on mutual trust and respect for each others’ role and mandate. * The session to engage the ICRC will be institutionalised within the agenda of the Annual SEA RCRC Leaders Meetings. * The ICRC will be invited to attend the next Annual SEA RCRC Leaders meeting on the same basis as at this meeting. * The issues for discussion for this agenda item will be worked out by the steering committee. All parties will be given early notice of the agenda items to facilitate better discussions at the Meeting. * The proposal to establish a Working Group on ICRC Issues will be put on hold for the time being. |
| DAY 2 Preparation for upcoming Statutory Meetings | |
| Guidance for General Assembly and  Council of Delegates (IFRC/ICRC) timeline and procedures, likely issues. | * Chairman summarized the minutes of Day 1 and **encouraged all NSs to provide their comments to the secretariat of the Meeting.** * ICRC regional cooperation delegate presented the overview of the forthcoming Council of Delegates (COD) (The Power of Humanity) meeting in Sydney in November 2013 and referred to the letter received by NS from the SG. * She reminded participants of the topics identified and shared information regarding the mid-term review. Participants were encouraged to share successes and challenges, also in light of the preparation to the next International Conference in 2 years time. * NSs should consult resolutions and have a look at where they stand with their pledges; reporting on pledges being a good opportunity to discuss with their governments. NSs should also take this opportunity to discuss their collective pledges. * Head of Operations, East Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific, ICRC elaborated on the theme of the COD (“150 years of Humanitarian Action”) and of the International RCRC Day on 8 May. The Movement has embarked on a two-year anniversary celebration to engage the Movement internally and externally through organizing country-wide and world-wide activities. A website has been created and a joint ICRC – IFRC message will be issued soon. All NSs are urged to also come up with some plans to acknowledge the anniversary. * Head of SEARD, IFRC introduced the overview of the General Assembly and Malaysia RC Chairman shared his experience as a member of the Board of Governors. He urged the Leaders to identify major areas for discussion. He encouraged NSs to contact ICRC, IFRC offices in the region or country for clarification should they require any. * Singapore RC, as the next chair, will organise a SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting on the margins of the General Assembly in Sydney, so as to add strength with a collective intervention. |
|  |  |
| Framework for Strengthening National Societies – Capacity Building | * Head of SEARD, IFRC presented the new framework for global initiative, highlighting 5 issues:  1. Global OCAC - 35 NSs have piloted worldwide with Myanmar the only one in the SEA region. Philippines have completed the training and other NS have expressed some interest.  * Myanmar RC shared that it found the OCAC a practical tool for the NS and that it helps NS build for the future. It also helps NS to assess where it was and how the NS can move forward. However there was a need to be realistic and honest with the 95 attributes. Head of SEARD, IFRC concluded that it is a good baseline assessment of the strengths and deficiencies of the NS. * Cambodia RC is still using the well functioning national society (WFNS) model and asked if NS should stop it and do OCAC? Director of Finance and Administration /member of OD task group of the CRC shared its experience in Branch Development Process. Learning from CRC was previously shared with Myanmar RC and Lao RC. * Head of SEARD, IFRC clarified that if WFNS was helpful and CRC should continue using it. OCAC was developed to take into consideration changes in the environment. * Then Head of SEARD, IFRC introduced other areas of the new framework:  1. Fed-wide databank and reporting- making a slow progress in SEA due to poor internet and challenges in data collection. All NSs are encouraged to use the data available as well as to add to the database the information on the databank. 2. Learning and knowledge sharing network (LKSN) - In Asia – lower usage -8,305 compared to globally 30,880. This is low, considering that the region has 60% of the global population. The materials are available in 40 languages (not all).  * Director of AP Zone, IFRC shared that it was a great tool developed by the Federation, and that millions of volunteers and hundreds of staff could benefit from this as an opportunity to learn. He urged the Leaders to collectively promote it.  1. Digital Divide: There is steady progress in the region and a strong commitment by leaders, However we need to capture the progress and emphasize the need for mutual support between NSs.  * Malaysia RC suggested the translation of the LKSN material into common languages in the region. In particular, translation into Bahasa, that would benefit volunteers and staff in a number of SEA countries, like Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Brunei, and Timor- Leste. It was noted that perhaps there could be some funding support from Singapore. * Session was concluded with an overview of the Youth and Organisation Development in RCRC, and with references to the IFRC youth policy 2011 and the new Youth Strategy 2013 that would be adopted in the GA in Sydney. |
|  |  |
| International Humanitarian Law and International Disaster Law (IHL and IDRL) – relevance in SEA – ICRC/IFRC | * Presentation on IHL and IDRL (definitions, differences between the two (seen from access point of view), role of NS in IHL and IDRL) by ICRC regional cooperation delegate and Head of SEARD, IFRC. * IHL is set out in treaty form and is a set of rules which apply only in armed conflicts, even if they create obligations in peacetime. IHL limits suffering caused by conflict and is a powerful tool for international community to ensure the safety and dignity of people in times of war. * IDRL Overview: applied in non-conflict disasters; have been developed since 2001; adopted by consensus by the 30th International Conference in 2007; just set of recommendations on how to work with Government and stakeholders when big disasters happen. There are no treaties or international agreement binding member states. * OCHA and some other UN agencies are keen to learn and adapt the IDRL guidelines and model act for their own operations. * The discussion that followed included the **following observations and suggestions**:  1. Agree on the importance and necessity to promote IHL in the respective countries as this is the most relevant tool for protection of the vulnerable people in times of conflicts. 2. More commitment from SEA NS Leaders in promoting both IHL and IDRL. Where possible we could promote IDRL as a Movement to the governments or with ASEAN. 3. For IDRL, there was a need to identify areas of common interest/ in the SEA region based on NSs experiences in handling disasters, taking into consideration the perspective of both recipient NSs and participating NSs. 4. This would help SEA NS and Federation to advocate the rationale for IDRL to the Government and other authorities. There is a need for NSs to continue to promote the promulgation of IDRL with their respective authorities, while at the same time recognizing that this is a politically sensitive issue. 5. Leaders were reminded about the collective pledge made by 10 NS Leaders at the previous statutory meeting and the need to report on this pledge. SEARD has offered to consolidate this feedback. 6. Need to ensure region wide-understanding of the IDRL guidelines and to develop practical ways to apply IDRL in the region. 7. Need to share practical experiences when major disasters happen, such as Tsunamis/earthquakes and Cyclones, to further our learning process in the effectiveness and usefulness of IDRL. 8. Use the Model Act for disaster law as a useful tool when engaging Governments to promote and advocate the introduction of disaster management laws in the country. 9. Leaders also noted that there was a need to emphasize the roles of the NSs in the National Disaster Response/Management framework in their respective countries. |
|  |  |
| Principles and Rules for Disaster Relief – what does it mean for SEA | Head of SEARD, IFRC highlighted the importance of the Principles and Rules (P&R). P&R are developed to help the Movement players to remain relevant in disaster situations, and she encouraged NS Leaders to take the exercise to revise the P&R seriously and to provide feedback. Leaders were briefed on the revision process, its timeline and stages. This followed by detailed presentation of 10 main issues addressed in the feedback received thus far from NSs. Leaders were encouraged to consider what type of support was needed and how this can be addressed during next Statutory Meeting.  Director of AP Zone, IFRC asked the Leaders what would be the best option for follow up in Geneva – shall we just stick to the limits of disaster relief or expand the area. He also stressed, that in providing feedback, the IFRC wanted to see the views and opinions of the NSs, views which should not be influenced by IFRC, which would better reflect NSs concerns.  Head of Operations, East Asia, Southeast Asia and the Pacific, ICRC also added that there were discussions in Geneva on establishing a small ICRC – IFRC working group at high level between the two institutions in order to explore how ICRC could also be involved and contribute to the development of the P&R. ICRC delegates had been involved in some of the consultative meetings at the regional and the field level, but not at the level of Geneva, and the scope of the document was changed in the meantime. He also explained that the underlying issue was the review of the Seville Agreement and its Supplementary Measures. In the region there are many good examples to review field experience (Ex. Philippines where a lot of energy and resources went into coordination of typhoon response).  Explaining the rationale of P&R revision, Director of AP Zone, IFRC noted that there were many regulations and policies and members saw a need for all of these to be consolidated into one central document, i.e. the P&R. The idea was once P&R is agreed on and adopted, it will serve as the only document to guide disaster response operations. This would harmonise all the documents within IFRC. While P&R is designed for disaster response, there were some talks that similar exercise may be undertaken for other areas of operations in the future.  On the issue of timing, the deadline for receiving feedback had been extended to July, so that the feedback can be ready for presentation to the Governing Board at its September Meeting (The deadline of July was because there would be a need to translate the feedback into the 5 working languages of the Governing Board.). The plan is to have the revised P&R ready for adoption at the GA in Sydney in November.  Overall observation was that the revision takes place in light of changing environment in disaster response, especially with the inclusion of many new state and non-state actors. It was a healthy process that helps the Movement to remain relevant, especially in SEA, where we see growing capacities of NS and growing number of new challenges.  All documents from these sessions are available on SEA Leaders website.  **Session’s conclusions and recommendations**:   1. All SEA RCRC NSs should engage and participate in the consultation and revision process of P&R. The deadline for providing the feedback was extended to July 2013. 2. NSs should dialogue with their respective authorities, Government agencies and if need be, with Permanent Missions in Geneva. This would make the feedback on the P&R more relevant and practical as it would include government concerns. 3. We need to think how NS should apply P&R in serving their auxiliary role to the Government in times of disaster. 4. Leaders instructed RDMC to discuss P&R at its next Meeting in June in Myanmar, as a priority, and provide comments and feedback to all SEA NS Leaders. 5. Feedback from the various SEA NS can consider recommendations from RDMC members, while recognising that such feedback might differ from the views of the RDMC. 6. All NS should send their feedback on P&R to **[pr.disasterrelief@ifrc.org](mailto:pr.disasterrelief@ifrc.org)** by July 2013**.** |
|  |  |
| SEA Plans and Budget LTPF 2012-2015  Calendar of events hosted/organized in the region by IFRC/NS/ICRC | In opening the discussions, the Chair highlighted that budgets should be a result of joint planning and consultation process. The important point was that NSe need to be aware of the process, and that the focus of the budget should be on meeting the needs of the region and the SEA NSs. Any budget that did not focus on the priorities of the NSs of the region would be irrelevant.  Head of SEARD, IFRC explained how IFRC prepared the budgets, and the different elements catered for in the budget, and the percentage of budget allocated to the various country activities, as well as, categories of activities.  Following the presentation, a number of questions were raised, such as revision of Long Term Planning Framework ( LTPF), possibility of inclusion of new programmes; whether NS could share plans and budgets with partners, governments and other stakeholders; any marketing tool for promoting our plans.  Head of SEARD, IFRC explained that LTPF revision was fairly flexible. If SEA NSs felt that the LTPF did not reflect the humanitarian needs, they should provide feedback so that the LTPF could be revised. However IFRC stressed that plans have to be realistic. When NS has an interesting idea, the NS should assess whether it has the capacity to implement it. With reference to promotion of plans, we should do it collectively at all levels and all Leaders are encouraged to promote LTPF within their networks. IFRC expects a growing number of requests from AP for the next planning cycle as the global trend is shifting towards this region. AP is also being a bigger share of the allocation.  This followed by a discussion on the need to manage the costs of operations. President of Myanmar RC noted that costs of programmes could be lowered if less expat staff were employed and more local qualified staff is employed instead. Director of AP Zone, IFRC noted that as a Swiss-based organisation, certain categories of staff, has to be employed based on the Swiss manpower employment requirements, e.g the Head of the Secretariat.  Acknowledging this, President of Myanmar RC suggested that moving forward, wherever possible and where qualified local candidates are available, they should be employed for the programme support. This would hopefully mean more funds for the beneficiaries themselves rather than cover staff costs.  IFRC took a note of this, but cautioned that it might not necessarily mean more funds for the programme.  **Outcomes:**  SEA IFRC Secretariat will engage all SEA NS by May to obtain their recommendations on plans and budgets revision. The revision process will take place from May to July.  Regional Cooperation Delegate, ICRC and Senior Programme Support officer, SEARD, IFRC presented the calendar of events from ICRC and IFRC respectively. All calendars should be posted on the IFRC AP Zone webpage. |
|  |  |
| Update of APFN/RM  Letter from AP Zone Director re Gender Balance | * Secretary General of Philippines RC /Chairman of Asia Pacific fundraising Network (APFN) presented APFN update. While highlighting the successes of the forum, a number of challenges were outlined. * She asked NS Leaders for their inputs and advice on how to move forward the plans and ability of the APFN to assist the NSs in their Resource Mobilisation (RM). * Chair congratulated the presenter and her presentation and noted that RM is a very important area of work and he is surprised some NS does not have RM staff. * APFN offered support to all NS in implementing Federation wide resource mobilisation system (FWRMS), so all NS are encouraged to provide feedback and ask for areas of support from Leaders if needed. * Director, AP Zone recalled a recent letter to all Presidents and SGs on the issue of gender balance and the possibility of starting a similar network to promote gender balance within the AP Zone. He noted that the SEARD team was a good example of gender balance, but overall in AP this is still poor. Jagan asked all Leaders to look at the letter sent out on 8 March on what could be done relating to mainstreaming the issue of gender diversity and how we in AP Zone could find a common approach in addressing this issue. He asked the SEA Leaders to provide the feedback to him as soon as possible. Thus far there had been no response from SEA Leaders. |
|  |  |
| Presentation of draft minutes of the meeting  Time and venue for next meeting  Conclusion and Wrap up | * Leaders briefly discussed the draft minutes and provided some feedback which was incorporated into the draft. As agreed, Secretariat circulated draft minutes to all the SEA NSs before the delegations left Luang Prabang. All NSs were requested to revert with their comments within a week (3 April 2013). These comments will be incorporated and the final draft will circulated to all SEA NSs for their approval. After which it will be posted on the SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting website, for all to refer to for follow up actions and for the preparation of the next Steering Group. * Chairman, LRC, Dr Faiphengyoa thanked all the delegates and handed over the Chairmanship of the Annual SEA RCRC Leaders’ Meeting to Chairman, Singapore RC, Tee Tua Ba. Mr Tee thanked LRC for capable chairmanship of the Leaders’ Meeting and for being such gracious hosts. * Singapore RC announced that the dates of the next Meeting were tentatively set as **24-26 March 2014 in Singapore**. Delegations were requested to confirm that these dates were convenient. Chairman Tee welcomed all SEA NSs to Singapore for the 11th SEA RCRC Leaders Meeting. |