



## I. Introduction

In April 2014 the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) launched the Regional Resilience Initiative (RRI), which was a 4-year endeavour funded by the Canadian Government (GAC – Global Affairs Canada) and the Canadian Red Cross (CRC). The Initiative supported eleven National Red Cross and Red Crescent (RCRC) Societies (NS) in Southeast Asia with the overarching goal of reducing the impact of natural disasters on vulnerable communities. Specifically, the Initiative sought to enhance skills and capacities within NS so that they could advocate more strongly at national and regional levels for the needs of communities in disaster risk reduction (DRR). This approach was complemented by the strengthening of regional partnerships, both within RCRC networks and with key partners such as the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) Secretariat and other regional stakeholders.

As part of the ongoing process to help illustrate the overall picture of achievements secured through the RRI, a Lessons Learned Workshop (LLW) was held as a means of generating key lessons from the experience of working on selected thematic areas and to promote the knowledge and learning gained through discussion of these topics and themes to a wider stakeholder audience.

The LLW had two specific objectives: (1) to generate key lessons learned related to the most significant RRI outcomes that can be used by stakeholders in future contexts. This objective aimed to ensure that the learning objectives and principles envisaged in the original Project Implementation Plan (PIP) were enacted; and (2) to identify how key IFRC contributions generated through the RRI could be broadened/up-scaled to the wider humanitarian system. This objective aimed to illustrate to external stakeholders how IFRC was able to contribute and add value to the broader humanitarian system by drawing on experience and presenting learning in a well-documented and evidence-based manner. A key output of the LLW was the documentation of key lessons from the RRI.

An important consideration in the workshop design and method was to account for the fact that not all stakeholders had a detailed understanding or knowledge of the RRI. With this factor in mind, workshop exercises were purposefully designed to enable maximum inclusivity i.e. creating a learning environment in which all workshop attendees can participate and contribute fully to workshop's purpose and aims.

## II. Participation

Fifty-two people attended the workshop from a range of stakeholder groups as follows:

- National Societies (**18**); comprising management representatives, DM departments representatives and G&D focal points.
- Canadian Red Cross (**4**)
- IFRC and partner National Societies (**13**)
- NDMO representatives from Southeast Asia (**6**)
- Representatives from Institutions responsible for Women Affairs (2)
- Local government representative (1)
- Other key regional partners involved in RRI implementation (**8**)

The Ambassador of Canada to ASEAN, H.E. Marie-Louise Hannan officially opened the event on 21 February, with supporting introduction by Marwan Jilani, Head of IFRC CCST, and Deborah Coté, Program Manager Asia, International Operations, Canadian Red Cross.

Participant list is provided in Annex B

## III. Presentations and agenda

All presentations (including opening statements) are available on the dedicated event page in the [Resilience Library](#).

The workshop agenda is contained in Annex C.

## IV. Summary of each day

### Day 1 – Focus on RRI lessons learnt

After the introductory session, the first morning session required the participants to review photos taken from RRI activities during the initiative's life cycle (2014-2017), offering them a recap of what has taken places, as well as setting the scene for the three-day event. Following this timetable exercise, IFRC consultant shared a summary of the RRI endline study being conducted from September 2017 to March 2018, with a focus on outcome level indicators. The afternoon session had the participant choose to join different thematic area discussions (*ASEAN Partnership, ASSI, Disaster Law, Gender & Diversity, and Regional Partnership*) in order to review case studies drafted as part of the endline study and discuss what had worked well, what could have been done better, as well as recommendations to the initiative. Output from this session is provided in Annex D.



Day 2 – Scaling up IFRC/RRI learning to the wider humanitarian and development system

Activities on the second day aimed at identifying how key IFRC contributions, generated through the RRI, can be broadened/up-scaled to the wider humanitarian and development system. The participants were divided into two main groups both in the morning and the



afternoon sessions. For each round, the groups discussed on two thematic areas (morning: *localization* and *protection/SGBV*; and afternoon: *evidence-based advocacy* and *peer-to-peer support and networking*). In each thematic session, the topic was introduced through a short panel discussion, blending RRI input and external perspectives. At the end of the session, participants agreed on key recommendations for each thematic area. Output from Day 2's discussions are provided in Annex E.

Day 3 – Development of key recommendations

After hearing reports from each of the four thematic group discussions held on day 2, the participants were asked to revisit recommendations from various sessions held in the two previous days, and identify key strategic recommendations for each thematic area. Key recommendations as a result of Day 3 activities are provided in Annex F.





## V. Participants' evaluation and recommendations

On the last day of the workshop (23 February), the participants were requested to provide their feedback and suggestions on the following aspects:

- overall usefulness of the workshop;
- their understanding of the workshop objective;
- application of knowledge from the workshop to their work;
- length and time of the workshop;
- relevancy of the workshop materials; and
- satisfaction of logistic and administrative arrangement.

Feedback which was received from 30 participants was positive overall, with most of them finding the workshop to be valuable and indicating that most participants understood the objective of the workshop and saw the application of lessons learned to their respective work.

In their comments, most of the participants expressed their satisfaction with the thematic area discussions, the opportunity to exchange knowledge with other National Societies, and the discussion on the recommendations on the way forward of thematic area implementation. However, a few of the participants found the workshop objectives to be unclear as there were various topics for discussions. One participant said it was “difficult to relate recommendations to overall objective of replication to other areas.”

On the overall recommendation, most of the participants shared positive views toward the design and organization of the workshop. Most of them urged for the recommendations to be shared and followed through. A few participants recommended a more coordinated and prepared presentation to ensure that all presentations are in the same line with the workshop objective. The table below provides quantitative report of the participants' feedback.

**Summary of Participants' Feedback in Percentage**

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Indifferent	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I find the workshop to be valuable overall.	53%	47%	0%	0%	0%
I understand the objective of the workshop.	48%	45%	4%	3%	0%
I can apply the knowledge from the workshop to my work.	40%	53%	7%	0%	0%
The facilitators are effective in helping me understanding their respective sessions.	40%	60%	0%	0%	0%
The length and timing of the workshop is appropriate.	30%	64%	3%	3%	0%
The materials handed out to me were helpful.	37%	60%	3%	0%	0%
Logistic and administrative arrangement were appropriate.	40%	57%	3%	0%	0%

### Abbreviation

AADMER	ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management & Emergency Response
ACDM	ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management
ACE	AHA Centre Executive Programme
ADDM	ASEAN Day for Disaster Management
ADPC	Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre
ADRRN	Asian Disaster Reduction and Response Network
AHA Centre	ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management
AMCDRR	Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction
ARF DiREx	ASEAN Regional Forum civil-military disaster simulation exercise
ASEAN	Association of South East Asian Nations
ASSI	ASEAN Safe Schools Initiative
CB	Community Based (as a prefix to an acronym e.g. CBDRR)
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CCST	Country Cluster Support Team
CRC	Canadian Red Cross
CRCS	Cambodian Red Cross Society
CSR	Community Safety and Resilience (Forum)
CVTL	Cruz Vermelha de Timor-Leste/Timor-Leste Red Cross Society
DL	Disaster Law
DM	Disaster Management
DMHA	(ASEAN) Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
DIPECHO	Disaster Preparedness ECHO Programme
ECHO	European Community Humanitarian Aid Office
ERAT	Emergency Response & Assessment Team
ESCAP	The Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
FP	Focal Points
GAC	Global Affairs Canada
G&D	Gender & Diversity
GoC	Government of Canada
HD	Humanitarian Diplomacy
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action
IDDR	International Day for Disaster Risk Reduction
IDRL	International Disaster Response Laws, Rules and Principles
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IR	Inception Report
KI	Key Informant
KII	Key Informant Interviews
LRC	Lao Red Cross
MoNRE	Ministry of Natural Resources and Energy (Lao PDR)
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
Movement	Red Cross Red Crescent Movement
MRC	Malaysian Red Crescent
MRCS	Myanmar Red Cross Society
NDMA	National Disaster Management Authority
NDMO	National Disaster Management Office
NDRT	National Disaster Response Team
NEP	No evidence presented
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NS	National Society/Societies

OCHA	(United Nations) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PGI	Protection, Gender, and Inclusion
PIP	Project Implementation Plan
PMER	Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting
PMI	Palang Merah Indonesia/Indonesian Red Cross Society
PNS	Partner National Society
PRC	Philippines Red Cross
RCRC	Red Cross Red Crescent
RDRT	Regional Disaster Response Team
RRI	Regional Resilience Initiative
SEA	Southeast Asia
SEAYN	Southeast Asia Youth Network
SEARD	Southeast Asia Regional Delegation
SFDRR	Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-based Violence
TA	Technical Assistance
ToC	Theory of Change
ToR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
TRC	Thai Red Cross
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNISDR	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
UNOCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
VCA	Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment
VNRC	Viet Nam Red Cross Society
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organisation

## Participant List

Name	Position	Organisation	Work base
Dr. Uy Sam Onn	Deputy Director of Disaster Management Department	Cambodian Red Cross	Phnom Penh
Ms. Mom Chanthy	Deputy Director of Health Department / Gender and Diversity Focal Point	Cambodian Red Cross	Phnom Penh
Ms. Keth Mardy	Director of Legal Protection Department	Ministry of Women Affair Cambodia	Phnom Penh
Mr. Arifin Muhammad Hadi	Head of Disaster Management Division	Indonesian Red Cross (PMI)	Jakarta
Mr. Teguh Wibowo	DRR Officer of Disaster Management Division	Indonesian Red Cross (PMI)	Jakarta
Amb. Thongphachanh Sonnasinh	Vice-President	Lao Red Cross	Vientiane
Ms. Ketkeo Oupalavong	Deputy Head of Advancement for Women / Gender and Diversity Focal Point	Lao Red Cross	Vientiane
Mr. Vilayphong Sisomvang	Deputy Director General	Ministry of Labor and Social Welfare, Lao PDR	Vientiane
Ms. Manivone Luangsombath	Deputy Director of NCAWMC Secretariat	Lao PDR National Commission for the Advancement of Women (NCAW)	Vientiane
Mr. Saiful Izan Bin Nordin	Manager, International Humanitarian Law, Legal and International Relations	Malaysian Red Crescent	Kuala Lumpur
Raja Dato' Nazrin bin Raja Tan Sri Aznam	Chairman for the Malaysian Red Crescent's International Relations Committee	Malaysian Red Crescent	Kuala Lumpur
Mr. Amaluddin bin Suib	Director, Logistic Division	Malaysia National Disaster Management Agency (NADMA)	Kuala Lumpur
Ms. Wut Yee Kyaw	Program Coordinator, Disaster Management Department	Myanmar Red Cross Society	Yangon
Mr. San Hlaing Min	Field Coordinator, Disaster Management Department	Myanmar Red Cross Society	Yangon

Mr. Tin Maung Wai	Assistant Director, Department of Disaster Management	Ministry of Social Welfare, Relief and Resettlement, Myanmar	Yangon
LT. Gen. Amnat Barlee M.D.	Director of Relief and Community Health Bureau	Thai Red Cross Society	Bangkok
Ms. Pavinee Yuprasert	Assistant Director of Relief and Community Health Bureau	Thai Red Cross Society	Bangkok
Ms. Sunisthida Phetduang	Head of Relief Division	Thai Red Cross Society	Bangkok
Mr. Chamnong Sangmahachai	Assistant Secretary General for Personnel Management	Thai Red Cross Society	Bangkok
Ms. Suttapak Panpapai	Policy and plan Analyst, Professional Level, Research and International Cooperation Bureau	Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, Thailand	Bangkok
Ms. Sophita Thanyaluckmetha	Policy and Plan Analyst, Practitioner level, Research and International Cooperation Bureau	Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation, Thailand	Bangkok
Mr. Hermenegildo Cardoso Rente	Head of Disaster Management Division	Timor-Leste Red Cross Society (CVTL)	Dili
Ms. Emidia Licinia Constanca Belo	DRR Manager	Timor-Leste Red Cross Society (CVTL)	Dili
Mr. Jose Amaral Tilman	Director of Centre of Social Solidarity	Manufahi Municipality, Timor-Leste	Dili
Ms. Tran Thi Thanh Huyen	Deputy Director Social Works Department	Vietnam Red Cross	Hanoi
Ms. Nguyen Kieu Trang	Disaster Management Department	Vietnam Red Cross	Hanoi
Ms. Hoang Thi Hien	Official of Policy and Training Division of Disaster Management Policy and Technology Center (DMPTC)	Vietnam Disaster Management Authority, MARD	Hanoi
Ms. Deborah Coté	Program Manager Asia, International Operations	Canadian Red Cross	Ottawa
Ms. Wartini Pramana	Planning, Evaluation, and Knowledge Management Manager	Canadian Red Cross	Ottawa
Ms. Nicole Robicheau	Manager, Communications & International Operations, Communications & Partnerships	Canadian Red Cross	Ottawa



Ms. Carla Taylor	Sr. Disaster Risk Management Advisor Global Programs, International Operations	Canadian Red Cross	Ottawa
Mr. Richard Cewers	Advisor Programming, Monitoring, Evaluation, Reporting (PMER) and Accountability, Asia Region	Swedish Red Cross	Bangkok
Mr. Marwan Jilani	Head of CCST	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Mr. Hervé Gazeau	DRR Manager	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Ms. Warongrong Tatrakom	DRR Officer	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Ms. Tiamkare Thitithamtada	Communications and Reporting Officer	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Ms. Helen Brunt	Senior Migration Officer	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Ms. Cindy Le Ky Huong	Support Services Manager	IFRC CCST Bangkok	Bangkok
Mr. Ahmad Husein	Senior National Society Development Manager	IFRC CCST Jakarta	Jakarta
Mr. Øivind Hetland	DRM delegate	IFRC Myanmar Country Office	Yangon
Ms. Christina Haneef	IFRC Protection, Gender and Inclusion Delegate	IFRC Bangladesh Country Office	Cox's Bazar
Ms. Gabrielle Emery	Coordinator for Asia Pacific Disaster Law Programme	IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office	Kuala Lumpur
Ms. Priyanka Bhalla	Sexual and Gender-based Violence (SGBV) Advisor	IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office	Kuala Lumpur
Ms. Sanna Salmela-Eckstein	Regional Disaster Risk Reduction Coordinator & Climate Change Focal Point	IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office	Kuala Lumpur
Ms. Branwen Millar	Humanitarian Project Coordinator, Asia Pacific Regional Office	UNFPA	Bangkok
Mr. Timothy Wilcox	Program Management Officer (Asia and Pacific)	UNISDR	Bangkok
Ms. Kai Spratt	Senior Regional Gender Advisor, Technical Advisory Group (TAG)	USAID/RDMA	Bangkok

Ms. Nadia Pulmano	Technical Advisor for DRR and Education	ASSI / Save the Children	Bangkok
Ms. Maria Holtsberg	Gender & Inclusion Advisor  Humanitarian Programme	International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)	Bangkok
Ms. Keya Saha-Chaudhury	Senior Capacity Development and Partnerships Advisor, Humanitarian Programme	International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)	Bangkok
Mr. Adam Poulter	Humanitarian Director	International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF)	Bangkok
Mr. Aekarad Rakwanat	Movement Cooperation Coordinator	ICRC	Bangkok

### Workshop Agenda

Day 1	Wednesday 21 February
08:30	Arrival at workshop and welcome
09:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop opening, housekeeping, introductions and objectives</li> <li>• Welcoming remarks: IFRC</li> <li>• Introductory remarks: CRC</li> <li>• Opening speech: HE Ambassador of Canada to ASEAN</li> <li>• Screening of 'community voices'</li> <li>• Workshop agenda and method (facilitator)</li> <li>• Group photo</li> </ul>
10:00	Exercise 1: 'Getting to know you' and engagement with RRI
10:30	Morning coffee break
10:45	Exercise 2: RRI Timeline Mapping
11:45	Exercise 3: Baseline- Endline Presentation
12:30	Lunch
13:30	Exercise 4: Change Story highlights <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introductions to 6 change stories (in plenary)</li> <li>• Group work (5-6 groups) – change story analysis</li> </ul>
15:00	Afternoon coffee break
15:15	Exercise 4: Continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change story discussion – identifying lessons learned</li> </ul>
16:00	Exercise 4: Continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change story presentations – in plenary</li> </ul>
17:00	Summary of day and close
18:00	Welcome reception

<b>Day 2</b>	<b>Thursday 22 February</b>
08:30	Arrival at workshop
09:00	Introduction to the Day
09:15	Exercise 5: Introductions to <u>morning</u> thematic sessions (in plenary) and group formation
09:45	Panel introduction for each theme
10:45	Morning coffee break
11:00	Exercise 5: Continued – thematic group discussions
12:30	Lunch
13:30	Exercise 6: Introductions to <u>afternoon</u> thematic sessions (in plenary) and group formation
14:00	Panel introduction for each theme
15:00	Afternoon coffee break
15:15	Exercise 6: Continued – thematic group discussions
16:45	Summary of day and close

<b>Day 3</b>	<b>Friday 23 February</b>
08:30	Arrival at workshop
09:00	Feedback from thematic groups (panel)
10:00	Presentation of draft summary recommendations
10:30	Morning coffee break
10:45	Exercise 7: Prioritization and finalisation of recommendations summary
11:30	Workshop evaluation and closing
12:30	Lunch

## Day 1: Key lessons learned

### A. ASEAN partnerships

What worked well: From an analysis of the ‘working together to promote resilience through ASEAN partnerships’ case study, workshop participants identified a number of key learning points. In the category of what worked well, these included: recognition of RCRC as key stakeholder of the One ASEAN One Response; building trust and mutual understanding through ACE programme, DIREX, ASSI, AON meetings and ADDN celebrations, etc.; and enhanced visibility/recognition of RCRC contribution to AADMER.

What could be done better: In terms of what could be done better in the future to strengthen the ASEAN partnership, key lessons included: better harmonise RDRT–ERAT and clarify the deployment flow; monitor the joint action plan with AHA Centre more closely; link the Resilience Library with several social media platforms; promote IFRC e-learning platform to ASEAN stakeholders more systematically; and increase information sharing and coordination among the SEA IFRC offices.

Recommendations: The working group made several important recommendations and/or suggestions for improving the ASEAN partnership, which included: engage NS more in relation to specific ACDM working groups (e.g. Thai RC and Lao RC on prevention and mitigation); accelerate IFRC EOC establishment and link with AHA Centre web EOC; invite ERAT members to join trainings and operations; have more RDT staff and volunteers trained as ERAT; and update the Joint Action Plan with AHA centre, including the CSR Forum and the leadership meeting.

### B. ASSI

What worked well: From an analysis of the ASSI case study, workshop participants identified a number of key learning points. In the category of what worked well, these included: an increased focus on Safe Learning Facilities (but this was only considered sufficient rather than enough); solid examples of working through existing community DMC structures; close collaboration with ministries of education at local levels; and positive engagement with civil society (through ASSI).

What could be done better: In terms of what could be done better in the future to strengthen ASSI work, key lessons included: a better documentation of all SLF initiatives; distinguishing IFRC’s work as a project approach or institutional approach from NS; generating more focus on disaster preparedness than risk reduction (i.e. Pillars 2 and 3); invest more in mapping existing practices before starting new projects (that have developed organically and over many years in different localities).

Recommendations: The working group made several important recommendations and/or suggestions for improving ASSI work, which included: ensure engagement at all levels related to policy planning and implementation (with ministries of education and DM authorities); ensure a focus on Pillar 1 and help better determine the role NS have within this approach; a better profiling of NS core competencies and scope within sectors in the context of what other actors present are able to contribute; and, link ASSI discussions to the wider resilience approach (Accompanying, Connecting, Enabling – the IFRC Road Map to Community Resilience).

### C. Disaster Law

*What worked well:* From an analysis of the disaster law case study, workshop participants identified a number of key learning points. In the category of what worked well, these included: supporting NS advocacy; strengthening the NS-government relationship; the DL dissemination models used; the clear understanding of roles and responsibilities of NS and government; adopting a “more of the same” approach (what has been done should continue); and the DL tools themselves.

*What could be done better:* In terms of what could be done better in future to strengthen DL work, key lessons included: improving the accessibility of DL content at the local level; stronger focus on the local level i.e. articulate “what’s in it for communities” and a contextualization towards their needs; better support for implementation and development; and creating more user-friendly information that can be readily shared.

*Recommendations:* The working group made several important recommendations and/or suggestions for improving DL work, which included: create more opportunities for knowledge sharing; begin to compile best practice (and continue its promotion); create an accessible DL database; consider how to encourage stronger ‘bottom up’ approach to the DL work; and engage a wider variety of stakeholders in advocacy/influence efforts e.g. parliamentarians, policy makers, and private-public partnerships.

#### **D. Gender and Diversity**

*What worked well:* From an analysis of the G&D case study, workshop participants identified a number of key learning points. In the category of what worked well, these included: overall awareness and deeper understanding of G&D issues created at all levels; the RRI efforts led to an impetus for policy development; the mainstreaming of G&D across NS departments (e.g. health, DM, social welfare, etc.) made for an effective strategy; the use of MSCs and G&D sensitive VCA yielded strong results; the peer-to-peer support with G&D networks was a great success; the added value nature of innovative partnerships and working groups e.g. Characters and Values Working Group in the Indonesia context which included IFRC, ICRC, CRC, and ARC, which resulted in a PMI-joint work plan and resource mobilization and PMI Code of Conduct.

*What could be done better:* In terms of what could be done better in future to strengthen G&D work, key lessons included: challenges related to convincing senior leadership of the importance of G&D remain; there is a need to put internal policies into practice (HQ, across departments, at branch level); there is a lack of technical and financial resources for future G&D efforts; working within different socio-cultural contexts is challenging; and improved methods related to measuring the impact of programme outcomes need to be identified and established.

*Recommendations:* The working group made several important recommendations and/or suggestions for improving G&D work, which included: clarifying the changing terminology within G&D arena e.g. the shift to PGI; a need to provide NS with further guidance on tools and policies developed as well as on the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse, internal codes of conduct and reporting mechanisms; the importance of continuing with the G&D Network and inviting senior leadership to those meetings; and develop a stronger and more coordinated partnerships with government departments (e.g. with Ministry of Women’s Affairs and NDMOs together and not in silos).

Other important recommendations/suggestions from the G&D group included: having a clearer definition of donor priorities and strengthening of these partnerships; more capacity development of G&D interventions both during emergency and non-emergency time (for longer-term community-based programmes); clarify the role of NS on how to address specific



issues e.g. SGBV prevention and response (should RCRC volunteers be able to handle disclosure and give referral information or be case managers); better earning from external actors on specific programme areas e.g. working with migrant workers; and finally placing a stronger emphasis on PMER and its linkages to strengthening data literacy, evaluating impact of programmes, and building on advocacy strategies for different audiences.

## **E. Regional partnerships**

What worked well: From an analysis of the regional partnerships case study, workshop participants identified a number of key learning points. In the category of what worked well, these included: intentional framework for regional partnerships; thematic building of expertise within the National Societies raised the profile of the organisation as leaders and as auxiliary to the government authority; and the flexibility and multiple aspects of the Initiatives allowed partnerships to flourish and enabled a response to a changing world.

What could be done better: In terms of what could be done better in future to strengthen regional partnerships, key lessons included: a better set of indicators would have driven the project to more meaningful, quicker partnerships with key target groups e.g. women groups; it took too long to establish partnerships at the national level; more support could have been provided to National Societies to help them implement at community level; and a more structured approach to partnership engagement with ASEAN would have been beneficial.

Recommendations: The working group made several important recommendations and/or suggestions for improving regional partnerships, which included: channel efforts through ASEAN to better ensure NDMOs' act on recommendations; link the high-level objectives and outcomes of the programme to the local level for stronger linkage; consult with National Societies about what they can offer in terms of building regional partnerships (and other aspects of the RRI); strategize the partnership approach to ensure a more systematic and structured intervention; and identify the 'Model Partnership' learning from RRI and build those parameters into a future project. This latter point built on a key understanding that the RRI brought a thematic area of expertise to the table highlighting what NS can bring to governments and partners.

## Day 2: Thematic areas recommendation

### **A. Protection: Addressing SGBV in disasters**

The discussion was focused on identifying actions to be taken before, during, and after the disasters in order to prevent sexual and gender-based violence.

#### *Primary (before)*

- Ensure collaboration on SGBV; cross sector and cross agency
- Budget is required to ensure PGI targeted and mainstreamed interventions
- Ensure SGBV referrals are known and understood including the capacity of service providers
- SGBV action plans and budget are developed

#### *Secondary (during disasters)*

- Strong co-operations during disasters between agencies and sectors. Understand RCRC role and capacities and where we need to link to and harness the expertise of other agencies
- Ensure a common set of guidelines –knowledge of and dissemination of guidelines for implementation at all levels
- Build capacity of local communities on SGBV and safe referrals – using our comparative advantage of proximity to the community. (RCRC movement is part of the community)
- Ensure PGI specific positions in emergency response operations (e.g. include positions in ERUs, PGI FACT, RDRT positions)
- PGI included in assessments for all emergency operations
- Training and briefings for staff and volunteers of SGBV obligations and commitments of RCRC in emergencies
- PGI to be included in design of all sectoral plans so this is integrated from the outset.

#### *Tertiary (after disaster)*

- Clear advocacy messages based on existing evidence (noting that we should advocate even if data or evidence is not available)
- Establish and build capacity of champions and first responders in National Societies
- Establish champions and leaders in communities for SGBV to address longer term initiatives
- Establish longer term partnerships to create real sustainable change
- Focus on continued capacity building on SGBV to prepare for future disasters
- Assess how well tools, partnerships and interventions worked – revise, adapt and assess gaps accordingly
- Collect feedback on disaster response, revise and adapt approaches to response based on feedback

### **B. Localization: From local to regional, investing in preparedness to response**

*On how to further reinforce the partnership between NDMO and NS at all levels enabling locally-led responses*

- National Society membership of national and local disaster management committees (cluster approach).

- Project-based MoUs.
- Direct coordination lines at different levels.
- Support capacity building particularly relief and response activities.
- Ensure MoUs are in place as needed.
- Unify relief and response standards (SPHERE vs local standards).
- Coordinate information/data gathering and dissemination (e.g. UNDMA official data).
- Strengthen overall approach to M&E and provide the appropriate tools.
- Ensure DL is an important area of cooperation.
- Establish national disaster response framework including contingency planning that is aligned to the RCRC.
- Ensure practical cooperation at district level through SimEx for example.
- Establish emergency response fund including a contribution from the private sector.
- Improve advocacy capacity as a means of engaging with multi-sector stakeholders.
- Strengthen collaboration and cooperation with DM structures at all levels.
- Ensure succession planning for local levels – need ‘back-up’ for key response staff which needs to be done ahead of time and practiced.
- Third tier must be given opportunities to manage DM at national-national level/district-district level.
- SOPs with government and RCRC.
- NS part of local contingency plans.
- Make authorities aware of skills/resources available in a response.
- Provide information on hazards and risks to government.
- Undertake regular joint simulations with government and the private sector.
- Link local response teams with local government.
- Harmonize tools-assessment forms across government departments.

*On how national and regional partnerships could be further enhanced in support of local preparedness*

- Address funding issues by: mobilizing funds/resources from different partners/stakeholders/sectors and ensure funding is decentralized.
- Enhance local capacity: before and after disasters; local planning; annual exercises and drills; ensure local awareness and capacity by undertaking regular/annual activities.
- Encourage learning exchange of good practices.
- National governments should have clear guidance for local areas (i.e. SOPs, tools, guidelines).
- Ensure involvement of stakeholders at different levels of DM from planning thru decision-making phases.
- Take account of local/indigenous wisdom/knowledge.
- Engage with national/sub-national coordination mechanisms (formal systems).
- Institutionalise the community resilience approach based on R2R (FbF; EWEA; health; DRM).
- Strengthen partnerships for EW (government and regional agencies like ADPC).
- Coordinate with Ministries that have existing information on vulnerability/vulnerable populations and collect information systematically.
- Demonstrate NS as a reliable organisation to deliver services from external donors.
- Ensure transparency in relation to annual reporting and spending.
- Promote RCRC profile.
- Advocate to government for risk mitigation in infrastructure development.
- Build RCRC and government capacity in cash transfer – strengthen cash monitoring systems; advocate use of cash; train government on its use and value.
- Do more training/capacity building in forecast-based financing.
- Use ASEAN as the ‘active’ agency to advocate for mobilising funds: 0.01% of salary of corporate workers to be put into emergency response fund; establish agreement

for automatic donation mechanism; use local banking system/post offices to distribute funds.

- Fund through corporate social responsibility.
- Discuss with ASEAN at summit.

*On how to best ensure local information, local coordination and local budgets available for effective and inclusive response*

- Innovative fundraising/local resource development at national and local level.
- From global warming to local action – how?
- Local response structures from community level.
- Risk analysis in place and sharing at local level.
- Strengthen sub-national capacity (fundraising; decision making).
- Identify and map locally relevant hazards through AHA/ASEAN.
- Train local mechanisms in DM response – specific to identified hazards.

### **C. Peer to Peer support and networking**

*On digital cooperation:*

Participants (not only NSs but also external stakeholders) recognized the quality and usefulness of the platform. However, much more can be done to disseminate its existence and increase the uploads. Recommendations included:

1. To promote a joint ownership of the library with between CCST Bangkok and the 11 National Societies by having a focal person at each National Society liaising with Bangkok in providing information.
2. To ensure the sustainability of the Resilience Library by:
  - Securing a focal point for knowledge management in IFRC beyond the end of RRI
  - Enhancing the partnership with the ADPRC hosted by Korean RC
  - Gradually expanding the scope of the library to Asia Pacific
3. To consider having the resilience library as an ‘integrator’ between various discussion groups on different platforms (Line, WA, Facebook)
4. To ensure consistent representation of each National Society, CCST Bangkok can obtain information from the IFRC Asia Pacific social media.
5. To increase the linkage of the Resilience Library to ASEAN, in particular, through sharing our experience with the KIM Working Group of the ACDM co-chaired by Indonesia, Singapore and Viet Nam. (Singapore seems to be the lead in terms of data management, whereas Indonesia leads on standardization and certification)

*On network meetings:*

1. The new structure of the IFRC with 5 offices in SEA makes coordination and interactions more challenging. This said, the appetite for cross-learning and network among SEA NSs remains high, also because of the ASEAN project among respective governments.
2. Face to face meetings remain important for joint learning, but costs are high. There is a joint responsibility for IFRC and NS to examine which ones should be prioritized and to secure funding as relevant
3. Some networks have taken good steps with regards to sustainability (Leadership meeting, SEAYN)
4. IFRC and network Chairs could increase the frequency of interactions between the National Societies in between face to face / annual meetings, by organizing webinars on specific issues (for example quarterly)

5. However, the networks should take into consideration the IT capacity issues for some National Societies

Also, having regular calls have not always been successful (example from the G&D networks) as focal points wear multiple hats and are travelling.

### Day 3: Key recommendations

#### Localisation recommendations:

- National Societies to develop *innovative mechanisms* for DRM work with other national and local actors, including with private sector to expand their corporate social responsibility (CSR) mechanisms, e.g. allocate % of salary as contribution to DRM to address the needs of most at-risk communities. [Need to develop other contextualized examples of innovative mechanisms.]
- National Societies to develop resource mobilization strategies in support of their auxiliary role, e.g. emergency response funds at all different levels. [Learn from good existing examples - replicate and contextualize.]

#### ASEAN partnership

- Support National Societies to have a sustained engagement with relevant ASEAN entities at national and regional levels within the ASEAN-RCRC strategy.
- Enhance the regional and national coordination within the RCRC movement for harmonized/coherent engagement and representation with ASEAN.
- Promote alignment of tools and mechanisms between RCRC and ASEAN (RDRT-ERT, ECO-AHA Centre, Joint Action Plan, G&D, SGBV, ASSI, etc.)

#### Peer-to-Peer

- Utilize and maximize the capacity of National Societies to collect, analyse, and use the data for advocacy and learning.
- Build on the existing platform of the Resilience Library by promoting/encouraging National Society's ownership, sustainability, utility, as well as greater linkages with ASEAN platforms and other knowledge management initiatives.
- Maintain the integrity of the Southeast Asian RCRC regional networks with a concerted focus on sustainability and concrete added value to the National Societies' priorities.
- Build on and learn from the Thai-Lao cross-border cooperation as an effective model for peer-to-peer support/capacity building

#### Gender and Diversity Recommendations

- Integrate the Minimum Standard Commitments on Gender and Diversity in Emergency Programming into Standard Operation Procedures and existing strategies of National Societies by the end of 2020.
- Continue and strengthen Gender and Diversity Network through:
  - involvement of senior leadership during Network meetings and at the Southeast Asia Leaders Meeting
  - refresher trainings on requested Gender and Diversity issues once a year
  - joint resource mobilization for formulation and implementation of a Gender and Diversity network work plan 2018-2020

#### SGBV thematic recommendations

- Contextualize and implement SGBV in emergencies training package at community, province and headquarter level with RCRC volunteers, staff and senior management by end of 2020.
- Strengthen Movement-wide efforts on PSEA by:
  - Developing and standardizing a template for internal feedback, reporting and follow-up mechanism by end of 2019



- Develop, contextualize and implement sensitization on prevention of sexual harassment in the workplace, in collaboration with the Human Resources, Security and Legal department by the end of 2018
- Strengthened commitment to regularly attend cluster meetings on SGBV prevention and response before emergencies.
- Dedicated financial and human resources towards integration of protection, gender and inclusion prevention and response during emergency and non-emergency time for National Societies by end of 2020.

#### **Disaster Law**

- National Societies, supported by IFRC, to act as a convenor of model/practice in development and implementation of Disaster Management Law at national and local levels, drawing on best practices from the world.
- IFRC to move systematically support and strengthen capacity of National Societies to engage in legislative advocacy, relevant for their countries.
- National Societies to strengthen ownership on Disaster Law activities and advocacy within their National Societies, particularly with leadership and local actors.
- IFRC to partner with ASEAN to encourage development and implementation of appropriate national disaster laws and policies in line with key regional frameworks and tailored to the country context.