



**SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF THE SECOND SESSION OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON DISASTER RISK REDUCTION\***

Bangkok, Thailand  
29 June-1<sup>st</sup> July 2011

**Contents**

- I. Attendance
  - II. Ownership
  - III. Relevance
  - IV. Efficiency
  - V. Outcomes in light of ESCAP resolution 64/1
  - VI. Most and least successful
  - VII. Conclusion
- 
- Annex I. Questionnaire results
  - Annex II. Questionnaire comments
  - Annex III Qualitative assessment of the substantive outcomes of the Committee session

\* Prepared by the Programme Management Division based on feedback provided by government delegations that attended the second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction.

## **Summary Assessment of the second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction**

The second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction was held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 29 June to 1<sup>st</sup> July 2011. A questionnaire was distributed towards the end of the session to obtain feedback from participants on its relevance, efficiency and effectiveness. The response rate to the questionnaire was 65.4%, corresponding to 17 of the 26 participating delegations.

The present assessment has been conducted on the basis of the feed-back received from delegations together with a qualitative analysis of the draft report of the session, bearing in mind the terms of reference for the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction, as contained in resolution 64/1 on the restructuring of the conference structure of the Commission.

### **I. Attendance**

The Committee session was fairly attended, with 49% (N = 26/53) of ESCAP member States participating.

The majority of delegations that attended the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction comprised High-level officials from the Capital of their respective country (53% N = 9/17). 12 % N=2/17 were mainly from representatives from Bangkok (Embassy) and 35% or N=6/17 came from a combination of Ministry of Foreign affairs, Line Ministry or the embassy.

### **II. Ownership**

The sense of ownership by participants of the Committee was good, with the majority of respondents indicating that the committee session was owned and driven by member States (59%, N=10/17), that the overall outcome of the deliberations was a result of a collaborative effort (53%, N=9/17), that the draft report adequately reflected the discussions, decisions and recommendations of the committee (53%, N=9/17) and that the secretariat's in-session interventions contributed to effective conduct and outcome of the session (65%, N=11/17)

### **III. Relevance**

The feed-back indicates that participants were of the view that the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction is a relevant mechanism for discussing disaster risk reduction in the region. The majority of respondents agreed that the Committee session was relevant to issues and trends regarding disaster risk reduction in the Asian and Pacific region (53%, N=9/17 to a greater extent) and 47% ,N=8/17 to a good extent, The majority also indicated that the needs and priorities of their countries were reflected in the agenda items, (47%, N=8/17) to a greater extent and 53% N=9/17 to a good extent. A great majority indicated that the benefits of their delegation's attendance outweighed the costs (82%, N=14/17).

The most relevant agenda items for the delegations in attendance included (in order or relevance): (a) Agenda item 6: Activities of ESCAP cooperative mechanisms on

disaster risk reduction; (b) Agenda item 4&7: Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific; and Strategic Framework and proposed outputs for the proposed programme of work for 2010-2011 and (c) Agenda item 5: Enhancing regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction in Asia and the Pacific.

#### **IV. Efficiency**

The efficiency of organization and conduct of the Committee session was rated highly by respondents. The majority of respondents agreed that the pre-session documents conveyed clear messages (41%, N=7/17 to a greater extent ) and 59% N=10/17 to a good extent, 2 were issued in a timely manner (84%, N=14/17), while 18% N=3/17 were neutral, that the Committee used efficiently the time provided (83%, N=14/17), 18% , N=3/17 remained neutral , the conference services provided by the secretariat were efficient (88%, N=15/17) and the organization of the work prior to/in between Committee sessions contributed to the effective functioning of the Committee (ACPR, working groups , task forces, communication with the secretariat), 70% N=12/17, while 29% N=5/17 were neutral.

#### **V. Outcomes in light of ESCAP resolution 64/1**

The majority of respondents agreed that the second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction addressed effectively the issues outlined in resolution 64/1 that should be addressed by all Committees subsidiary to the Commission, including: to review and analyze regional trends (76%, N=13/17), identify priorities and emerging issues (88%, N=15/17), promote dialogue on regional and subregional approaches (100%, N=17/17), and promote a collaborative approach to addressing the development challenges at the regional and subregional levels (88%, N=15/17).

The qualitative analysis of the session documentation concurred with the results of the questionnaire. For example, regional cooperative mechanisms and knowledge-sharing arrangements for disaster risk reduction, including the role of information, communications and space technology in disaster risk management, were discussed as priority issues for the region. Additionally, the meeting promoted dialogue on regional and subregional approaches, for example the Committee requests that the secretariat build national capacities in the collection and analysis of disaster data for hazard and vulnerability assessments, disaster preparedness and mitigation and contingency planning. The Committee also requests that the secretariat and the United Nations Development Programme provide more training on practical disaster assessment methodologies, including on how to conduct disaster assessments more efficiently.

#### **Most and least successful**

The exchange of ideas and experiences was rated as the most successful feature of the session by a number of delegations, whereas others highlighted the administration by the secretariat and panel discussions.

In terms of the least successful feature of the session, there was a mixture of issues raised such as: Lack of participation from the floor and some agenda items difficult to understand.

## **VI. Conclusion**

This assessment concludes that the second session of the Committee on Disaster Risk Reduction was successful. A good attendance and a high level of relevance of the topic for delegations enabled productive substantive discussions and agreement on a number of important issues for disaster risk reduction in the region.

- - -

## Annex I Questionnaire Results

### A. Overall relevance of the session

1. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	To a great extent (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Not at all (5)
a. The agenda items were timely and relevant to issues and trends regarding disaster risk reduction in the Asian and Pacific region.	53% (9)	47% (8)	0% (0)	-	-
b. The agenda items reflected the needs and priorities of my country.	47% (8)	53% (9)	0% (0)	-	-
c. The benefits of my delegation's attendance justified the costs (travel, time, opportunity cost of absence from the office).	82% (14)	18% (3)	0% (0)	-	-

### B. Organization

2. To what extent do you agree with the following statements?	To a great extent (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Not at all (5)	No answer
a. The pre-session documents conveyed clear messages concerning the issues placed on the agenda.	41% (7)	59% (10)	0% (0)	-	-	-
b. The pre-session documents were issued in a timely manner.	41% (7)	41% (7)	18% (3)	0% (0)	-	-
c. The Committee used efficiently the time available for discussions.	59% (10)	24% (4)	18% (3)	0% (0)	-	-
d. The conference services provided by the secretariat were efficient.	47% (8)	41% (7)	12% (2)	0% (0)	-	-
e. The organization of work prior to/in between Committee sessions contributed to the effective functioning of the Committee (ACPR, working groups, task forces, communication with the secretariat).	41% (7)	29% (5)	29% (5)	0% (0)	-	-

### C. Substantive outcome of the session

3. To what extent did the deliberations on the following substantive agenda items meet the expected outcomes as described below?	To a great extent (1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Not at all (5)	No answer
<b>Agenda item 4:</b> Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific:						

<b>3. To what extent did the deliberations on the following substantive agenda items meet the expected outcomes as described below?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
<i>a) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its future strategic direction for its work in the area of disaster risk reduction in the Asia-Pacific region and facilitation of strengthened regional cooperation on the issue;</i>	53% (9)	41% (7)	6% (1)	-	-	-
<i>b) To discuss how ESCAP will contribute to the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in coordination with UN/ISDR and other key members of the Regional Coordination Mechanism;</i>	35% (6)	65% (11)	0% (0)	-	-	-
<i>c) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its involvement in the preparations for the Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction;</i>	59% (10)	35% (6)	6% (1)	-	-	-
<b>Agenda item 5: Enhancing regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction in Asia and the Pacific</b>						
<i>d) To consider the establishment of a network of networks on knowledge sharing and analysis for disaster management in the region and examine the possible role(s) of the secretariat;</i>	59% (10)	29% (5)	12% (2)	-	-	-
<i>e) To consider how the secretariat could contribute to building collaborative technical and information capacities for disaster risk reduction and management, including recommendations for action that would enable universal early warning throughout the Pacific islands;</i>	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-	-	-
<i>f) To advise the secretariat on regional priorities with regard to information, communications and space technologies for disaster risk reduction.</i>	41% (7)	35% (6)	24% (4)	-	-	-
<b>Agenda item 6: Activities of ESCAP cooperative mechanisms on disaster risk reduction</b>						
<i>g) To provide guidance to the secretariat on its work related to the Typhoon Committee and the Panel on Tropical Cyclones.</i>	24% (4)	47% (8)	18% (3)	-	-	12% (2)
<b>Agenda item 7: Strategic framework and proposed outputs for the proposed programme of work for 2010-2011</b>						
<i>h) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its work related to disaster risk reduction, including possible work programme outputs that could be reflected in the programme of work for 2010-2011.</i>	59% (10)	29% (5)	12% (2)	-	-	-
<i>i)</i>	41% (7)	24% (4)	24% (4)	-	-	12% (2)

#### D. Outcome in the light of ESCAP resolution 64/1 and the Committee's general terms of reference

<b>4. All eight ESCAP Committees have common terms of reference. To what extent did the Committee session succeed in performing the following?</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
a) Review and analyze regional trends.	41% (7)	35% (6)	12% (2)	-	-	12% (2)
b) Identify priorities and emerging issues, particularly those with implications for the work of the secretariat.	41% (7)	47% (8)	12% (2)	-	-	-
c) Promote dialogue on regional and subregional approaches and an exchange of experiences on policies and programmes.	65% (11)	35% (6)	-	-	-	-
d) Promote a collaborative approach to addressing the development challenges at the regional and subregional levels.	59% (10)	29% (5)	12% (2)	-	-	-
6.	24% (4)	-	-	-	-	76% (13)
<b>5. How can the Committee more effectively address its terms of reference (5 (a- d) above)?</b>						
3 delegations (17.6% of respondents) provided comments (see Annex II)						

#### Participation

<b>6. To what extent do you feel that...</b>	<b>To a great extent (1)</b>	<b>(2)</b>	<b>(3)</b>	<b>(4)</b>	<b>Not at all (5)</b>	<b>No answer</b>
a) the Committee session was owned and driven by member States?	59% (10)	41% (7)	-	-	-	-
b) the overall outcome of the deliberations is a result of a collaborative effort by members of the Committee?	53% (9)	47% (8)	-	-	-	-
c) the draft report adequately reflects the discussions, decisions and recommendations of the Committee?	53% (9)	41% (7)	-	-	-	6% (1)
d) the secretariat's in-session interventions contributed to effective conduct and outcome of the session?	65% (11)	35% (6)	-	-	-	-

#### **7. My delegation's attendance at the Committee session was:**

53% (9)	mainly from the Capital - Ministry of Foreign Affairs
0% (0)	mainly from the Capital - Line Ministry
12% (2)	mainly from representatives in Bangkok (Embassy)
35% (6)	a combination of the above
0% (1)	other:

## **Annex II**

### Questionnaire comments

#### **What was the most relevant agenda item for your delegation?**

- The most relevant agenda for my delegation were agenda no. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.
- Agenda 4 and 6.
- All the items were relevant.
- Agenda item 5 and 6 to give guidance to the secretariat on its future work. Agenda item 10 to inform the Committee of the general idea of the draft resolution that Japan has started preparing for adoption at the 68<sup>th</sup> session of the Committee.
- Item 6 and item 7.
- Agenda items 4, 5, 6 and 7
- Agenda item 6 is the most relevant for my delegation.
- Item 6.
- Agenda 4 and 8.
- 6 and 7.
- 4, 5, Item 7, we need assistance on this particularly on capacity building.
- 6 and 8.

#### **How can the Committee more effectively address its terms of reference (5 (a-d) above)?**

- As I think
- Earlier distribution of the pre-session documents.
- Discussion time and active participation as well as clearly objectives and expectation from both country members and the meeting are very importantly.

#### **Is there anything that could have been done to encourage higher and wider representation from your country at the Committee session?**

- Adequate.
- More support activities at national level.
- As I could understand, many delegates for EGM were sponsored by ESCAP and could join Committee session afterwards. Funds have been a problem for the delegation from the respective agency (NEMA) of Mongolia to arrive to Bangkok.
- Appropriate steps were taken by the secretariat to inform the concerned officials of the Government of Pakistan.
- Need to select the meeting period more strategically (June is cyclone season already). 2473514
- Perhaps an expression that the representation of the government is very important to the Committee session.

**What was the most successful feature of the Committee session?**

- Panel discussions.
- Sharing experience and good practices on DRR.
- The whole secretariat was administered efficiently. Thank you.
- Recommendations: AP Disaster Report – recommends to establish as advisory board & editorial committee, include more issues & link to Global Assessment report.
- All the delegates were aware about the session and have participated very actively. The secretariat has made excellent arrangement to conduct the Committee session.
- Participatory approach followed by the secretariat.
- The deliberations on points 5, 6 and 7 of the agenda.
- I would say that the session is very successful in the manner that it was conducted.
- Its role as a discussing forum for all member countries to share experiences and best practices.

**What was the least successful feature of the Committee session?**

- Problems of countries are different. How to overcome the consonance of the problems need to be discussed. How to looking down the risk, research is much more needed.
- Report discussion.
- It was difficult to understand the item 9. Thus, it was difficult to take participation in discussion.
- Noting. Well organized and properly conducted.
- Lack of participation from the floor. Less interactive dialogue.

**Please provide any additional comments you may have on the Committee session and further suggestions on how we may improve on secretariat preparations for and the servicing of future session:**

- More time for discussion, sharing information, good practices on DRR. DRR activities are very important at national level with support from ESCAP and other UNs agencies concerned, and this Committee meeting will be a good forum to help mobilize resources and expertise to implement DRR in this region.
- It's excellent.
- Draft report should be distributed earlier to accord time for delegations to thoroughly read the text.
- The panel discussion could not much effective. The rule of panelist was not defined in the beginning. I would like to request to define the rule of panelist and

the rule of presentations. The same person could not be panelist and presenter in the same session. Last, but not list, I would like to extend my appreciation to the secretariat for their hard work to make the session more successful.

.....

**Annex III**  
**Qualitative Assessment of the substantive outcomes of the Committee session**

<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Expected outcome</b>	<b>Quantitative questionnaire response</b>	<b>Qualitative assessment based on a review of the draft report of the session</b>
<b>Agenda item 4:</b> Implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action in Asia and the Pacific	(a) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its future strategic direction for its work in the area of disaster risk reduction in the Asia-Pacific region and facilitation of strengthened regional cooperation on the issue;	94% (16/17) agree to a great or good extent	§ The expected outcome was met to a great extent. § The Committee requested the Executive Secretary, amongst other things to take effective measures to facilitate the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for action in the region The secretariat was instructed to explore the possibilities of enhancing the outreach of early warning systems information and ensuring its successful delivery to end-users including, through the established Asia-Pacific Gateway for Disaster Risk Reduction and Development.
	(b) To discuss how ESCAP will contribute to the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction in coordination with UN/ISDR and other key members of the Regional Coordination	100% (17/17) agree to a great or good extent	§ The expected outcome was met to a great extent. § An information note contributed by the regional unit for Asia and the Pacific of the Interagency Secretariat of the ISDR would focus on the extent to which implementation

	Mechanism;		of the Hyogo Framework for Action has progressed in Asia and the Pacific region, including achievements and challenges in its implementation.
	(c) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its involvement in the preparations for the Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction;	94% (16/17) agree to a great or good extent	<p>§ The expected outcome was met to a great extent.</p> <p>§ Outcomes of the Fourth Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Incheon, Republic of Korea highlighted ways in which disaster risk reduction could be prioritized and mainstreamed in social and economic development planning processes and prioritize the issue of social vulnerability to disasters and for investing consistently in social sectors as part of the recovery and reconstruction efforts for long term inclusive development.</p>
<b>Agenda item 5:</b> Enhancing regional cooperation on disaster risk reduction in Asia and the Pacific	(d) To consider the establishment of a network of networks on knowledge sharing and analysis for disaster management in the region and examine the possible role(s) of the secretariat;	88% (N=15/17) agree to a great or good extent	<p>§ The expected outcome was met to a great extent.</p> <p>§ The Committee endorses the establishment of an advisory board and editorial committee to guide the preparation of the Asia-Pacific Disaster Report 2012 and its terms of reference. The Committee recommends that the Report continue to feature such elements as economic and social analysis of the impacts of disasters, descriptions of regional cooperation and analysis of the role of space applications and information and communications technology in disaster risk</p>

			<p>reduction, in addition to new elements, such as (a) information on champions for disaster risk reduction, (b) social and psychological analysis, (c) coverage of community practices vis-à-vis global perspectives, (d) analysis of a possible linkage between the Hyogo Framework for Action and the Millennium Development Goals and (e) linkage to the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction.</p> <p>§ The Committee recommended that all stakeholders of disaster risk reduction make full use of the Asia-Pacific Gateway for Disaster Risk Reduction and establish partnerships with the site in order to improve access to information and prevent duplication of work.</p>
	<p>(e) To consider how the secretariat could contribute to building collaborative technical and information capacities for disaster risk reduction and management, including recommendations for action that would enable universal early warning throughout the Pacific</p>	<p>88% (N=15/17) agree to a great or good extent</p>	<p>§ The expected outcome was met to a great extent.</p> <p>§ The Committee requests that the secretariat accord high priority to capacity-building and training in information and communications technologies, including space-based technologies. The Committee requests that the secretariat accord high priority to capacity-building and training in</p>

	islands;		information and communications technologies, including space-based technologies. The Committee requests that the secretariat take steps to broaden the scope of the work of the ESCAP Regional Space Applications Programme for Sustainable Development (RESAP) and to align it better with the core agenda
	(f) To advise the secretariat on regional priorities with regard to information, communications and space technologies for disaster risk reduction.	76% (N=13/17) agree to a great or good extent	<p>§ The expected outcomes were met to a great extent.</p> <p>§ The Committee acknowledged that making disaster data comparable over time and across different disasters and regions was challenging and that developing countries needed guidance and assistance in building the capacity to compile sound disaster statistics and establish national disaster databases. Coordination between disaster management agencies and statistical offices was also of critical importance.</p>

<p><b>Agenda Item 6</b> Activities of ESCAP Cooperative Mechanisms on Disaster Risk Reduction</p>	<p>g) To provide guidance to the secretariat on its work related to the Typhoon Committee and the Panel on Tropical Cyclones</p>	<p>71% (N=12/17) agree to a great or good extent</p>	<p>The expected outcomes were met to a great extent.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Committee had before it the note by the secretariat on the work of the Typhoon Committee and the Panel on Tropical Cyclones (E/ESCAP/CDR (2)/5).</li> </ul>
<p><b>Agenda Item 7</b> Consideration of the future focus of the Sub-Programme</p>	<p>h) To provide the secretariat with guidance on its work related to disaster reduction, including possible work programme outputs that could be reflected in the programme of work for 2012-2013</p>	<p>88% (N=15/17) agree to a great or good extent</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The expected outcomes were met to a great extent.</li> <li>• The secretariat provided an overview of the strategic framework for the biennium 2012-2013 of the subprogramme on information and communications technology and disaster risk reduction, which served as the basis for developing the programme of work for the subprogramme</li> </ul>

			<p>in respect of the same biennium The deliberations and recommendations of the Committee under agenda items 4 through 8 would serve as the basis for the formulation of the strategic framework and programme of work for 2014-2015.</p>
--	--	--	---