



PROVENTION CONSORTIUM

**REPORT of
Steering Committee Meeting
5-6 March 2003
IFRC Secretariat, Geneva**

Chair:

Eva von Oelreich (EO) Head, Disaster Preparedness & Policy, IFRC

List of Participants:

Kate Alexander (KA) Head of Global Partnerships, Conflict & Humanitarian Affairs Department, DFID

Margaret Arnold (MA) Senior Program Officer, Disaster Management Facility, World Bank

Yasemin Aysan (YA) Senior Advisor, Disaster Reduction & Recovery Unit, UNDP

Sarah Barlow (SB/DFID) DFID Consultant

Stephen Bender (SB/OAS) Chief, Unit for Sustainable Development & Environment, Organisation of American States

Mihir R. Bhatt (MB) Honorary Director, Disaster Mitigation Institute, India

Sálvano Briceño (SB/ISDR) Director, UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction

Harouna M. Diallo (HD) Director, Technical Cooperation Department, WMO

Fenella Frost (FF) Disaster Reduction Advisor, Conflict & Humanitarian Affairs Department, DFID

Alexandre Ghélew (AG) Advisor, Multilateral Affairs and Special Tasks, SDC, Humanitarian Aid Department & Swiss Humanitarian Aid Unit

Bruno Haghebaert (BH) Program Officer, ProVention Consortium Secretariat

Alcira Kreimer (AK) Manager, Disaster Management Facility, World Bank

Andrew Maskrey (AM) Chief, Bureau for Crisis Prevention & Recovery, Disaster Reduction & Recovery Programme, UNDP

Stefan Micallef (SM) Chief, Disaster Management Branch, Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, UNEP Norwegian Mission Geneva

Rasmus Myklebust (RM) Manager, ProVention Consortium Secretariat

David Peppiatt (DP) Area Manager, Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief, PAHO/WHO

Jean Luc Poncelet (JLP) Director, Partnerships, Development, Information and Research, Asian Disaster Preparedness Center (ADPC)

Aloysius Rego (AR) Chief Compliance Officer and Deputy Director General, Regional & Sustainable Development Department, Asian Development Bank

Rolf Zelius (RZ)

Executive Summary

Introduction

The ProVention Consortium Steering Committee Meeting took place on March 5-6, 2003 at the IFRC in Geneva. The Meeting, which marked the official point of departure of the new IFRC hosted Secretariat, was attended by 19 participants, listed above, representing 14 different ProVention member organisations. The agenda focused on four key areas: (i) Overview of progress on activities; (ii) Transition of the ProVention Secretariat; (iii) Review of governance structures, and (iv) Work Plan of activities 2003-05.

The Meeting was opened by Mr. Didier Cherpitel, Secretary General of IFRC and Member of the ProVention Consortium Presiding Council. Mr. Cherpitel emphasised both his personal commitment and the support of IFRC to the ProVention initiative, expressing the delight and honour of IFRC in becoming the new host of the ProVention Secretariat. He congratulated the World Bank's Disaster Management Facility for successfully launching ProVention, hosting the Secretariat for the first three years and making such substantial progress on the goals of integrating disaster risk management into development efforts and reducing disaster impacts in developing countries. As a Member of the Presiding Council, Mr. Cherpitel invited the Steering Committee and the Secretariat to engage the Presiding Council, when appropriate in mobilising greater political will and global commitment to disaster risk management and offered his personal support to any such initiative.

Following the welcome and opening remarks from Mr. Cherpitel, the Meeting was chaired by Eva von Oelreich, Head of Disaster Preparedness & Policy Department at IFRC.

Overview of progress on activities

Alcira Kreimer and Margaret Arnold, members of the World Bank-hosted Secretariat for the first three years and staff of the Disaster Management Facility (DMF) gave an overview of progress and update on the portfolio of activities during the past three years. The presentation summarized the process of consultation and, - strategy developments that led to the launch of the Consortium. It emphasized the strategy of risk management that guided the Consortium's work. It also - highlighted the synergy between ProVention and DMF and progress on mainstreaming disaster risk management into Bank policies and procedures, with examples of influencing Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and the World Bank's Country Assistance Strategy (CAS), process. Several Steering Committee members commented on the valuable contribution that ProVention has made to disaster risk management, in particular in developing the financial and economic dimensions of risk management.

Within the current Work Plan, a number of activities have been completed while others will continue under the supervision of the Disaster Management Facility. The remaining funds related to three ProVention projects will be transferred to finance activities within the next Work Plan. The importance of continuity of activities was stressed by the Steering Committee and both the World Bank and the IFRC hosted Secretariat agreed to develop an integrated Work Plan.

Transition of the ProVention Secretariat

Alcira Kreimer introduced the background to the transition of the Secretariat and the concept of host agency rotation. The idea of transferring the Secretariat to IFRC was conceived at the launch of ProVention in February 2000 on the basis that IFRC would be well placed to help broaden the membership of ProVention to include more civil society organisations, involve community based activities and take the ProVention agenda forward to the regional and local level through the network of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

She emphasized the continuity of the work of the Consortium and the support the World Bank will provide to the IFRC – hosted Secretariat.

David Peppiatt gave an overview of the main functions and objectives of the Secretariat and a progress report on the transition and consultation meetings with ProVention partners. Eva von Oelreich elaborated on the IFRC hosting arrangements for inter-agency projects and explained how ProVention is connected to the Disaster Preparedness & Policy Department but treated as an independent, off site project. The Steering Committee were informed that the Secretariat costs of \$330,000 per year for two years will be funded by a World Bank Development Grant Facility grant as well as a contribution from the Norwegian Government ProVention Trust Funds. An Agreement between the World Bank and IFRC concerning the transfer and funding of the Secretariat is due to be signed shortly.

The Steering Committee endorsed the transition of the Secretariat from the World Bank to the IFRC and raised a number of points for clarification and follow up by the Secretariat. It was suggested that an official

announcement be made as soon as possible to inform Associate Members and other key constituents regarding the transition of the Secretariat. It was agreed that the signing of the Agreement between the World Bank and IFRC provides an appropriate and timely opportunity for such an official announcement and it is hoped that this may be made in the following weeks.

With regard to the functions and objectives of the Secretariat, the Secretariat was asked to make a clear distinction between objectives and functions and separate Secretariat objectives from those of the Consortium. The role, responsibilities and procedures of the host organisation with regard to funding and fundraising were discussed. Eva von Oelreich clarified that IFRC would not be involved in any direct fundraising for ProVention activities and explained the IFRC procedures for charging an 11% Program Support Rate for administration and overhead costs. On the subject of Secretariat funding, the Secretariat also clarified that the World Bank DGF grant would fund Secretariat costs and not ProVention activities *per se* other than specific costs relating to knowledge sharing, travel and Steering Committee meetings. Fundraising for activities, therefore, will be a separate task of the Secretariat linked directly to the Work Plan.

Matters concerning the concept of host agency rotation received limited attention since the transition has only just taken place and the funding situation is secure for two years. However, it was acknowledged that two years may be too short a period for a successful Secretariat term. It was generally agreed that the Secretariat should plan within a three year window and seek funding from ProVention partners for year three. The governments (as donors and as development agencies) present all indicated an interest in potentially funding the Secretariat in the future.

Review of governance structure

David Peppiatt gave an overview of the various components of the current governance structure and highlighted a number of key issues for Steering Committee discussion concerning the strengthening of ProVention governance, including the role of the Presiding Council, composition of the Steering Committee, conflict of interests, proposal of an Executive Committee, frequency of meetings and alternative mechanisms for advisory support and guidance.

It was agreed that the Presiding Council provides a unique forum for mobilising political will and increased global commitment to disaster risk management. The sustained interest of key members such as James Wolfensohn and Didier Cherpitel offers opportunities to engage the Presiding Council in ProVention activities; these opportunities should be seized by the Steering Committee and Secretariat in the forthcoming Work Plan.

The Steering Committee acknowledged the need to broaden the membership of ProVention to involve greater participation of civil society organisations as well as the private sector. It was not clear, however, whether these constituents should be given a greater role and involvement in ProVention governance or other initiatives, such as ad hoc advisory and consultative groups. There was, nonetheless, general consensus that ProVention would benefit from fresh perspectives and drawing in new individuals and organisations into ProVention's agenda and activities.

There was also recognition of the potentially problematic conflict of interests as Steering Committee members provide both advice and guidance on the Work Plan and use of ProVention funds and yet also can be direct implementers and recipients of ProVention funding. It was agreed that the revision process of strengthening the governance structures must address this issue of separating governance from execution of activities and funding.

With regard to the nomination of a Chair, two proposals were offered. The first proposed the idea of a revolving Chair for each meeting; the second proposed the idea of the host organisation acting as Chair. The Secretariat suggests that the IFRC remains the Chair for the immediate future to enable close and constant interaction between the Secretariat and the Chair of the Steering Committee.

The proposal to establish an Executive Committee was not supported by most members of the Steering Committee who found no added value in creating an additional layer of governance. Nevertheless, the Steering Committee encouraged the Secretariat to convene advisory or consultative groups for specific technical or advisory support.

Bearing in mind the time, cost and resources required to convene Steering Committee meetings it was suggested that the Steering Committee should where possible link meetings to other relevant events for instance those taking place in Geneva, such as an ISDR Task Force meeting, or ProVention activities in the field. A "listserve" will be set up to improve the flow of information between the Secretariat and the Steering Committee.

Work Plan of activities 2003-05

The Secretariat team presented the Draft Work Plan 2003-05 against the criteria for project focus and prioritisation, which includes building on current ProVention activities; closer involvement of civil society actors; practical application at the local level; sharing knowledge with key decision makers and practitioners; and adding value by working as a Consortium.

The Steering Committee stressed the importance of continuity and building on existing ProVention activities where possible. It was agreed to maintain the strategic framework of the Work Plan (i.e., risk identification/analysis, risk reduction, and risk sharing/transfer) and it was also suggested that the Secretariat should focus on a limited number (3-5) of core areas and avoid too broad a portfolio of activities. The attention to advocacy initiatives, such as the EU, the International RC Conference and the World Economic Forum was widely supported with the recognition of the need for more advocacy and policy work in the field of disaster risk management.

A number of Steering Committee members stressed the importance of good co-ordination with ISDR in the work plan of activities in order to avoid duplication of activities and achieve an appropriate division of labour between ProVention and ISDR. The similarity and difference between the two entities needs to be clearly understood and explained by their constituents through the mission statements and objectives. David Peppiatt commented on the high level of co-operation between the ProVention and ISDR Secretariats and the recognition by both teams of the need to co-ordinate and complement efforts.

Conclusion

The Steering Committee Meeting resulted in a number of specific action points, summarised in Section 9, which will form the basis of the plan of action for the Secretariat. The action points concern those key areas addressed during the Steering Committee Meeting:

- successful transition of the Secretariat;
- strengthening the governance structure;
- reviewing and revising the goal and objectives of ProVention;
- developing an integrated and focused Work Plan;
- broadening the membership;
- diversifying the funding and donor base.

The Steering Committee Meeting also provided an important opportunity to reflect on progress and the future direction of ProVention. The discussion during the Meeting benefited from open and constructive debate on the role and purpose of ProVention and underlined the challenges faced by any multi-stakeholder initiative involving such a diverse groups of actors and constituencies. However, the added value of ProVention as an inter-sectoral consortium was emphasised repeatedly: doing things collectively that cannot be done as individual organisations. ProVention should build on the early achievements of the first three years and seize the new opportunities during this next phase to take the ProVention agenda forward to the local level. The Consortium can have a major influence on decision makers, both internal to ProVention member organisations and externally, but this requires more than the efforts of the Secretariat or host organisation. It requires a collective commitment to work together, build partnerships and dedicate more time and resources to the ProVention initiative.

1. Opening remarks by Mr. Didier Cherpitel, Secretary General of IFRC

- Didier Cherpitel, Secretary General of IFRC and Member of the ProVention Consortium Presiding Council, opened the meeting. He welcomed the Steering Committee members to Geneva and stressed both his personal commitment and the support of IFRC to the ProVention Consortium initiative. He expressed the delight and honour of IFRC in becoming the new host of the ProVention Secretariat- an idea that was proposed at the launch of ProVention and now come to fruition with the transition of the Secretariat from the World Bank to IFRC.
- Mr. Cherpitel acknowledged and congratulated the successful work carried out by the World Bank's Disaster Management Facility (DMF) in launching ProVention and making substantial progress on the goals of integrating disaster risk management into development efforts and reducing disaster impacts in developing countries. ProVention activities have not only influenced the policies, assistance strategies and operations of the World Bank but also other key development actors concerned with disaster risk reduction in developing countries, including IFRC.
- Mr. Cherpitel also underlined the challenges faced by ProVention in mobilising greater political will and commitment to disaster risk management, particularly at a time when the subject of natural disasters is not high on the political agenda. However, the strength of the Consortium is the coalition of such different organisations and sectors, crossing the relief-development divide and linking key players and resources together, including the role and corporate responsibility of the private sector. The Consortium can have a major influence on decision makers but this requires a collective commitment to work together, build meaningful partnerships and dedicate more time and resources to the ProVention initiative.
- As host of the ProVention Secretariat, he promised that IFRC will play its part through the involvement and participation of our National Societies who are active in disaster preparedness and risk reduction across every region of the world. The global network of the Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies, branches and volunteers provides a great opportunity for ProVention to broaden the membership, support community-based activities and mobilise grassroots support for disaster reduction.
- Finally, Mr. Cherpitel invited the Secretariat and the Steering Committee to take the initiative to further engage the Presiding Council. As a member of the Council and Secretary General of the Secretariat host organisation, Mr. Cherpitel stated that he would be willing to play a role in engaging the Presiding Council to mobilise greater political will and global commitment to disaster risk management. He declared the Steering Committee Meeting open.

2. Introduction by Chair

- The Chair, Eva von Oelreich (EO), also welcomed participants and acknowledged the diverse representation of ProVention partners, donors and member organizations present at the meeting. Apologies were given for Vasantt Jogoo of the African Development Bank who was unable to attend due to the current security situation in Abidjan and suspension of Bank travel. EO introduced the agenda and invited comments for amendments or revision. No revisions were made and the agenda was approved.

3. Overview of progress on activities

- Alcira Kreimer (AK) and Margaret Arnold (MA) gave an overview of progress and activities as the DMF host of the ProVention Secretariat. The presentation included a re-cap of the objectives and the strategic framework of ProVention. AK explained that the ProVention Consortium was created to: (1) promote a culture of safety through education and training; (2) support public policy that can reduce the risk of disasters within developing countries; (3) support pilot projects and to disseminate information about "best practices" proven to mitigate the scope and frequency of disasters; (4) develop governments' ability to minimize disasters and to respond effectively when they occur and to (5) forge links between stakeholders to work together to strengthen the economy, reduce pain and suffering and promote the common good. The Consortium launch was the result of a process of consultation, strategy development and program formulation. The strategic framework of ProVention includes three core areas of disaster risk management: Risk Identification, Risk Reduction and Risk

Sharing/Transfer. AK highlighted that this Meeting of the Steering Committee had as a goal to build a bridge that will help transfer the Secretariat of ProVention from the Disaster Management Facility to an IFRC-hosted body. She mentioned other partnerships the World Bank has developed over the years with other organizations, civil society, and the private sector, supporting them at the ramp-up stage and subsequently rotating responsibility of other organizations to multiply the impact of those initiatives. Examples included the Global Road Safety Initiative also hosted by IFRC, the Consultative Group on Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and the Cities Alliance.

- The following facts were highlighted regarding the effective synergy between the ProVention Consortium and the Disaster Management Facility at the World Bank:
 - The total of the WB's natural disaster-related funding amounts to \$38.3 billion (1980- 2003).
 - The ratio of mitigation to reconstruction funding increased from 17 % (1980 – 1999) to at least 69 % for projects approved FY 2000-2002.
 - Case study by DMF in Mexico resulted in project investment.
 - Other countries requesting similar analysis were Viet Nam, India, Cambodia, Philippines.
 - Mitigation projects are underway in Honduras, Nicaragua, OECS countries.
 - Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and Country Assistance Strategy (CAS) documents are incorporating aspects of disaster risk management.
 - DMF works with ProVention partners to incorporate ProVention knowledge and expertise into Bank projects.
 - To disseminate the ProVention activities the WB hosted Secretariat launched a public Web site: <http://www.proventionconsortium.org>. ProVention also supports training courses, distance learning programs, workshops, conferences, action learning and applied research grants for disaster reduction for young professionals in developing countries. In addition it increased its networking activities with partner organizations. Publications and toolkits have been another tool for dissemination.
- AK elaborated on the transfer of the ProVention Secretariat. The transition will ensure the continuation of some of the ongoing projects. The IFRC hosted Secretariat will continue to facilitate collaboration among stakeholders and members and will work to develop and execute activities that build on existing capacity and focus on the comparative advantage of the IFRC.
- MA presented an overview of progress on activities in the last three years:

1) **Risk Identification** activities include:

- Methodology and Standards for Damage and Needs Assessments
 - Methodology applied in Turkey, India (Gujarat), Mozambique and others
 - Also used by the IDB, CENAPRED, UNDP and PAHO in joint evaluations with ECLAC
 - Joint training of the ECLAC methodology given in Asia with the ADPC
 - Training courses provided to Bank staff and clients
- Improved Database for the Social and Economic Analysis of Disaster Impacts
- Modeling the Macroeconomic Impacts of Disasters
- Critical Infrastructure, Disaster Vulnerability and the Role of the Private Sector
 - December 2002 conference: “The Future of Disaster Risk: Building Safer Cities”
 - Edited conference papers will be published as a full report
 - The development of guidelines for the construction of disaster-resistant hospitals and health centers in partnership with PAHO
 - The creation of guidelines for constructing disaster-resistant schools in partnership with the OAS
- Identification and Analysis of Global Disaster Risk Hotspots with Columbia University and the Norwegian Geotechnical Institute.

2) **Risk Reduction** activities include:

- Workshop on Strengthening Community Resilience to Natural Disasters in Sub-Saharan Africa with the Centre for Innovative Environmental Management of the University of

Witwatersrand in partnership with the National Disaster Management Centre from Pretoria, South Africa

- International evaluation of Recovery Efforts for Massive Natural Disasters
 - Preliminary draft of findings presented to the ad hoc advisory committee Dec., 2002
 - Case studies include: Mozambique, Honduras, Turkey, India, Bangladesh
 - Draft report to be completed in March 2003
 - Lessons to feed into development of training materials
 - Disaster Mitigation Institute (India) is applying study methodology to recovery efforts for disaster events at the local level

3) **Risk Sharing/Transfer** activities include:

- Innovations in Managing Catastrophic Risk: How Can They Help the Poor?
- Study and evaluation of Microfinance and Micro- insurance for Disaster Risk Management
- Innovative risk transfer World Bank projects underway in Mexico, OECS countries, India (Gujarat), Romania and Turkey
- Initiatives are also under preparation for Bulgaria, Colombia, three additional Indian states, and Vietnam
- These projects are the first of their kind to be developed and implemented by the World Bank
- Analyses underway in South Asia, East Asia and Europe & Central Asia regions

4) **Knowledge Sharing**

From 2000-2002, the ProVention Consortium supported 26 events that provided training to over 750 people from around the world on various disaster management-related topics. Different knowledge sharing activities were developed such as toolkits, learning activities, distance learning programs, action learning, conferences, workshops, training courses. Also the dissemination of publications, the ProVention Consortium Web site and the recent Applied Grants Program for young professionals in developing countries contributes substantially to the knowledge sharing component.

AK emphasized the World Bank's continued commitment to ProVention, demonstrated by the grant to fund the Secretariat and continuity of activities. Within the current Work Plan, a number of activities have been completed while others will continue under the supervision of the Disaster Management Facility. The remaining funds related to three ProVention projects will be transferred to finance activities within the next Work Plan. The importance of continuity of activities was stressed by the Steering Committee and both the World Bank and the IFRC hosted Secretariat agreed to develop an integrated Work Plan.

DISCUSSION:

Megacities Conference Report: Rasmus Myklebust (RM) enquired about the date the Conference report will be published. MA replied that the papers presented at the Conference are available at the website, and the publication of the report is planned for the end of April-beginning of May.

Different activities: Jean Luc Poncelet (JLP) expressed his appreciation for the comprehensive work achieved by the ProVention Secretariat in the last three years. He highlighted the difference between activities carried out by the Consortium members individually and activities carried out by the members through the Consortium. Both types of activities contribute to the realization of the ProVention objectives.

Timing: Alexandre Ghélew (AG) wondered if there is a timeline for the ongoing ProVention activities. MA and AK explained that the timeframe is different from one activity to another. Some of the Consortium activities have been completed before the transition. Other activities are going to continue under the new Secretariat. The World Bank ensures the continuity of the ProVention activities by financing the operational expenses of the ProVention Secretariat for the coming two years.

Publications & World Bank: Sálvano Briceño (SB/ISDR) stressed the importance of having a clear separation between the publications addressing the Bank policy makers and those publications, which have a different audience. He asked to what extent ProVention has influenced the work of the World Bank. In response, AK explained how the Bank is integrating Disaster Management into its main objective of reducing poverty, and that a key issue to integrate disaster management into the World Bank's work is through inclusion of natural disaster risk management concerns into CASs and PRSPs.

Capacity Building: Rolf Zelius (RZ) asked for more information about the Consortium activities in Asia and their contribution to capacity building. AK showed what activities the ProVention has conducted in the region, including working in partnership with the Asian Development Bank in the post-earthquake evaluation of damage and needs in Gujarat, Rapid Assessment Training for disaster management experts in Asia with the Asia Disaster and Preparedness Center, ADPC, in Bangkok and ongoing work on emergency reconstruction with the Disaster Management Institute, DMI, in India.

Contribution of ProVention to risk reduction: Mihir Bhatt (MB) observed four unique characteristics of ProVention.

- Firstly, ProVention provides a global view on disaster risk management.
- Secondly, it contributes to a multi-stakeholder perspective since it is not limited to one member organization's vision.
- Thirdly, the products it has developed are accessible and useable: tools, database, training programs, etc.
- Fourthly, ProVention brings financial dimension to disaster risk management and adds to earlier technical approaches. He urged that ProVention should continue to work to influence the multilateral financial institutions.

4. Transition of ProVention Secretariat

EO asked AK to introduce the background of the transition of the ProVention Secretariat and the rationale for shifting to IFRC. David Peppiatt (DP) gave an overview of the main functions and objectives of the Secretariat and highlighted the concept and benefits of host agency rotation. He also gave a progress report on the transition and the process of consultation meetings with ProVention partners. EO elaborated on IFRC hosting of the ProVention Consortium Secretariat, building on the experience of IFRC as host of 4 other inter-agency projects, including the Humanitarian Accountability Project (HAP), the SPHERE Project, the Reach-Out Refugee Protection Initiative and the Global Road Safety Project. The Steering Committee were informed that the Secretariat costs of \$330,000 per year for two years will be funded by a World Bank Development Grant Facility grant as well as a contribution from the Norwegian Government ProVention Trust Funds. An Agreement between the World Bank and IFRC concerning the transfer and funding of the Secretariat is due to be signed shortly.

DP highlighted the following key issues for Steering Committee guidance and discussion:

- Steering Committee endorsement of transition
- Announcement to Associate Members and other constituents regarding transition of Secretariat
- The functions and objectives of the Secretariat.
- Roles and responsibilities of the host organization.
- Concept of rotating Secretariat and appropriate length of time for IFRC to host organization.

DISCUSSION

Endorsement and official announcement of transition

- The Steering Committee endorsed the transition of the Secretariat from the World Bank to the IFRC and raised a number of points for clarification and follow up by the Secretariat. It was suggested that an official announcement be made as soon as possible to inform Associate Members and other key constituents regarding the transition of the Secretariat. It was agreed that the signing of the Agreement between the World Bank and IFRC provides an appropriate and timely opportunity for such an official announcement and it is hoped that this may be made in the following weeks.

The functions and objectives of the Secretariat

- The following comments were made on the functions and objectives of the Secretariat:
 - Certain objectives need to be revised.
 - A clear distinction should be made between objectives and functions.

- SB/ISDR stressed the importance of separating the objectives of the Secretariat from those of the Consortium.

Roles and responsibilities of the host organization and funding

- Yasemin Aysan (YA) inquired about the fund raising procedure that will be used and IFRC's procedures for managing trust funds. EV clarified that IFRC will not be involved in any direct fundraising for the ProVention activities since this is the sole responsibility of the ProVention Secretariat. EV also clarified that IFRC charges 11% for Programme Support Recovery.
- Stephen Bender (SB/OAS) raised a question concerning the different sources of funding for the Secretariat and the ProVention Work Plan. AK explained that the ProVention Secretariat is funded for two years by the World Bank. The budget of activities will be totally separate from the Secretariat's budget. She also explained that for three activities the remaining budget will be transferred to the IFRC hosted Secretariat.
- Fenella Frost (FF) emphasized that DFID will continue to fund future ProVention activities. Coordination could be envisaged with the Swiss and Norwegian government to agree on the exact amount of the contribution.

Transition procedure

- FF -inquired about the state of affairs with regard to the Agreement between the WB and IFRC. She stressed that the appropriate time to host the Secretariat would probably at least three years and that DFID would be willing to cover the Secretariat costs in a third year. She emphasized that it was important to officially announce the transfer to IFRC. Finally she asked for indications on the budget needed for the coming 2-3 years.

Concept of rotating Secretariat

- YA assumed that hosting the ProVention will have an impact on the hosting agency that will continue after ProVention is hosted by another organisation. She understands why ProVention has been considered a World Bank initiative in the last three years and, to a certain extent, will be considered a Federation's undertaking in the next two-three years.
- Other matters concerning the concept of host agency rotation received limited attention since the transition has only just taken place and the funding situation is secure for two year. However, it was acknowledged that two years may be too short a period for a successful Secretariat term. It was generally agreed that the Secretariat should plan within a three year window and seek funding from ProVention partners for year three. The donor governments present all indicated an interest in potentially funding the Secretariat in the future.

Institutional reform

- SB/OAS called the Steering Committee members' attention to the uniqueness of the ProVention where different members with different agendas come together. He proposed to grasp this opportunity to start long-term institutional reform. ProVention can provide "cover" for reform, policy change and development within each member organisation.

5. Review of governance

DP gave an overview of the different components of the current governance structure, outlining the roles and responsibilities of the Presiding Council, Steering Committee and Secretariat. He proposed the idea of establishing an Executive Committee of 6-7 members in order to enable a more active and direct engagement of the Steering Committee in guiding the Work Plan of the Secretariat. DP also highlighted a number of key issues that need for Steering Committee attention and discussion with regard to developing the governance of ProVention:

- Role of Presiding Council as advocacy forum
- Size and composition of Steering Committee
- Representation on Steering Committee- as individuals or organisations?
- Conflict of interests of Steering Committee members (donors, implementers, etc)
- Nomination of Chair
- Proposal of an Executive Committee
- Frequency of meetings, alternative mechanisms for decision making

- Balance between focus on project implementation and addressing governance and membership issues

DISCUSSION:

Role of Presiding Council as advocacy forum

- It was agreed that the Presiding Council provides a unique forum for advocacy, mobilising political will and increased global commitment to disaster risk management. The sustained interest of key members such as James Wolfensohn and Didier Cherpitel offers opportunities to engage the Presiding Council in ProVention affairs; these opportunities should be seized by the Steering Committee and Secretariat in the forthcoming Work Plan.

Size and Composition of the Steering Committee

- The Steering Committee acknowledged the need to broaden the membership of ProVention to involve greater participation of civil society organisations as well as the private sector. It was not clear, however, whether these constituents should be given a greater role and involvement in ProVention governance or other initiatives, such as ad hoc advisory and consultative groups. There was, nonetheless, general consensus that ProVention would benefit from fresh perspectives and drawing in new individuals and organisations into the disaster risk management community.
- AG stressed the need to involve as well civil society actors as academic and research institutions in ProVention membership.
- SB/OAS raised the point that the same individuals tend to participate in the different international forums on disaster risk management and the need for wider participation, in particular from civil society actors, and fresh perspectives on disaster reduction.
- FF proposed to widen the audience by inviting NGOs and civil society organisations to participate in the Steering Committee. DFID would be willing to support the costs of NGO participation in future ProVention meetings.

Conflict of interests of Steering Committee members

- There was recognition of the potentially problematic conflict of interests as Steering Committee members provide both advice and guidance on the work plan and use of ProVention funds and yet are also often direct implementers and recipients of ProVention funding. It was agreed that the revision process of strengthening the governance structures must address this issue of separating governance from execution of activities and funding.
- Commenting on the current governance structure, YA proposed to separate the governance and execution functions. This will ensure greater accountability in terms of work plan and funding decisions. It also protects the Secretariat from being the sole responsible decision makers. She stressed that governance and management needs to be separated in selecting projects and activities, deciding on allocation of ProVention funds and on which activities are most needed and which gaps to address. She also drew attention to the potential conflict of interests of Steering Committee members who have should have governance responsibilities and, therefore, need some independence but yet, at present, many benefit from ProVention funding.
- Harouna Diallo (HD) from WMO warned the Steering Committee members of a possible conflict of interests between decision making and implementation if the current governance structure is maintained.

Proposal of an Executive Committee

- According to JLP the current structure is a workable structure but needs to be activated. He stressed that it is better to maintain the existing structure than create a new one. He recommended using all available expertise to make ProVention a successful undertaking.
- Andrew Maskrey (AM) responded to the suggestion of creating an Executive Committee by saying that there is a need for a body that can combine the executive with the steering functions. This body should be able to provide technical guidance and back-up to the Secretariat and lead any policy changes. He questioned what tasks would be left for the current Steering Committee if an Executive Committee was created.

- AK referred to an earlier Consultative Group for Global Disaster Reduction Meeting in June 1999 in which it was envisaged to keep the future ProVention governance structure as flexible as possible. She stressed that ProVention was established as an informal network and always tried to avoid an over bureaucratic or formalised governance structure to enable flexibility and an ad hoc way of working focusing on substance and technical issues. She gave examples of replacement of members who retired or moved to another organisation. She also emphasised that there is no need to repeat other activities already undertaken by other agencies and stressed the complementary nature of ProVention.
- FF advocated to maintain the current Steering Committee structure and not establish a separate Executive Committee.
- YA asked the Steering Committee members to consider the proposal of an Executive Committee as this proposal has been developed by the Secretariat based on consultations with the different members.
- The proposal to establish an Executive Committee was, however, rejected but the Steering Committee encouraged initiatives from the Secretariat to convene advisory or consultative groups for specific technical or advisory support.

Frequency of Meetings

- FF stressed the importance of more regular meetings to enhance commitment.
- Bearing in mind the time, cost and resources required to convene Steering Committee meetings it was suggested that the Steering Committee should meet twice a year and where possible link meetings to other relevant events, such as an ISDR Task Force meeting or a ProVention activity in the field or other related event. A “listserve” will be set up to improve the flow of information between the Secretariat and the Steering Committee.

Nomination of Chair

- With regard to the nomination of a Chair, two proposals were offered. The first proposed the idea of a revolving Chair for each meeting; the second proposed the idea of the host organisation acting as Chair. The Secretariat suggests that the IFRC remains the Chair for the immediate future to enable close and constant interaction between the Secretariat and the Chair of the Steering Committee.

Balance between focus on project implementation and advocacy work

- JLP urged that ProVention should focus on policy rather than on implementation.
- HD stressed the importance of being action oriented.
- SB/OAS advised ProVention members to focus more on policy issues and advocacy.

The relationship with ISDR and other related initiatives

- A number of Steering Committee members stressed the importance of good co-ordination with ISDR and welcomed the opportunity for more interaction now that both initiatives are Geneva based. However, the Steering Committee urged that the Secretariat avoids duplication of activities and achieves an appropriate division of labour between ProVention and ISDR. David Peppiatt commented on the high level of co-operation between the ProVention and ISDR Secretariats and the recognition by both teams of the need to co-ordinate and complement efforts.
- YA noted that the main objectives of the ProVention and the ISDR are very similar. Therefore, she recommended regular coordination between the two institutions in order to avoid duplication.
- Responding to YA’s remarks with regard to the similarity between the ISDR and the ProVention, SB/ISDR explained that there is a difference between the two initiatives both in terms of the target group and the sectors being addressed by each of them. SB/ISDR pointed out the added value of ProVention membership as it involves the private sector and civil society organisations. In this regard, ProVention targets different organisations from ISDR although it shares the same fundamental objectives.
- AG expressed his delight that Switzerland is hosting now two major initiatives in the field of disaster reduction. The Swiss Government would appreciate if the ISDR Secretariat and the ProVention Secretariat could work more closely at all levels including policy and project activities.

- SB/ISDR promised to work closely with the ProVention Consortium and to look together at the long-term coordination. He proposed to have brainstorming sessions when needed for the Steering Committee members based in Geneva to provide advice to the ProVention Secretariat.

6. IFRC and Disaster Risk Management: Introduction and Perspectives of the Secretariat Host

Hisham Khogali, Food Security Senior Officer at IFRC, presented an overview of the work of the Federation and, in particular, the Disaster Preparedness & Disaster Policy Department, explaining where disaster risk management fits into the current ten year strategy, Strategy 2010, of IFRC and the Red Cross/Red Crescent National Societies.

7. Presentation of Draft Work Plan of Activities 2003-2005

DP presented the background to the Draft Work Plan, the consultation process and the criteria for project focus and prioritisation, outlined below.

The criteria for project focus and prioritisation will be based on:

- Building on current ProVention activities;
- Closer involvement of civil society and other local actors in ProVention;
- Practical application of disaster risk management at local level;
- Sharing knowledge on disaster risk management with key decision makers, practitioners and vulnerable communities;
- Working as a Consortium; strong participation by representatives from targeted developing country or region.

Bruno Haghebaert (BH) presented the portfolio of potential project activities within the ProVention categories of risk identification/analysis; risk reduction; risk transfer/sharing and core knowledge sharing activities, including advocacy. He highlighted the key points for Steering Committee discussion:

- Prioritisation, balance and focus of activities
- Criteria for project identification and selection
- Linking macro and micro dimension of ProVention
- How to increase private sector involvement
- Output of knowledge sharing activities
- Fundraising
- Financial and technical contribution of Consortium partners

DISCUSSION:

Prioritisation, balance and focus of activities

- FF stressed the importance of continuity since ProVention will act as an umbrella for the member organisations. She pointed out that the objectives of ProVention are long-term which makes it necessary for the current Secretariat to focus on key substantive areas. She asked the Steering Committee to guide the Secretariat in project prioritisation and focus. She proposed that the Steering Committee should meet in the near future, e.g. within 2-3 months, for this purpose. FF offered full support to the knowledge sharing and advocacy activities, especially the proposed initiative with the EU.
- JLP urged that the focus on the economic and financial sectors should not be lost and that there should be continuity with DMF activities addressing the financial instruments of risk management. ProVention should primarily be a policy tool and the focus of future ProVention work should be on knowledge sharing and advocacy.
- YA proposed that the Secretariat should focus on 3-4 areas, which need support.
- AM welcomed the community approach in the proposed Work Plan since these are seldom addressed in a global forum, such as ProVention. However, he highlighted the apparent tension between a policy and advocacy focus on one hand and a global R&D on the other supporting cutting edge themes. He

advised that ProVention should set the agenda with a focus on a limited number of priority areas over the next 5 years and ensure that the substance of ProVention activities are fed into ISDR.

- Rolf Zelius (RZ) advised that ADB would benefit from a Consortium focusing on knowledge sharing, to provide technical advice and assistance to the members. Apart from activities where ProVention as a Consortium can do the work more effectively than individual members or draw on the strength of representing a larger group, activities should be left to individual members. Most of the proposed activities should be left to the members of the ProVention taking into consideration that every organisation has its own different needs and agendas. For Asian Development Bank important activities would include:
 - Capacity building in member countries
 - Harmonization of activities
 - Inclusion of risk identification and analysis in country programming
 - Risk transfer
- Aloysius Rego (AR) perceived the new focus on community level activities as a significant shift from the financial sector focus of the past. He advised the ProVention Secretariat to document the accumulated experience of the Consortium and to bring together experiences of the different members. With regard to his own organisation (ADPC) he tabled a few ideas for consideration:
 - Showing good practices in community based disaster reduction activities in South and SE –Asia.
 - Targeting of high-risk cities (earthquakes).
 - Advancing the agenda of disaster risk management in the activities of the Asian Development Bank.
- SB/OAS proposed to the Consortium to try to influence the mainstreaming of risk management into development planning. He referred to the three principal areas of development in the Americas - strengthening democracy, free trade, and sustainable development. A choice may have to be made between focusing on global R&D or on advocacy work. With regard to more active engagement of the Steering Committee, he proposed a listserv be established.

Fundraising

- FF stated that DFID is allocating a substantial amount of funding to support ProVention activities. She recognises that several activities are still to be completed and asked for a full picture of the ongoing activities by DMF in order to ensure continuity in the next work plan.
- RM stressed that it is important to broaden ProVention's donor base. The Norwegian Government remains interested in ProVention. However, decisions concerning continued funding have not yet been taken and will depend on the outcome of this Steering Committee meeting as well as on the conclusions of ongoing evaluations of ProVention.
- In support to what RM said, AK asserted that Norway has been a major sponsor since the beginning of the project. She acknowledged the support given by DFID, the World Bank, the Dutch Government and a number of other partners.

Conclusion by the Chair

EO summarised the key conclusions emerging from the day's discussion:

- Presiding Council: the Steering Committee should try to use the opportunity offered by Mr. Cherpitel to actively involve the Presiding Council in future ProVention work.
- There is a need to look at areas where ProVention can focus and prioritise activities in key core areas.
- There was a suggestion to broaden the Steering Committee and membership by bringing new members from civil society and the private sector.
- With regard to proposed change of governance structure by the Secretariat, EO concluded that the Steering Committee is not ready to take such a decision. However, she recommended that the Secretariat takes the initiative to form an advisory group, based on specific needs. Separate advisory from policy functions.
- The Secretariat will propose a Chair for the next Steering Committee meeting.

- All parties agreed that there is a need for a third year extension of the Secretariat.
- There is a need to broaden the donor base.
- Define and develop the advocacy role for ProVention- both in terms of internal institutional reform and external advocacy.
- A "listserve" should be developed for the Steering Committee.
- The transition should be announced to the associate members as soon as the World Bank/IFRC Agreement is signed.
- After a discussion on how often the Steering Committee should convene, the Chair proposed that the next meeting would be held in six months time. SB/ISDR proposed that future Steering Committee meetings be linked to ISDR Task Force meetings. Another suggestion was to have the next meeting in the field linked directly to ProVention activities. JLP emphasised the importance of the site selection since this type of meetings will have an impact on governments and will involve their participation.

8. Round Table Discussion on Work Plan, 6 March 2003

Chair:

Alcira Kreimer

List of Participants:

Margaret Arnold

Yasemin Aysan

Stephen Bender

Mihir R. Bhatt

Helena Molin Valdes (HMY)

Senior Officer Policy, ISDR

Direitinho Tavares (DT)

Technical Cooperation Department, WMO

Fenella Frost

Sarah Barlow

Bruno Haghebaert

Alcira Kreimer

Hisham Khogali (HK)

Senior Officer, Disaster Preparedness & Policy Department, IFRC

Stefan Micallef

Rasmus Myklebust

David Peppiatt

Jean-Luc Poncelet

Aloysius Rego

Rolf Zelius

AK introduced the agenda of the second day, involving a round-table discussion on the Work Plan of activities, and explained the purpose of the final session to guide the Secretariat in the prioritisation and focus of activities.

DP presented the key points emerging out of the Work Plan discussion of the previous day:

- Prioritisation, balance and focus of activities.
- Criteria for project identification and selection.
- Continuity of activities.
- How to ensure the strong body of work with the private sector and financial instruments of risk management is developed further.

DP also reminded the Steering Committee members of the Goal, Mission and Objectives of ProVention and asked the Steering Committee to consider whether these should be revised or developed during the next phase of ProVention.

It was agreed that before a detailed discussion on project activities can take place it was important to first consider the higher level of goal and objectives. Therefore, the goal and objectives subsequently provided the framework for discussion.

DISCUSSION:

Goals and Objectives

- YA commented on the objectives: forming a coalition is more a method or means to achieve the goal than a goal itself.
- RZ questioned who is the main target group for ProVention. He recognised the main client of ProVention as the members rather than the developing countries.
- MB argued that the goal needs to reflect more pro-active and preventive activities (ProVention). It is a Consortium, it is not a coalition, network or Federation. Thirdly he suggested that attention should be paid to the Millennium Development Goals. The mission/goal needs to refer to poverty or the suffering of poor people.
- BH inquired whether technological catastrophes should still be mentioned in the Goal, given the fact that no ProVention activities have touched this.
- AR requested from the Secretariat to have the advocacy role towards financial institutions explicitly mentioned in the objectives.
- FF stressed the need to show how the Work Plan activities feed into the overarching objectives and suggested there is a need to revise the original objectives for this next phase of ProVention.

Working as a Consortium

- JLP mentioned that the successful introduction of disaster risk management is closely related to the political context and legal procedures in a country and depends on the political commitment. As a result, a collective effort by the Consortium members may make a difference while an individual organisation would not be able to succeed. The prestige of the Consortium can be used to set up certain standards and mechanisms for enforcement.
- In SB/OAS' opinion, ProVention can provide cover for its members. It allows members to support certain initiative that would be difficult, if not impossible, to do alone. He proposed a White Paper series following the advocacy line, making policy tools and their results available through an exchange.
- YA mentioned that there are different forums and coalitions in various fields (e.g. on food security). Therefore forming a coalition on risk reduction is an objective in itself. Certain groups, such as the academic institutions and the NGOs, are not yet represented. With regard to advocacy work, one should focus on 1 or 2 issues only and start to lobby on an agreed result (e.g. mine action campaign).
- RZ raised the question whether ProVention is a separate actor or works through its members as a service institution. In his view, the members should identify the need and the Secretariat should act accordingly.

- FF said that work should focus on activities that could not be achieved individually but can only be accomplished as a group.
- SB/OAS replied that it is not so much a matter of either /or but both and when focusing on whether ProVention is a separate actor or works through its members.

Key priorities, focus and criteria

- In this session, DP asked the Steering Committee members for their comments on the focus and criteria of future project activities, taking into consideration opportunities and challenges.
- MB argued that knowledge sharing is already included in the three areas Risk Identification, Risk Reduction and Risk Transfer. Therefore there is no need to have it as a separate fourth category. When one looks at the ongoing project activities, distinction can be made between three different areas of activities. The first is key themes and issue and research, second, policy development and the third is good practice and innovative approaches. Policy development and good practices at community level should be focused upon in the coming three years. More attention should be paid to Risk Transfer activities. He nevertheless stressed the need for balance and continuation of ongoing activities.
- YA welcomed the focus on practical application in the Plan. However, she thought that Risk Identification project needs further work since the ECLAC methodology needs also to be developed and disseminated in Asia and Africa. Secondly, further work is needed on the Improved Database project and the dissemination of its research findings. Data play a crucial role as an advocacy instrument.
- MA replied that the ECLAC project is still ongoing and that a lot of dissemination and training activities are still envisaged. Funding for this activity is still available. With regard to the Improved Database there is a strong interest for this initiative from within the Bank.
- AK stressed the need for more work in cost benefit analysis. She requested to have a more balanced approach between action oriented activities and advocacy efforts.
- BH claimed that 4 out of the 12 proposed activities could be considered as advocacy initiatives. With regard to the planned risk transfer activities, he mentioned that these would be carried out in collaboration with local NGOs, such as DMI in India, and would not necessarily involve the RC community.
- SB/OAS mentioned that OAS was interested in collaborating with the RC in Latin America to develop a joint approach in the field of Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment.
- HVM stated that ProVention is reaching sectors and involving groups that are not involved in ISDR. The Consortium initiatives feed into ISDR work. Meanwhile it also provides a vehicle for bringing in new partners into ISDR.
- YA stressed that we should avoid advocacy issues that are sector based, such as climate change. As an advocacy group ProVention can raise certain issues that cannot be raised individually by member organisations. ProVention should address new things while at the same time building on the past. Mainstreaming Risk reduction in multilateral development planning could be one such issue.
- SB/OAS highlighted the fact that many NGOs do not include disaster mitigation in their programmes due to a lack of interest and knowledge. He appealed for a closer involvement of NGOs in future ProVention work.
- MB stated that the main advocacy argument that should be used is that pro-active approaches to disaster management are financially profitable. It is not only theoretically possible to prove that prevention pays off but also practically at the local level preventive approaches have shown their benefit.
- AK stressed that one of the main goals of ProVention has been and should be to integrate risk reduction in the development bank policies. AK recommended that ProVention should use every possible forum to advocate for its activities. Possibilities include the RC/RC International Conference 2003 and the World Economic Forum in Davos, organising meeting with key influential, decisions makers, such as Jim Wolfensohn, Didier Cherpitel and Hilde Johnson.

AK concluded the discussion by summarising the main points. The members agreed to have a revised version of the mission statement and objectives. The Secretariat Staff will send the revised version to the Steering Committee for their feedback and approval before the end of March. Feedback is expected before mid-April.

9. Action Points

The Steering Committee agreed on the following action points :

Transition

- A clear distinction should be made between objectives and functions of the Secretariat.
- The transition should be announced to the associate members as soon as the Agreement is signed.
- There is a need for a third year extension of the Secretariat.

Governance

- Presiding Council: the Steering Committee should try to use the opportunity offered by Mr. Cherpitel to actively involve the Presiding Council in future ProVention work.
- Governance and management needs to be separated in selecting projects and activities and deciding on funding issues.
- The Secretariat can take an initiative to form an advisory group, based on its practical needs. The advisory group should provide technical guidance and back-up to the Secretariat.
- The next Steering Committee meeting will be held in six months time. The Secretariat will propose a Chair for the meeting. The Steering Committee meeting could be linked to ISDR Task Force meetings or take place in the field to be linked directly to ProVention activities.
- The Secretariat will nominate a Chair for the next meeting.

Work Plan

- Regular coordination between ProVention and ISDR Secretariats is needed in order to avoid duplication of activities.
- Regular consultation is important to enhance commitment to the Work Plan. A "listserve" should be set up between the Steering Committee members.
- The need for prioritisation in a number of key core areas. The focus should be limited to 3 to 5 themes.
- ProVention should develop relevant advocacy activities and seize opportunities for both internal reform and external advocacy, such as the RC/RC International Conference 2003, the EU and the World Economic Forum in Davos.

Membership

- Involve academic and research institutions more closely in ProVention work.
- Broaden the Steering Committee and membership by inviting NGOs and civil society organisations to participate actively in the governance structure and implementation of projects.

Funding

ProVention's donor base should be broadened.

Objectives and Mission Statement

The Secretariat Staff will send the revised version of ProVention's objectives and mission statement to the Steering Committee for their feedback and approval before the end of March.