Catalyst session at the 2nd APWS meeting in Chiang Mai, May 17, morning session WRR3, Room D2

Registered for the Catalyst session:

1. Ms. Fiona Chandler, International Water Centre, f.chandler@waterandlive.org

2. Albert Salamanca, SEI, albert.salamanca@sei-international.org

3. Malin Beckman, SEI, malin.beckman@sei-international.se

4. Daronare Kunchai, no data

5. Prof. Dr. M. Monowar Hossain, Executive Director IWM / Bangkok, mnh@iwmbd.org

6. P. Teerasak, FTI, tepadoongtan@gmail.com

7. Mr. Lanthom, MOST.I2, lanthom21@hotmail.com

8. Dr. Sangeun Lee, ICHARM (Japan), UNESCO, Public Works Research Institute (PWRI), peregian78@gmail.com

9. Wiwat Sutiwipakorn (WS), formerly lecturer in Civil Engineering, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai, Songkhla 90112, wiwat525@gmail.com, 081 6981672

10. [Name in Thai], DWR Thailand, adirektrakam.w@gmail.com

11. Chucheep Pankaeo, DWR, chucheep-pk@yahoo.com

12. Arthit Boonrod, Green Sivikikit Botanic Garden, email ?

13. Chonticha Suksuphak, PTT, Petroleum Public Company, Safety & ENU officer, chonthicha.s@pttplc.com

14. Houn Sokchea, CNMC, no email

15. Thanawat, Jarupongsakul (TJ), Dept. of Geology Chulalongkorn Univ., Bangkok, jthanawat@ymail.com

Present to session:

1. Wiwat Sutiwipakorn (WS), formerly lecturer in Civil Engineering, Prince of Songkla University, Hat Yai, Songkhla 90112, wiwat525@gmail.com, 081 6981672

2. Thanawat, Jarupongsakul (TJ), Dept. of Geology Chulalongkorn Univ., Bangkok, jthanawat@gmail.com

3. Malin Beckman (MB), researcher on DRR and CCA, based at SEI Asia in Bangkok, malin.beckman@sei-international.org

4. Sang Eun Lee (SEL), Research specialist of ICHARM, Tsukuba, Japan, peregian78@gmail.com

5. Chonticha Suksuphak (CS), PTT, Petroleum Public Company, safety officer

6. Salmah Zakaria (SZ), UNESCAP, Bangkok, Thailand, Catalyst Think Tank member

7. Peter van der Keur (PKE), GEUS, Denmark, Catalyst session organiser

Summary of WRR3 session

Peter van der Keur, Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland (GEUS), was presented by Salmah Zakaria, UNESCAP. PKE presented the outline of the Catalyst project, including the Catalyst approach, the Think Tank process, the held virtual meetings and regional workshops. Special focus was on the outcome of the in January held regional workshop for the South and Southeast Asian region, hosted by UNESCAP at the UNCC in Bangkok, Thailand. Countries in the S/SE region include Thailand, Philippines, Indonesia, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Nepal and India. In this meeting Think Tank members discussed Best Practices in capacity development in disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA) and also identified gaps and barriers to move from current practices, as they had knowledge on from their regions in S/SE Asia, to best practices. From the minutes of this meeting a summary report was extracted and from this report five most important transformative practices were identified. Transformative practices indicate what is needed to move from current to best practices. The five transformative practices were the point of discussion in the WRR3 session. Finally, future directions for the Catalyst project were presented as well as ideas on how to follow up on the project to demonstrate and further develop its approach.

After the presentation by PKE, the participants were invited to take part in a round table discussion. It was pointed out that there is the need for success stories in the project, i.e. to demonstrate how BP in DRR and CCA can function in practice. The Catalyst website was searched already during the session and there was agreement that as many as possible project products should be publicly available. On the subject of how sharing of knowledge could be improved across different levels, it was suggested that boundary partners should be involved in defining and elaborating research. Boundary partners meant the people and organizations that would be using the research results, e.g. relevant government bodies and other actors in development. If boundary partners are included in defining research objectives, interpreting data and evaluating results, there is a bigger chance that the research results will actually be used. The Mekong River Commission (MRC) projects were mentioned as a way this can be done in practice, although this concerns govt to govt collaboration only. Integration of feasibility assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) studies in operational stages of project development could improve sharing knowledge across administrative levels. Agencies that perform such assessments must be urged (‘lobbied’) to include DRR and CCA in EIA. Knowledge sharing from scientific level to operational level is in Thailand, but presumably also in most other regions in Asia, impeded by the non-existence of an intermediate level to translate scientific knowledge into knowledge that can be used by practitioners in DRR and CCA. There are no or few organizations that translate scientific to operational knowledge. Use of scientific descriptions in operational DRR and CCA should be avoided, instead use e.g. graphical means to get the message through. In addition, the younger generation needs to be involved. This needs to be achieved through bottom-up mechanisms, not top-down as is the case now.

Knowledge on DRR and CCA needs to be integrated / mainstreamed in regular education, i.e. elementary and higher schools. It needs to be acknowledged that disaster risk is the normal case and to be dealt with as part of normal life. Capacity development should focus on independent risk assessments, learning about the risk we are taking today should teach us how to deal with future risks. This enables people to make decisions on their own. Therefore current education at basic levels must be adapted. Competence in assessing risks and making decisions in consideration of risk should be included in more education programs.

Despite good intentions and increasing knowledge on disaster risk management, natural hazards are still predominantly dealt with by crisis management. It is felt by policy makers that it is cheaper to wait and see and then repair. Who is going to pay for preventive measures?. The costs need to be balanced, how much risk are we willing to take?. Conventional Cost-Benefit Analysis (CBA) is not sufficient, there is also a need to include uncertainty assessments in the CBA. You cannot be prepared for any degree of extreme events, you have to accept some uncertainty. Scenario analyses can help estimating uncertainty, sometimes called 'guesstimate'. Improved maps are needed to estimate vulnerability at the local scale.

There is a need for estimation of how the added effect of many different developments together affects the risk picture. Risk assessment of each separate investment or development activity does not give an adequate understanding.