

June_18_408_004

So a very warm welcome. We're really, really excited to see a big group after lunch. So we will promise you that we are gonna be as dynamic as possible so you won't fall asleep. We will guarantee you no panels.

We will guarantee you a lot of discussions and we will guarantee you that you are gonna leave this room with some questions, ideas, and definitely new people that you haven't met before. Okay, so that's the plan.

So my name is Catalina Jaime, I'm the head of the climate and conflict team at the Red Cross and Recreation Climate Center. I also lead all the topic of conflict in the anticipation hub as well as Collid with my colleague Tessie, the multi -risk working group of the anticipation hub.

The work that we do is really focused on bringing climate action and disaster risk reduction, of course, to conflict settings, to people affected by conflict. This session has been organized with a lot of love and a lot of time and ideas by this group of people.

So I'm gonna introduce you to Jeremy. How do you pronounce your last name? Exactly.

Vetterwald.

Impossible. I'm Colombian, so it's just I have a limit to my pronunciation. So Jeremy, he leads the work on data analysis and understanding risk in a really cool organization called the impact initiative.

So who know what impact initiative is? No, so you have to have a chat. You have to have a chat with Jeremy after this session, okay? And then with me we have Lisa, your last name.

sour hammer

Yeah, oh, God, sorry, I made a mess. First disaster. Good, so Lisa, she's the lead of disaster reduction in conflict of the German Red Cross. So the German Red Cross supports national societies of the Red Cross all over the world with a focus of how to bring disaster reduction in conflict settings.

So her job is quiet and amazing. And with me as well, Tessie DeBoer, I can't pronounce that very well because Tessie works with me every single day. So, good, Tessie is a technical advisor at the Red Cross 100 Ketsen Climate Center.

She's a specialist on multi -risk analysis. She leads a lot of the work of the ICRC to integrate climate risk into the work, into the frameworks. So you can see that we have a very nice group of people that is actually doing a lot of the practice of like, how do we crack the knot of bringing disaster reduction to conflict settings.

So to get us started, agenda. What is agenda? One second. Good. So we just hear the cartoon exploration. We really wanted to give you a little taste of the work on communication that we do to really kind of think about this concept of like bringing disaster reduction to people affected by conflict in a different way.

So I think I really hope, like, I really, really hope that these cartoons spark some ideas, some questions, and it makes you think about the complexities of disasters that are actually in this context in a different way.

You can have access to all these cartoons in our website. We're gonna share with you. This is a super open source. You can use it anytime. It would be really great that you can take advantage of a lot of these materials that we have developed.

And now, let's, why are we here? So some of the facts, some of you might have been in the session that GFDR organized this morning that really highlighted a lot of the facts of like, why are we talking about this?

I mean, why is it a difference of really doing DRR in a, let's say, peaceful context rather than doing it in places where like war and violence have affected people? So GFDR have been doing a really fantastic job on building the evidence, as well as some other organizations.

Yet, we know that we don't have all the facts. We know that there is a lot of research that needs to be done. But I think this is very clear. We know that disasters are more daily in conflict settings.

Around 34%, there is a likelihood of 34% that a person will die in a conflict setting rather than in a normal area. Then, we know in terms of exposure of a number of people living in FCP context, we're like two billion people in FCP context.

And for example, our research that we are just doing recently on IDPs exposure, with a global analysis of like, how IDPs are exposed to different climate hazards, almost 95% of all the IDP camps in around like 20 countries are exposed.

That is gigantic, you know? And we are not really doing enough yet for that. Then, clearly, like the big question that probably many of you have looked into, we know clearly that disaster reduction funding and climate finances are not reaching conflict affected context.

We have here in the room amazing people from different government departments that are trying to push like this topic, like our colleagues from Somalia, from Mozambique, from areas where climate finances are not reaching.

Why? Because there are a lot of complexities in the financial mechanisms to actually make it happen. I think the move that the bank is doing to push for this to kind of like change, I think it's very positive, although we're not quite there yet, isn't it, Katie?

Good, so these are like some of the facts. Now, the action.

The action. That's me. You came in and you got a red and a green card. I just want to double check that before we dive in. If you haven't, there's a couple here at the front row so you can actually grab one.

And maybe my lovely facilitation team can help you get some more if necessary.

Yeah.

All right, I think we're almost all have our voting rights in hand. Yes, it's a democracy. We really want everyone to vote. It's very important. Okay, so we are gonna have a little experience of what disaster risk reduction means in a fragile conflict or violence affected setting.

To do that, you will become the decision makers in our make -believe country. You've just come to the country. You're part of an international organization. And in a very, very short time span, you are required to make some difficult decisions.

In this game, there is no perfect information. There's also no perfect answer. And you'll probably have more questions than answers before and after. So we've learned a lot during the development of our Practitioner's Guide for Disaster Risk Reduction in Fragile Conflict and Violence -Effected Settings within the Red Cross movement.

We've been learning a lot from different national societies that have been implementing disaster risk production in FCV settings, as well as a load of different partners, some of whom are here in the room as well.

We know that there are very big operational challenges in FCV settings, and we'll take you through a couple of them in this activity. So I'll be presenting three plausible but fictional scenarios, and what you can do is you can make a decision.

Green is go, red is no go. We only vote once I do the countdown, and that is because the majority wins. Doesn't mean it's the right answer, but it does mean that the majority wins, okay? So no early voting and no changing of your votes.

We're keeping an eye out here. Great, so we're gonna do an easy one to get you warmed up first, but maybe let's try it out. So I'll do the countdown, and then you'll make a vote. Any, so three, two, one, vote.

Great, all right, yes, we already see a little bit of a spread in the room. Some people have a tendency to go and others no go, so says something about your reverse tolerance. Okay, so our first challenge in the room.

We are in our fictional context, in a faraway land. We're dealing with a limited conflict, which means that certain areas in the country are affected by violence. The violence intensity is low, but predictable, and is mainly between different communal groups.

The government is not party to the conflict at the moment, and you get very regular security updates because you've worked a lot with your partners, you have your security information, et cetera. However, there's a lot of distrust between communities and also of you as an organization, so people are quite skeptical.

Still, your boss is asking you something. Should we start engaging with community - based disaster risk reduction? So should we start planning some work here? You'll have a little think, only 10 seconds, we do rapid voting in this exercise, and then when it countdown, you can actually let me know what you think.

Should we go or should we not go? Are you ready? Okay, three, two, one. Okay, yeah, I see some people who have some doubts, but the majority says we should go and we should proceed, interesting. All right, thank you.

We'll have some time afterwards to actually think about the choices and how you would actually make them differently, if any. The situation has changed. Conflict has intensified, it's now widespread, not just one province, the whole country is affected.

The intensity is high, unpredictable, things are changing very quickly, but still you have regular security information. Again, acceptance still not great, also not terrible, and the local authority is not party to the conflict, so it's still very much inter-communal.

Now, you have done a multi-risk assessment. You've been looking into which communities are most vulnerable and you've found that one of the IDP camps in your region is very much at risk. The question is, do you focus on the IDP camp only or do you expand?

IDP camp only means green, expand means red. Are you ready? Okay, three, two, one. Interesting, so we see a bit of a mix. I think the majority says red, so no go, but quite some people convincingly say green.

Okay, and then our last scenario. Things have changed again, very dynamic situation. What you now are faced with is a contained violence, of a contained conflict. Government has stepped in. So government is now party to the conflict.

They're fighting the different insurgent groups. Different communities are still in conflict with each other. But, and you're also getting less and less security information, so it's difficult to actually get access to the field.

It's difficult to understand what is happening. The acceptance is very low, and there's a lot of distrust also among certain communities of your organization and the government as well. This is very tricky.

You don't have access at the moment to communities, but you're considering maybe starting to support the government in a formal partnership to enhance their disaster risk management. The question is, do we proceed, or do we maybe do something else?

Proceed is green, something else is red. Three, two, one. Interesting, I think the majority says red, something else, okay, thank you so much. I realized I wanted to ask some of my facilitation colleagues to add a couple of reflections on what they actually saw in the field.

I didn't do that yet, but what we can do in the exercise is actually have a bit of a debrief. Jeremy will introduce this, and my different colleagues will join and tell you a bit about what we have seen in our different work, in the different contexts that we've been supporting as well, and we would love to hear from you in terms of what you have seen as well.

So Jeremy, I'll pass to you.

Great, thanks a lot, Tessin. I think what was very interesting about the exercise was, A, the different responses that we had, and B, how things changed based on the context. And I think from our experiences of doing DR and several FCV contexts with those different characteristics that were highlighted as part of the game, these are very much the types of very difficult decisions that you need to be making.

And so if we reflect a bit on those different exercise, on what is quite unique about the FCV conflicts, is that usually you have a higher level of hazard exposure due to that conflict. And you highlighted it in the last case study, the fact that there was a lot of issues related to trust.

Who makes decisions? And this is extremely difficult in context, where governance, decision -making mechanisms change very rapidly. And so here, what I found interesting, especially in the last one, was the fact that when you have this low trust, when you have the state that is party to a conflict, it becomes very difficult to do meaningful partnerships with the government.

And I think what we've seen in a lot of contexts is that working much more at the local level, so understanding local risks, understanding local dynamics, and trying to unpack what can be done in those contexts at the local level is one approach that has worked quite well.

And just to reflect a bit on the access side, reflecting on the role of humanitarian, I think that's quite important. In the session this morning, it was highlighted, how do you do DR and FCV? And I think there's different areas where you can do a lot of work with IDPs, where the government still has a lot of control.

But in areas with very limited access, this becomes extremely difficult. And this is where humanitarians tend to have that experience. If you're looking at ICRC, the OCHES of the world, they tend to be able to work in these environments.

So there's a bit of a reflection to be had on how do you engage with humanitarian stakeholders that are able to operate in these contexts, but don't necessarily have the same level of DRM expertise that probably the development actors have.

I think I was allocated 30 seconds. I had a bit more than that, so Tessa, back to you.

Alright, so we'll ask you now to turn to your neighbors, but neighbors you haven't spoken to before. So actually have a look around and find someone you don't know. And discuss what did you find challenging, what did you find surprising, and what would make you change your mind.

Great, everyone. I see a lot of important discussions happening here. We'll go slowly, slowly back to the plenary. And maybe I would ask for people for a brief reflection from the discussion. So maybe let's start with a government representative who would like to reflect.

Someone wants to share something from the discussion? Or we start with another organization who feels ready to share? Maybe you? Thank you.

Okay, what am I supposed to say? Just your reflection. Well, I don't know. So my reflection on challenge one was that it was, I was just talking about this, that it seemed like this is the easiest case to make a decision to go or intervene in some way.

But I actually have elected not to because I think that it wasn't clear who's actually requesting assistance. The government's not involved at this point. It seems as though there's not really a direct ask and therefore the worst thing you can do, I think, is to just develop your own theory of the case and provide assistance independently.

So I feel like that requires more information before you could actually make a decision, even though it's low intensity and it seems as though it should be the easiest one of the three.

Okay, thank you very much. So clear preference for first of all talk to the government before you do anything. Thank you. Then another reflection maybe from another participant. Yeah. Who would like to share?

You want to share?

So we were just talking about how there was, and I think it's a similar conversation, about how there was lack of information about a lot of things. So the first thing we had an issue with was who's asking for this in three of the times.

And then you had the last one, which was the most challenging for us, where we talked about how the government is intervening. We had questions around how are they intervening? What's the definition of insurgents in this case?

What are the dynamics of the conflict? We don't have that data. So we just talked about how our decisions will be very different if we had more contextual information, because

all that was missing. A lot of high level kind of quick stats, and very large heavy words, but not a lot of context to back up our decisions.

So it was hard for both of us.

Thank you very much. So definitely we need more information, right? Before we do anything, definitely more secondary data. Thank you very much. Who else would like to share something? Maybe now from the government perspective?

Yes?

Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm from Somalia, mayor of Baiduwa, one of the climate affected areas in Somalia. And also conflict is, and violence is, and displacement is happening in our city, Batukal, my city, for the last 30 years.

But now World Bank has engaged the militia baratis, the government, and improving the infrastructures in our city. Which is, which was, which is now is building the trust between the communities and the government.

And people believe that the militia baratis are doing their own best to provide the surfaces in the ground. So our, our, our, our organization is now dealing with the, with the climate change, disaster management, and our city has been hit last year with a flooding that have resulted with the death of the 26.

So we agree with the communities also to decide what they want to achieve in the future. Because we have made a community, integrated the community action plan to consult with them what they want to achieve in the future.

In terms of the development, in terms of the crisis management, in terms of the flood mitigation issues. So that, that's why we are here today. We believe that most people are talking about, in sessions we have seen, they are talking about high level engagement is of the crisis issues, earthquakes and also other volcanoes, something like that.

But our situation was different. It's, it's a certain, this, this session, our reality on the ground, which says that the, the, the, the the, the, the, the, the, the fragility, the climate and conflict areas, that is still, the bank is still making possible to work and engage with the militia baratis, with the communities.

So this is, we believe that this, this discussion is, is, is very important and touching our, our needs in the ground. Thank you.

I will just add one more thing. I think we have practically experienced in prior session of communities in high intensity and inter -communal conflict in living in camps. And I want to thank the ICRC and the Red Cross in taking decisions to reach the most affected people in fragile conflicts.

So just to reflect on this, I think with the, both even in challenge three, we need to engage the governments even if they are part of this because of the, they need to be explained to the do no harm concept.

Which is the first thing so that they also need to know the principles of humanitarian ethics, all these. So we know all these and we have the practical experience. So I would also like to thank the bank who without their support we shouldn't be here.

Yeah, thank you.

Thank you very much for your reflections. And I also like very much that you highlight the whole of society approach and the trust building with the community as well and also thinking about their priorities, right?

Not just the high level up and the people who are kind of a little bit far maybe from the implementation and the local level. Thank you so much. And with that I would hand over to my dear colleague.

Good, great. I mean, you cannot imagine how special and important this conversation is for many of us, because this is, I think we feel very passionate about that need of really trying to reduce the risk of disasters in this place.

And I just wanna super improvise, give like a short chat to say, like some people, like Katie is here, I don't know if you know her, like she has been pushing for this topic of disaster and is actually in conflict for years from Sendai, where there was no mention whatsoever of conflict.

Where Mohammed from the government, he's the director of Soma, who is like the head of disaster in Somalia, and many, many other of you that are here. So what we're gonna do now is an exercise to harvest ideas.

We really want this session to be useful and to get us somewhere. Like we have the brain power that is in this room is powerful and it's quite unique. I forgot to mention Virginia, for example, who has been like working for years on trying to help us to move disaster with this reaction.

So we are gonna do something that is gonna be fun, that is gonna really get us to brainstorm, like the key ideas of like, how do we bring meaningful disaster with reaction in conflict settings? So if you had the power to convince the donor, to convince the GCF, to convince or influence the loss and damage man, you know, to say, okay, we need to do, we need to invest and we need to do more disaster with the action in this context, what do we do?

What is your elevator pitch with a concrete action of what we can do? And we're gonna do an exercise in which we're gonna prioritize the best ideas that will come from this room. So the challenge, first step is that you have a paper with you, you have a white paper, all of you.

So this is the challenge is that you need to write very clearly because everybody is gonna read it. So make sure, which is very difficult for me. I have like a doctor handwriting, so I understand. But write down, you know, a sentence of like, what is that elevator pitch?

What is what we need to do concretely to make sure that the people that you work with in Somalia, in your municipality, can actually be rich with disaster with reaction and that we can meaningfully reduce like risk.

We're in one of the most important conference on this topic and we need to get something useful out of this. So write your ideas very clear because people will read it and we're gonna vote based on your ideas and we will gather all these.

This is gonna be useful. We're gonna use these for many, many different pieces of work and you will hear from us from these ideas. Okay, so you have one minute to write, write it. Okay, I'm gonna give you two minutes.

Thank you.

Don't be shy, remember. This is very important. Remember, everybody has to have a paper because what you won't be able to be part of the game. Thank you. I'm going to give you bonus time. 30 seconds bonus time.

It's so generous. Thank you. It's the time. Great. Excellent. So we are going to play a game called 721. And I recommend you to use these in any workshop that you have because it's so good to prioritize ideas.

So the idea will be that you are going to stand up and you will go around the room with your neighbor and exchange papers. Exchange papers as much as you can with everybody. When I say stop, you find a neighbor near you, hopefully you don't know.

And then we are going to read the messages. So you will have your partner. Let's say that you and me, we're partners. So then, and then we, each of us have a paper. So we will read the paper and we will give a score.

So the maximum punctuation between you, you know, the couple, it will be 7. So 7 is the maximum number. So you, if this idea is like the best idea in the planet and the other one is just so bad, then it's going to be 7 and 0.

But if like both ideas are kind of good, but maybe one is a little bit better than the other, then it's like 4 and 3. Basically, maximum 7. No more than 7 or was you damaged the game? Okay. So 7. Exactly.

But the maximum punctuation between the two papers has to be 7. So it could be 6 and 1 or 7 and 0 or 4 and 3. And then you will write it on the back of the paper, no in front, on the back. Okay. So easy, easy.

We do first round and you will see how easy it is. Choose your score, exchange, exchange, find a partner, and I will explain you more. So now let's go for it. One, two, three. Exchange papers and say hi to the people that you exchange papers with.

Just go around. Exchange papers, move around. Exchange, exchange. Exchange papers, move around. Move, no, no, no yet. No reading yet. Exchange. No reading yet, no reading yet. Exchange, exchange. Exchange, exchange, no reading.

No, no reading yet. Exchange, exchange. Exchange papers. Exchange. Now, stop. Stop. Find a neighbor. Time to stop. Find a neighbor. Find someone next to you. Find someone next to you. Okay. Find someone next to you.

Now, read. Find someone, you need to go around. Find someone that doesn't have a... So, and remember, seven is the maximum. So, oh, you need to find out, yeah, oh no, because we need the opportunity.

Yeah, really? Okay. So, remember, maximum number of punctuation seven, base on the best idea. No? Best idea? It could be seven, and the bad idea could be zero. If both of them are good, then four and three.

Exactly. On the back. Yeah, maximum, maximum seven between both of them. Maximum. Thank you. Good. Okay. Now we are going to do another round. Okay? Go around. Exchange papers on the back of the paper.

Yeah. Write it on the back. Exchange papers. Time to exchange. Time to write in the number. Exchange, exchange, exchange. Time to exchange. Time to exchange the papers. Yeah. Give it to different neighbors.

Make sure you don't keep the same paper. Exchange, exchange. Yeah. You can exchange papers. Yes. Good. Exchange, exchange. Now give it to somebody. You can change many times. Like, dude, the two of you, change.

Yeah. Change, change, change, change, change, change, change. Change. Now stop. Stop. Now find a neighbor. Read it again. Punctuation. Find a neighbor. Good. Punctuation. Oh, you had, you had three. No, you need to find a neighbor.

Let me get your neighbor. Who is it? Who is, oh, Madhavji. God, you are a new friend. Good. Great.

Thank you.

Exactly. So then you do everyone who has 14 points and then you can just add some

Good. So now, excellent. Now you can go back to your seats. Everybody can sit. No, yeah, we will do just two rounds. That's fine, but go back to your seats. I'm gonna ask. I'm so happy that you are meeting new friends and having conversations.

That's the objective of these sessions. Just come to your seats. I want to invite to the stage anyone that has a paper with a punctuation of 14. Who has a 14 on the paper? Yeah, you need to add them up.

So count, count. You know how many in total do you have? Okay, so for example, you have... You go 12. Okay, so I think you are gonna be a... So count. Who has 14? Who has 13? 13? Who has 12? Come here, my friend.

12? Who else has a 12? Just look at the... at your paper and count on the back. How many points if you add? How many points in total you have? No? Who else has an 11? A 10? Great. Okay, Virginia, come here.

Who else has a 10? Who... Yes, come here. Great. Another 10. Let's do four people very quickly. So, Virginia, tell us quickly. What is the idea?

strategic partnerships with all stakeholders involved.

Okay, good point. Yeah, that's definitely we need it. We need to do it better

The idea is community based DTR initiatives like livelihoods and skill building.

And that's a very good point. I think we are tired of tiny community -based early warning systems here and there. We need to scale them up at really big, large scale.

So I have do no harm trust building and context of situation and data.

I think maybe that truss building, in terms of financing, that needs investment. That doesn't happen just for one day to the other. So I think that's an element in terms of climate finances. We need to push more for it.

She was not there. Sorry.

Have clarity on the problem that is being faced. Engage with stakeholders with the best information to tackle the problem.

Yeah, you need to talk to the right people that knows what is the problem.

So, we can say do a rapid assessment to find out the following. So better understanding on who are the victims of violence, of course with the gender desegregation, and what are the hidden stigmas in the community, and who have the most influential power in the community, probably to try to have an influence on all of these.

I really like this one. I think this is a very powerful one in terms of really getting to know the bottom of those conflict dynamics of power dynamics because without that you cannot do disaster reduction.

And the last one.

Okay, it says we need reliable data and we also need the money. We need to engage local stakeholders, government, academia, development partners and donors.

Excellent. So who, if you remember, who growled? Like just raise your hand. Who were the ones who growled these messages? Great. Yeah. So big applause. Excellent.

Thank you so much everyone, you can find your seats. If you can leave the papers at the door, unless you're very attached to them, we would love to see them. So we can actually use them for something useful after the session as well.

I'm just past Lisa for the closing words. We're running a couple minutes over. I hope you don't mind. And then we'll wrap up.

So first of all, thank you all for coming and for having this important discussion with us. Actually, we're so excited and motivated to continue this work altogether. And I think the most important point is also to reflect on our own work.

Like how, what can we do on a daily basis to make this happen, to make this work, to advance the topic, and to get everyone on board. Thank you so much. And yeah, this is the great work we're doing altogether.

The IFRC, ICRC, German Red Cross, and together with the Dirk Ulrichs from the Climate Center as well. Thank you so much for coming.

and you're all awake after lunch. You can still add stuff to the cartoons. We'll keep them up for a little bit. They'll go back to the anticipation booth for probably where you can find more info and more cartoons.

There is going to be an entire day of disaster -free interaction and conflict on Thursday, so we will continue unpacking a lot of these. And we will also have a session on anticipatory action in conflict, which is more the early warning system part of the spectrum, at another session on the same day of the DRR session.