

**Co-Chairs' Summary Report of
the Eleventh ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting on Disaster Relief
Brisbane, Australia, 16-17 April 2012**

Introduction

1. Pursuant to the decision of the 18th Ministerial Meeting of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) held in Bali on 23 July 2011, the Meeting of the 11th ARF Inter-Sessional Meeting on Disaster Relief (ISM on DR) was held in Brisbane, Australia on 16-17 April 2012. The Meeting was co-chaired by Mr. Jose Tavares, Director for ASEAN Political and Security Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, and Mr. Rod Smith, First Assistant Secretary, South-East Asia Division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia.
2. All ARF participants except the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mongolia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Sri Lanka and Timor Leste attended the Meeting. The Chair of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM), representatives of the Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC), the United Nations Office of Humanitarian Assistance (UNOCHA), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), European Commission Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), and the ASEAN Secretariat were also present. The List of Participants appears as **ANNEX 1**.

Agenda Item 1: Opening Session

3. In his opening remarks, Mr. Rod Smith, First Assistant Secretary, South-East Asia Division of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade of Australia, emphasised that the ARF remained an important forum for civil-military cooperation and regional confidence-building. To maintain its relevance, however, the ARF needed to continue to strengthen its role and develop closer links to work with other ASEAN groupings such as the East Asia Summit (EAS) and the ASEAN Defence Ministers' Meeting Plus (ADMM-Plus). The ARF had made a significant contribution in the area of disaster relief, particularly through its biennial disaster relief exercise. The objectives of the Meeting were to share experiences and lessons learned, to discuss the tools and exercises needed to better prepare for and respond to future natural disasters and to consider possible ways to improve coordination with other regional groupings. In light of the review of the ARF Work Plan on Disaster Relief, Mr Smith encouraged all ARF participants to begin a discussion on possible new activities for the period of 2012-2014.
4. Ambassador Nadjib Riphath Kesoema, Deputy for Foreign Affairs of the Coordinating Ministry of Political, Legal and Security of Indonesia, delivered Indonesia's opening remarks. He said national disasters would continue to confront countries in the Asia Pacific region, and cited the 11 April 2012 tsunami warning issued in Aceh, Indonesia as an example. In this context, it was important that the ARF continue to work to: 1) enhance coordination when dealing with disasters; 2) improve early warning systems to prevent casualties; and 3) continue to promote capacity-building and civil-military coordination in response to disasters. Ambassador Nadjib noted there had been successful outcomes from the ARF Disaster Relief Exercise (ARF DiREx) in Manado, Indonesia on 14-19 March 2011, despite the difficult circumstances in which it had been held (with the Japanese earthquake and tsunami on 11 March). He also briefed the Meeting on the results of the First Meeting of the

Conference of Parties to the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER COP) in March 2012, which had reaffirmed the ASEAN Leaders' decision that AADMER should be the main policy backbone and coordinating platform for disaster management cooperation in the ASEAN region.

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of Agenda

5. The Meeting considered and adopted the Agenda, which appears as **ANNEX 2**.

Agenda Item 3: Administrative Arrangements

6. The Meeting was informed of the Programme of Activities which appears as **ANNEX 3**.

Agenda Item 4: Lessons Learned Presentations

4. 1. Lessons Learned Presentation by Australia

7. Mr. Ross Barnett, Deputy Commissioner of the Queensland Police gave a presentation on lessons learned from the floods in the Australian state of Queensland in 2010-2011. The success of Queensland's response to the floods was assisted by effective inter-agency cooperation at the state and federal level. Legislated divisions of responsibilities between the Queensland State Disaster Coordinator (with Queensland Police as lead) and the State Recovery Coordinator (the Queensland Reconstruction Authority) had assisted by ensuring clear lines of communication during the crisis. In the aftermath of the disaster, the Government of Queensland had conducted a formal lessons-learned exercise that highlighted the importance of well-coordinated multi-agency and multi-jurisdictional responses. Noting the good networks and high levels of trust between Queensland and other jurisdictions, including the federal government, Mr. Barnett said Queensland was now formalizing many of these relationships in legislation. The review exercise had also identified areas for improvement such as local government capacity and inter-agency coordination. The Queensland Police now had a dedicated team for conducting disaster reviews, incident command training, public awareness campaigns and providing disaster response capacity building support to districts and sub-districts. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 4**.

4. 2. Lessons Learned Presentation by Japan

8. Mr. Taku Aramaki, National Security Policy Division, Foreign Affairs Bureau of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan, gave a presentation on the lessons learned from the East Japan Earthquake in March 2011. He gave an overview of the damage caused by the earthquake and tsunami, the worst disaster to have ever struck Japan. Casualties amounted to 15,270 deaths with 8499 missing. The estimated cost of the disaster was estimated at cost of USD200 billion. Rescue and experts teams from more than 28 countries, relief supplies from 55 countries and donations of ¥16.1 billion were received from 81 countries, regions and organisations. Coordination of international teams within Japan had presented challenges. In effect, international teams had to be self-sufficient. Mr Aramaki also gave an overview of the nuclear disaster at the Tokyo Electric Power Company Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station that followed the earthquake. Japan's focus was now on supporting afflicted people, ensuring information flows to the community and ensuring transparency for the international community. Japan noted it would host an international conference

on responses to natural disasters on 3-4 July 2012 in Sendai, Japan. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 5**.

4. 3. Lessons Learned Presentation by New Zealand

9. Mr. David Coetzee, Manager, Operations/National Controller of the Ministry of Civil Defence and Emergency Management of New Zealand, gave a presentation on New Zealand's response to the Christchurch earthquake of February 2011. Three phases of response had been run concurrently. Phase 1 focused on rescue, safety, shelter, food, water and utilities; phase 2 included recovery of the deceased, detailed assessments and providing welfare to residents; and phase 3 addressed community wellbeing and economic recovery. Challenges faced in the response operation included cordon management; movement of local populations; managing public information (including social media); volunteer management; and needs assessments. He urged different models of integrated disaster response (national, regional, local) be considered in members' planning for large scale disasters so that a best-fit response model for the circumstances and nature of an actual disaster could be drawn upon. Consultation with local communities and local business was key, particularly in the recovery phase. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 6**.
10. The Meeting discussed issues related to coordination of international assistance and recognized that offers of assistance needed to be made with an understanding that assistance missions may need to be self-sufficient. It was also important to align international assistance with the needs of the affected country, particularly in large disasters. Donors needed to be aware of the burden of excessive support on local authorities. Coordination between national agencies in receiving states was also identified as crucial.

Agenda Item 5: National Agency Presentations

5. 1. National Agency Presentation by EMA (Australia)

11. Mr. Campbell Darby, Director-General of Emergency Management Australia (EMA) noted some of the challenges that faced domestic agencies in times of disaster, including coordinating between federal and sub-federal governments, and ensuring ongoing information accuracy (with particular reference to social media). He emphasised the importance of coordination and communication across all levels of governments. He outlined Australia's multi-agency approach, whereby EMA provided a single channel for coordination of disaster response and recovery activities for all Australian states and territories. EMA also provided a single avenue through which domestic government requests for assistance could be made and met. He noted the importance of disaster relief planning across jurisdictions (including law enforcement) and across sectors. Australia was moving to a resilience footing in domestic disaster relief, based on an understanding of risks to ensure the best decisions were made on the information available. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 7**.

5. 2. National Agency Presentation by Indonesia-BNPB (Indonesia)

12. Mr. Jose Tavares, Director for ASEAN Political and Security Cooperation of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Indonesia, shared the Indonesian national experience in disaster management. He outlined National Law No. 24/2007, which established the National Agency for Disaster Management (BNPB), and its mandate to address disaster management at the national and provincial levels. He explained the scope of BNPB's work, including its structure, standby assets, operational mechanisms and

funding sources. He outlined BNPB's ongoing work to include risk reduction in the school curriculum and noted that a number of training and capacity-building projects involving the communities and non-government organisations had been undertaken. The document appears as **ANNEX 8**.

5. 3. Presentation by the Chair of the ACDM (Thailand)

13. Thailand, as Chair of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) presented an overview of the work of the ACDM, including the establishment of the ASEAN Emergency Rapid Assessment Team (ASEAN ERAT) and its successful deployment in the aftermath of the large floods in Thailand in 2011. With reference to the initiative on disaster rapid regional response agreed by the East Asia Summit (EAS) Leaders in Bali in November 2011, Thailand advised a meeting of a working group, consisting of the ASEAN Secretariat, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Australia, would be convened in Thailand to study linkages between the work plan set out in the Leaders' initiative and the AADMER Work Programme. The ACDM would invite the Chair and Vice-Chair of the ASEAN Defence Senior Officials' Meeting (ADSOM) to exchange views on civil-military cooperation at the 20th ACDM Meeting, scheduled for July 2012. The ASEAN Regional Disaster Emergency Relief Exercise (ARDEX) would be held in Viet Nam in 2013. The role of women in disaster management had been agreed as the theme for the ASEAN Day on Disaster Management and International Day for Disaster Reduction on 13 October 2012. ASEAN Disaster Awareness Week would be celebrated starting 17 November, along with the 1st Anniversary of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance (AHA) Centre. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 9**.

5. 4. Presentations by China

14. Mr. Zhang Xuequan, of the Division of Disaster Relief of the Department of Disaster Relief, Ministry of Civil Affairs of China, presented an overview of natural disasters and disaster management in China. He highlighted practices including establishing and improving disaster management systems; improving laws and regulations on disaster management; building a disaster emergency relief system; constructing major disaster-reduction projects; promoting scientific and technological applications in disaster reduction and relief efforts; improving social mobilization mechanisms; raising public awareness of disaster prevention and reduction, and promoting international cooperation and exchange on disaster management. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 10**.

15. Professor Mei Wang from the National Defence University of China briefed the Meeting on preparations for the 3rd ARF Seminar on the Laws and Regulations of Disaster Relief, to be co-chaired by Indonesia, China and the United States and to be held 11-13 June 2012 in Beijing.

16. The Meeting discussed lessons-learned in regard to coordination, cooperation and information management. The Meeting underscored the importance of building strong networks between national agencies and departments and noted the utility of electronic information-sharing systems that could operate across all levels of government. The Meeting also exchanged experiences in handling social media vis-à-vis disaster management. Social media provided a useful platform for advice to citizens, but could also spread misinformation and rumours that needed to be countered quickly.

17. The Meeting noted that national disaster management agencies needed to cooperate and coordinate with regional and international governments and agencies, including the United Nations. Strong relationships between international agencies were encouraged. Standby arrangements were also critical in facilitating responses and relief operation.

Agenda Item 6: Briefings

6. 1. ASEAN Developments (ASEAN Secretariat)

18. Ms. Adelina Kamal, Head of the Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance Division of the ASEAN Secretariat updated the Meeting on ASEAN cooperation in the field of disaster management. There were a number of obligations to be fulfilled by ASEAN members under the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER), including legislative, administrative and other necessary measures to implement AADMER at the national level. Ms. Kamal also briefed the Meeting on the AADMER Work Programme (2010-2015) and its flagship projects for Phase 1 (2010-2012). ASEAN, under the AADMER framework, was continuing to work in partnership with other regional and international organisations and centres, as well as academic and scientific communities and civil society, through a consortium known as the AADMER Partnership Group (APG). A plan for engagement with the private sector was also being developed.
19. Ms Kamal also noted that at the 19th ASEAN Summit in November 2011, ASEAN leaders confirmed AADMER was to serve as the main regional “policy backbone” and as a coordinating platform in ASEAN. In this regard, other sectors and mechanisms in ASEAN were to synchronise their policies using AADMER as the common platform. The recent AADMER COP had appointed an Executive Director of the AHA Centre and endorsed the ACDM as the Governing Board of the AHA Centre. Ms. Kamal outlined the AHA Centre’s phases of development from 2011 onwards. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 11** and an excerpt from the AADMER Work Programme appears as **ANNEX 12**.
20. The Meeting exchanged views on the way forward of the AHA Centre. The ASEAN Secretariat noted institutional development of the AHA Centre was a challenge. The AHA Centre was focusing on this challenge and would be strengthened by an increase in the number of staff and by putting in place operational procedures, work plans and guidelines. The other challenge facing the AHA Centre was ensuring that it could add value and play a role for the ASEAN Member States and therefore, establishing an AHA Centre connection with the Member States was a priority for 2012-2015.
21. The meeting noted the role of the ASEAN Secretary-General as the Executive Secretary of the AADMER COP, informing the COP of decisions by the ASEAN Leaders and developments in other ASEAN sectors or other ASEAN mechanisms. Some autonomy had been entrusted to the Executive Director of the AHA Centre, but certain decisions were referred to the Governing Board of the AHA Centre.

6. 2. EAS Developments (Australia and Indonesia)

22. Indonesia and Australia briefed the Meeting on the disaster rapid response initiative, endorsed by the EAS leaders in November 2011. Australia noted that the initiative calls for an “expanded ACDM” made up of EAS member countries to take forward a programme of work. The “expanded ACDM” would meet back-to-back with the

ACDM and would be supported by a Secretariat. Australia noted that the “expanded ACDM” had not yet been convened. In advance of that occurring, the ACDM had called for a working group, comprising of the ASEAN Secretariat, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand and Australia to meet to discuss linkages between work programs set out in the EAS initiative and AADMER. The working group was yet to meet, but it would be necessary to demonstrate progress by the time of the next EAS leaders’ meeting. The Meeting noted the ACDM’s advice that the working group meeting referred in the ACDM Chair’s presentation under Item 5.3, would study linkages between the proposed EAS Work Plan and the AADMER Work Programme. The EAS concept paper on the Practical Approach to Enhance Regional Cooperation on Disaster Rapid response appears as **ANNEX 13**.

23. The Meeting recognised that to the extent possible, broader regional disaster response initiatives should be synchronized with AADMER.

6. 3. UNOCHA Developments

24. The Meeting noted the briefing by Mr. Oliver Lacey-Hall, Head of the Regional Office for Asia and the Asia Pacific of the UNOCHA. He explained the work program of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) of the United Nations which formed the new key strategic coordination mechanism for the humanitarian system. UNOCHA was preparing for a consultative meeting involving existing regional and international organisations to discuss whether there was a need to develop a single set of guidelines for use by all actors and countries in the event of a disaster. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 14**.

6. 4. European Commission Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO)

25. The Meeting noted the briefing by Mr. David Verboom, the Head of Regional Support Office of the European Commission Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO). Mr Verboom provided the Meeting with an overview of ECHO, including its mandate, principles and reach, as well as its activities in integrating humanitarian aid and civil protection. ECHO was closely collaborating with UNOCHA including through training, exercises, emergency assessments and response. It was actively planning its cooperation with ASEAN and continued to support the AADMER Partnership Group on implementation of AADMER. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 15**.

6. 5. AusAID

26. Mr. Andrew Cumpston, A/g Assistant Director-General, Asia Strategies and Partnership Branch, AusAID, briefed the Meeting on developments in Australia’s aid program, humanitarian action policy and regional disaster management. He noted Australia’s priority was to provide funding in a way that met both the immediate needs of crisis-affected people and facilitated the transition from relief to development. Noting that the bulk of Australia’s humanitarian aid in the region was delivered by multilateral partners, Australia’s capacity building work was mainly delivered bilaterally, working with partner governments to identify and implement priorities. He emphasized the critical role that regional coordination plays in improving disaster relief and noted the ARF provides a robust mechanism to take this forward. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 16**.

Agenda Item 7: ARF Tools for HADR

7. 1. Model Arrangements

27. The Meeting noted the briefing by the United States on the proposal to establish an ARF Rapid Disaster Response Agreement (RDR). The RDR was an evolution of the ARF Model Arrangements for the Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets (MCDA) in Disaster Relief (the Model Arrangements). The US noted the RDR was not intended to be a multilateral agreement, but provide a set of pre-negotiated and pre-concluded bilateral agreements between potential affected and assisting states that could be tailored to a country's needs. Each pairing of countries should negotiate an agreement suitable to their own needs and in compliance with their national laws and regulations. The RDR was not a standing agreement, rather a temporary, disaster-relief specific agreement that would be used only in the event of an extreme natural disaster. It would remain in effect for a limited period of time to allow for military assets to conduct rapid disaster response operations until such time as the domestic government and NGO assets could effectively respond to the disaster. The United States encouraged ARF participants to indicate in principle their intent to use the RDR Agreement in the event of future disasters. The briefing and a copy of the Agreement appears as **ANNEX 17**.
28. The Meeting noted with appreciation the proposal for the RDR Agreement. Some participants observed foreign military assets had been used in previous disasters without any formal agreement in place between affected and assisting countries. Nevertheless, the Meeting viewed the RDR Agreement as a positive initiative that could be further considered including in a less legal format such as regional guidelines to avoid bottlenecks, where appropriate, for international assistance and support. The Meeting also noted the importance of national sovereignty and domestic legislative issues in the use of the foreign military assets. The Meeting recalled the decision of the 17th ARF (Hanoi, 23 July 2010) that the ARF Voluntary Model Arrangement for Use of Foreign Military and Civil Defence Assets (MDCA) in Disaster Relief should be a reference non-binding model to be utilized for bilateral arrangements between ARF Participants on a voluntary basis.

7. 2. Disaster Relief Mapping Service (Australia)

29. The Meeting noted the update by Mr. Guenther Ebenwaldner of the Defence Imagery and Geospatial Organisation of Australia regarding the geospatial disaster relief mapping service developed by Australia and Singapore. Mr. Ebenwaldner informed the meeting of further technical improvements to the service, including making the file-transfer-protocol (FTP) access easier, creating a failover, improving the backup regime and installing end-point security. He noted the service had been utilized to an extent during the Christchurch earthquake in 2011 and gave an overview on how to use the service. He encouraged ARF participants to provide feedback on the future extension of this service, taking into account the limited resources available for the project, and encouraged feedback from participants on whether it provided sufficient utility and value. Log-in details for the website were provided to each delegation. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 18**.

7. 3. International Disaster Response Law (IFRC)

30. The Meeting was briefed by Ms. Tessa Kelly, Coordinator for Asia Pacific Disaster Law Programme of the IFRC, on the importance of international disaster response

law (IDRL) and the IDRL Guidelines and its Model Acts developed by the IFRC. The Meeting noted that the IDRL has been used by ASEAN in developing the AADMER Work Programme, and the IFRC has been supporting ASEAN in the implementation and institutionalisation of the AADMER using IDRL as a reference document. The IFRC has the capacity to assist countries to review their national disaster response laws to ensure conformity with the IDRL Guidelines. The presentation appears as **ANNEX 19**.

7. 4. Open Discussion: Development of these and future tools

31. No issue was raised under this agenda item.

Dinner speaker: Major-General Wilson, Chair, Queensland Reconstruction Authority, Australia

32. The presentation by General Wilson appears at **ANNEX 20**.

Agenda Item 8: ARF Disaster Relief Exercises (DiREx)

8. 1. Review of 2011 Exercise (Indonesia and Japan)

33. Indonesia and Japan briefed the meeting on the outcomes of the ARF DiREx, held in Manado, Indonesia, on 14-19 March 2011. The Exercise had provided an opportunity for the ARF to verify the existing tools and guidelines under the framework of ASEAN and the ARF. A total of 25 ARF participants and six international organizations attended the exercise, involving 4334 personnel across three activities: the table-top exercise (TTX), the field training exercise (FTX) and the humanitarian civic action (HCA). The meeting congratulated Indonesia and Japan for their conduct of the exercises despite the tragic Great East Japan Earthquake of 11 March 2011.

34. An After Action Review (AAR) had recommended that the future TTX should include role-playing and have a well-defined scale and scope. It was also important for participating countries and agencies to share views on the disaster relief policy of the affected country in order to address disaster relief more effectively and more rapidly. The AAR suggested that follow-up activities to the exercise should be conducted. Japan and Indonesia offered their assistance to future co-chairs of the ARF DiREx. The Meeting noted that as a similar exercise was planned for 2013 under the framework of the ADMM-Plus and a domestic exercise was to be organised by Indonesia in 2013 (possibly with some international involvement), it would be important to avoid duplication of efforts. The briefings by Indonesia and Japan appear as **ANNEX 21 and 22**.

35. The Meeting viewed the ARF DiREx as a critical practical element of the ARF and discussed possible elements of a roadmap to guide future co-chairs. Taking into consideration the scale of the ARF DiREx in Manado, the Meeting noted future co-chairs may not always be able or feel it necessary to organize DiREx on a similar large scale. The Meeting discussed the possibility of having smaller-scale and tailor-made DiREx exercises focusing on particular elements of disaster response, such as search and rescue, disaster emergency and logistics. A full-scale ARF DiREx could then be conducted at longer intervals. The Meeting agreed there should continue to be civil-military cooperation components in every exercise. It was suggested that a consular element might usefully be included in future exercises. New Zealand offered to work with co-chairs of the next DiREx on this. Australia noted it also would be pleased to work with the DiREx co-chairs in the planning of the next DiREx.

36. The Meeting touched on the possibility of linking the ARF DiREx and the ARDEX, particularly for larger-scale exercises.

8. 2. Planning for Next Exercise

37. The Meeting welcomed the Republic of Korea's nomination to co-chair the 3rd ARF DiREx. The Republic of Korea briefed the Meeting on preparations for the next exercise, noting it was consulting ASEAN Member States directly, as well as through the Cambodian Chair, on the nomination of an ASEAN Member State to co-chair the ARF DiREx. Once an ASEAN co-chair was identified, the Republic of Korea would first consult with the co-chair and then circulate an exercise plan to all ARF participants. An initial planning conference was anticipated for 2012 and the final planning conference for 2013, before the ARF DiREx. The Republic of Korea was considering holding the TTX and FTX concurrently and sought inputs from the former ARF DiREx co-chairs to ensure smooth preparations.

Agenda Item 9: Regional Coordination/Linkages between Regional Groupings

9. 1. Introductory Comments (Australia and Indonesia)

38. The Meeting recognised the numerous regional initiatives in the area of disaster relief, including the AADMER Work Programme, the ADMM-Plus Experts' Working Group on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief (ADMM-Plus EWG on HADR) and the EAS disaster response initiative. The key was to ensure they complemented each other and built the region's capacity. The meeting saw value in synchronizing to the extent possible, ARF disaster relief activities across the AADMER Work Programme, while recognizing the ARF's wider membership. It was recommended the Co-Chairs of the ADMM-Plus Experts Working Group on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief be invited to address the next ARF ISM on Disaster Relief. The Meeting also noted that the ISM on Disaster Relief could also receive regular updates on the EAS disaster response initiative.

39. The Meeting reaffirmed that each of the regional groupings has its own uniqueness and advantages, and therefore the ARF should continue exploring complementarities among these groupings. Indonesia noted that the overlap of regional groupings, to some extent, could not be avoided and could be very useful, particularly when looking at issues of common concern. The Meeting agreed that the ARF should continue elaborating effective instruments to assist its participants in disaster relief capacity building and noted the proposal by Russia to develop a regional network of national emergency management centres. A presentation on the Russian National Emergency Management Centre appears as **ANNEX 23**.

9. 2. Presentation by the ADPC

40. Mr. Aslam Perwaiz, Head of Disaster Risk Management Systems of the Asia Disaster Preparedness Centre (ADPC), gave a presentation on regional coordination and linkages between regional groupings. He noted the ADPC has been playing an active role in bridging the gaps between individual countries and the international community by conducting activities on information management and dissemination, building the capacity of national and sub-national authorities, and promoting cooperation among regional groupings through the Regional Consultative Committee for Disaster Management (RCC). The presentation appears as **ANNEX 24**.

9. 3. Open Discussion

41. The Meeting expressed appreciation for contributions by the ADPC, particularly in working with and supporting ASEAN and the ARF, noted members' ongoing support for the AHA Centre and suggested cooperation with the AHA Centre be included in the revised ARF Disaster Relief Work Plan.

Agenda Item 10: Review of the ARF Disaster Relief Work Plan

10. 1. Overview (Australia and Indonesia)

42. The Meeting recalled that the ARF Disaster Relief Work Plan was due for updating. The Meeting was encouraged to discuss the process and substance for the new Work Plan and submit comments and suggestions.

10. 2. Update on Priority Area 1 (Australia)

43. The Meeting noted the update by Australia on Priority Area 1 - Disaster Risk and Vulnerability Identification, Reduction and Prevention in Selected ARF Sub-Region. The Meeting took note that Australia has been constrained in moving forward due to the absence of a co-lead country. Australia noted that disaster risk reduction remained a crucial area for the international community and noted its intention to re-nominate as a co-lead under the updated Work Plan. Australia noted that many of the activities currently listed under Priority 1 were by the APDC and thanked the ADPC for its activities in the region.

Agenda Item 10. 3. : Update on Priority Area 2 (Cambodia and United States)

44. The US noted it intended to re-nominate as a Co-Lead for Priority Area 2 – Improving Government Emergency Response, Relief and Early Recovery.

10. 4. Comments on the ARF Work Plan

45. The Meeting noted with appreciation the paper on the Review of the ARF Disaster Relief prepared by the ASEAN Secretariat, which appears as **ANNEX 25**.
46. The Meeting agreed that in developing the new ARF Work Plan, the ISM should:
- simplify and/or narrow down the current priority areas
 - consider setting a two-year timeframe for the updated work plan, which would give a greater immediacy to the ARF's work and increase the likelihood of activities being implemented
 - identify lead countries for priority areas.
 - only list activities in the Work Plan that have co-sponsors identified (understanding this would be in line with decisions adopted at other ARF ISMs, including at the 9th ARF ISM on Counter-terrorism and Transnational Crime in Kuala Lumpur in 2011)
 - be guided by the Hanoi Plan of Action
 - synchronise, to the extent possible, new activities with the AADMER Work Programme, while recognizing the ARF's broader membership.
47. The ASEAN Secretariat noted that in line with ASEAN Leaders' decision that AADMER should be the main policy backbone and coordinating platform for disaster management cooperation in the ASEAN region, AADMER should guide

implementation of the ARF Work Plan and ensure ASEAN lead countries were nominated in each priority area, while working in partnership with non-ASEAN ARF participants.

48. The Meeting agreed the ARF could build on existing activities in the AADMER Work Programme, noting the example of activity 7.1. of the AADMER Work Programme (review of existing domestic policies, procedures and regulations being used to facilitate the entry of international assistance).
49. The Meeting agreed that the ACDM Chair should be invited to future ARF ISMs on disaster relief. In addition, the meeting noted suggestions from the ACDM Chair and several ASEAN countries that each ASEAN country should include its ACDM National Focal Point (or representative) in its delegation to the ARF ISM on disaster relief.
50. The Co-Chairs invited written suggestions on the priority areas for the new Work Plan to be sent to the Co-Chairs and the ASEAN Secretariat. The Co-Chairs would work with the ASEAN Secretariat to produce the first draft of the new Work Plan which would be circulated to ARF participants for comment, possibly in advance of the ARF ISG on CBMs and PD on 7-9 May 2012 but before the ARF SOM at the end of May.

Agenda Item 11: Co-Chairs' Summary Report

51. The Meeting noted that the draft Co-Chairs' Summary Report would be circulated for comments, with a view to being finalized in advance of the ARF ISG on CBMs and PD on 7-9 May 2012.

Agenda Item 12: Closing remarks

52. The Co-Chairs expressed appreciation to all ARF participants for their contributions. Discussions had demonstrated the extent of interaction underway between the various regional arrangements and fora and underscored the importance of determining how to best coordinate these efforts. There was consensus that some degree of overlap was inevitable and in many cases, desirable. The challenge was to identify areas where each organization, including the ARF, could add-value, be streamlined and synchronised.
53. The Meeting welcomed the invitation of the Co-Chairs to the 12th ARF ISM on DR to be held in Indonesia at the end of 2012 or in the first quarter of 2013.
54. The Meeting expressed gratitude to Australia and Indonesia for their effective co-chairmanship. They also thanked the Government of Australia for the hospitality and arrangements in hosting the 11th ARF ISM on DR.

...