



European Symposium:
Results of the FP 7 CATALYST Project
Capacity Development for
Natural Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation
Wednesday, 11th September 2013

MINUTES

Prepared under contract from the European Commission
Grant agreement no: 283177
Theme ENV.2011.1.3.4-1
[Capacity building in natural hazards risks reduction]
in the 7th EU Framework Programme

The CATALYST Project

A central aim of the FP7 CATALYST project (a Coordination Action) has been to exchange knowledge and best practices in DRR and CCA among practitioners and scientists working in hazard risk reduction and adaptation, and to develop capacity in these areas.

CATALYST does not seek to create new knowledge. Rather, the project explores ways to more effectively assemble, analyse and use the rapidly expanding knowledge base of natural hazards and disasters in order to then provide guidelines for transformational practices both before and after such disasters occur.

Together the practitioners and scientists involved in the project form the CATALYST Think Tank members who have been working together to describe the state of the art, and to identify existing and new best practices that may be transformational in this field, and network and research gaps and barriers. At the same time, the project has served to strengthen and extend existing networks, and develop new networks especially between those working in disaster risk reduction (DRR) and climate change adaptation (CCA).

Four best practices papers outline the transformational practices, the environmental policy implications for DRR (and CCA) and recommendations for four regions of the world: Mediterranean Europe (droughts, floods, earthquakes); South and Southeast Asia (floods, tropical storms cyclones, droughts, earthquakes); East & West Africa (floods, droughts, storms) and Central America and the Caribbean (hurricanes, tropical storms, droughts, earthquakes, tsunamis). The primary audiences are practitioners, policy makers, the public and the media.

A best practices policy notebook has been published for a wider group of stakeholders and policy makers. It summarizes key results and recommendations of the project and outline areas requiring advancement in DRR and CCA.

All public outcomes are available at the project website: <http://www.catalyst-project.eu>.

Contact: Matt Hare and Caroline van Bers, seeconsult GmbH (Coordinator) info@catalyst.info

Table of Contents

Executive summary.....	3
Session I: Introduction to CATALYST	4
Session II: Main CATALYST Results	4
Session III: Communication and dissemination	7
Session IV: Feedback on Results and Dissemination	7
Session V: Follow-up to CATALYST.....	10
Annex 1: Agenda and Participants.....	11
Annex 2: Criteria for best practices	14

European Symposium:
Results of the FP 7 CATALYST Project
Capacity Development for Natural Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation

Wednesday, 11th September 2013
European Commission, DG for Research & Innovation, Brussels

Executive summary

The purpose of this symposium has been for CATALYST project partners and several members of the project's Think Tank to share and discuss with the European Commission, UNISDR and other relevant agencies and organisations, the achievements and future plans of the FP7 CATALYST project. This includes, in particular, the knowledge compiled about current practices to address natural hazards (including climate change-induced ones) and those practices that show promise to be transformative for future efforts to reduce and adapt to the risks of natural hazards. Driven by the accumulated knowledge and experience of a global think tank, the project has also identified key networks in Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) and Climate Change Adaptation (CCA), gaps in networks and research, and key needs in capacity development.

The project received positive feedback from European Commission representatives as well as the Think tank Members (TTM) who participated. It was discussed that the added value of the work being done has been the integration of the various views of the Think Tank Members (TTM). UNISDR agreed that the CATALYST work is complementary to their work on best practices – it is not a formal process like theirs with country representatives, but instead working with practitioners at a sometimes much lower level. A discussion point was on how representative the Think Tank Members are. The TTM group is self-selecting, since it is based on voluntary participation in a personal capacity. CATALYST has had the benefit of knowledgeable practitioners to support it. The discussion affirmed the value of the knowledge the TTM had provided the project.

Another issue raised by the EC was how the Best Practices were selected and under what analytical framework. The project responded that since it is a stakeholder-driven process, using stakeholder knowledge, not a research project, CATALYST neither had the mandate nor resources to do so. Again, CATALYST has to be seen as being complimentary to more formal analyses done by ISDR, for example.

Finally, an EC representative suggested that there was nothing new in the knowledge products produced. Although TTM present disagreed with the representative, it must also be mentioned that the SREX report says that there is sufficient knowledge already out there, and that all we need to do at the moment is compile and disseminate it better. This is what CATALYST was designed for. Our role is get the knowledge to policy makers who do not yet know everything (maybe those with new mandates due to mainstreaming activities).

Session I: Introduction to CATALYST

Opening by Denis Peter and Paola Agostini (Project Officer), Climate Change and Natural Hazards Unit, Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission

Mr. Peter provided an overview of the beginnings of and the expected results of the CATALYST Project. He described how this follows previous products/results of other initiatives/projects of the Climate Change and Natural Hazards Unit such as NAVAS, DRR school programme, and the principle of multi-risk assessment.

Opening by Demetrio Innocenti, UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) – Regional Office for Europe (UNISDR has supported the European Commission in its promotion of the CATALYST project)

Mr. Innocenti highlighted the innovative aspect of CATALYST, that of compiling existing knowledge instead of producing new knowledge. The project has served to stress the importance of resilience, and points to some of the post- Hyogo framework for action directions. The CATALYST consultations have demonstrated how science supports or can support DRR. It has pointed to further research needed in risk assessment, multi hazard approaches, and accounting for losses including standardization of this, to name a few themes. Although DRR has received insufficient attention in the scientific world and insufficient funding generally, it has brought in the political and social aspects of reducing the risks associated with natural hazards. This symposium is a good opportunity to strengthen the importance of DRR.

Symposium Purpose and Agenda, Matt Hare, seeconsult GmbH

This final symposium was intended to share results of the CATALYST project, obtain stakeholder feedback on results, and discuss plans for following-up the project. The symposium agenda can be found in Annex 1 of this document. The presentations are available from the project website: <http://catalyst-project.eu/09finalsymposium.html>

Session II: Main CATALYST Results

Overview of activities and outputs , Matt Hare, seeconsult GmbH

The CATALYST Project has compiled and analysed existing knowledge from stakeholders, supplemented by the literature, for practitioners but also for the policy sector. The emphasis has been on capacity development through an assessment of current and promising best practices in particular those that are considered to be transformative for DRR and CCA. At the same time the project has made specific recommendations for capacity development and the strengthening of networks in these fields. The presentations are available from the project website: <http://catalyst-project.eu/09finalsymposium.html>

The project was summarised in the presentation, *1_Catalyst_Project_Overview_Hare.pdf*

Issues and opportunities in the regions, Jaroslav Mysiak, FEEM

The results of the assessment of issues and opportunities are presented in CATALYST's *Report on issues, gaps and opportunities, and network coverage*. The presentation outlined the geographic focus of the project, the patterns of natural hazard exposure and risk, and vulnerability and coping capacity.

See presentation: http://catalyst-project.eu/2_Catalyst_RegionalOpportunities_Mysiak.pdf

Introduction to the Best Practice papers, Cristina Serra, TWAS

The four regional papers are entitled *Before disaster strikes: Transformations in Practice and Policy*, and then distinguished by the names of the four regions. They can be downloaded from homepage the project website: <http://catalyst-project.eu/09finalsymposium.html>

See presentation: http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/3_Catalyst_Intro_BestPractices_Serra.pdf

Best Practices – East and West Africa (EWA), Jochen Luther, UFZ:

The presentation, http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/4_EWA_Best-Practices_Luther.pdf

Best Practices - South and Southeast Asia (SSA), Peter van der Keur, GEUS

The presentation, http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/5_SSA-BestPractices_vdKeur.pdf

Best Practices - European Mediterranean (EUM), Peter van der Keur, GEUS

The presentation, http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/6_SSA-BestPractices_vdKeur.pdf

Best Practices - Central America and the Caribbean (CAC), Elisa Calliari, FEEM

This presentation, http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/7_CAC_BestPractices_Callieri.pdf

Discussion

Q: What is the project's understanding of best practices and what are the take home messages?

A: There was a significant discussion among partners and think tank members on what constitutes a best practice. The key was to try to find examples that could be transferable.

A: Explained the criteria for best practices (see Annex 2 listing of the criteria considered). There is no holistic framework to evaluate practices, no indicator system, no long-term projects which can say this is a real best practice

Q: Have you identified concrete examples that could be practical /useful?

A: Some are very practical but sometimes you cannot find one.

Q: We need further information for policies makers; what happened to other hazards like wild fire?

A: In this project we had to focus on few major hazards. However, wild fires have been mentioned in the context of drought.

A: We have been heavily focused on DRR, and capacity development that is working.

Q: How did you select the case studies (BP)?

We were guided by think tank members, by less formal networks, and then with all information being filtered by CATALYST experts.

Q: Have the Think Tank members considered economics issues in the selection of best practices?

There was no formal economic evaluation.

Q: On what type of evidence were the best practices based?

A: The potency of the benefit / the long-term positive effect, according to TTM knowledge

Suggestion: Describe the evaluation method of the best practices on the CATALYST Website and list experts who can be referred to, so that users have quick access to what is behind the booklets (Best practice papers) and to sources of answers.

Suggestion: A knowledge management system would be a good tool for us to develop as a follow up.

Research Gaps, Networks, Fostering Capacity Development

The presentations on research gaps, networks and fostering capacity development can be downloaded from homepage the project website: <http://catalyst-project.eu/09finalsymposium.html>

Presentation: East and West Africa (EWA) – *Jochen Luther, UFZ*,
http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/8_EWA_Gaps_Networks_Luther.pdf

Presentation: South and Southeast Asia (SSA)– *Peter van der Keur, GEUS*,
http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/9_SSA-Networks_Gaps_vdKeur.pdf

Presentation: [European](#) Mediterranean (EUM)– *Peter van der Keur*,
http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/10_EUM-Gaps_Networks_Keur.pdf

Presentation: [Central](#) America and the Caribbean (CCA) – *Elisa Calliari, FEEM*,
http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/11_CAC_Gaps_Networks_Calliari.pdf

Training Module on DRR & CCA - *Fons Jaspers, Alterra* : [12_CATALYST_trainingModule_Jaspers.pdf](#)

Special report on Stakeholders Advice to Policy Makers

Presentation: Summary of Stakeholder Advice - *Matt Hare, seeconsult*
http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/13_CATALYST_Stakeholder_Advice_to_Policy_Hare.pdf

Presentation: Stakeholders Advice to Policy Makers: South Mediterranean experience in drought DRR – *Raffaele Giordano, Water Research Institute – National Research Council*

http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/14_CATALYST_StakeholderAdvice_Giordano.pdf

Discussion

Discussion question posed: There is a lot of unused knowledge. Should we focus more on capacity consolidation instead of capacity development?

A: We should capacitate people to do what they are already doing. For example we should not try to introduce “resilient projects” because there are already projects handling with resilience. They are just are not named as resilient projects.

A: Not only the knowledge is the capacity but the capacity to use this knowledge is the capacity.

A: **Training** needs to take care of the content and the presentation of the content (notes, pictures). It must be very easy to understand the content, intention, because if there is no real “presenter” information could be misunderstood. We should take care of terminology and especially in translation.

A: CATALYST partners have prepared a training module. Principle module can be useful for them.

A: This could be used for training for DEVCO staff

Discussion item: Stakeholder consultation process

A: Outcome of CATALYST can feed some initiatives (stakeholder advice from for the horn of Africa)

Q: Relating to risk assessment can be quite confusing. Have you seen best practices for risk assessment (methodology)?

A: No standard way to account disaster losses in Europe. How we can improve to standardise this is a main issue?

Q: Was there any work in the regions working on the assessment of standardization?

No, but Elisa Calliari (CAC) knows of an example in Jamaica.

Session III: Communication and dissemination

Communication and dissemination strategy and activities, Cristina Serra, TWAS

Presentation: http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/16_Catalyst_Dissemination_Serra.pdf

Best Practices Policy Notebook

(published: http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/CATALYST_D65_Best_Practices_Policy_Notebook.pdf)

Presentation: http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/15_CATALYST_Best_Practice_Notebook_vBers.pdf

Session IV: Feedback on Results and Dissemination *(Moderator: Jaroslav Mysiak)*

Panel Discussion: Paola Agostini (Stakeholder Advisory Board member) and Raffaele Giordano, Frank van Weert, Jeroen Warner (TTM)

Discussion Question: Development of a project concept including location, theme, type of capacity development, skills/knowledge needed, who can implement? Who can be approached for resources?

A: You don't need a new set of skills to do DRR. Many commonalities with natural resource management and planning and organisational structures do not have to change radically.

A: Building on natural resource management – optimise existing resources.

Q: Enhancing capacity at the local level

A: Existing communities in the Mediterranean have a lot of knowledge (in drought management) based on experience but need to look at capacities, cultural contexts and needs of communities where you want to embed this knowledge.

A: Why was the private sector not represented? They are becoming more important. There is no obvious profit motive for businesses to join the network.

A: Best practices are a picture of a given reality but 10 years later the practice and the network of actors in it are not as important. Many things change and we need to refresh the Best Practices.

A: Institutionalising best practices in our western sense is not always the best approach. So what do the TTM suggest? Need to be sensitive to the local situation – it can be very difficult to do a local assessment – all kinds of interests are at work.

Q: We have seen a lot of knowledge management has occurred through exchange/interactions in networks. How do we perpetuate these Networks?

A: you really want people to internalise knowledge from networks like ours. How do we reach them ?

A: ok to have multiple networks and platforms (more opportunities to reach the multitude of audiences)

A: secondments and training exchanges are good learning opportunities. People do not change their behaviour until they have the experience e.g. through simulation. This happens in universities but not so much among government agencies.

A: There are programmes that promote exchanges at various levels linked to DRR/CCA. Visit Europeaid website: http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/index_en.htm

Funding possibilities for follow up:

- Call for proposals/funding: <http://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/work/funding/>
- Suggestion that CATALYST focus more on climate change adaptation.
- Funding for exchange for international cooperation is available (Paola)

Discussion Question: How do we assess the capability and how do we compare it? Is there learning capacity?

There is a great variability of functions to assess the capacity

For the stakeholders in the countries it is similar to what they are doing already. We need better planning; and to make use of the existing knowledge and institutional structures.

Discussion Question: How we can optimize already existing knowledge? What might be the best way to assess the capacity that is available there?

Droughts are an issue in southern Europe. Is there anything the other parts of Europe that can learn from the experiences in southern Europe?

A: Yes. The knowledge is there but the transfer of knowledge is limited. We should be very clear on the context of the knowledge produced and where it shall be put into practice. A further step would be to know in which context the practices are useful.

Q: There is no balance of actors. Best practices are mostly community-oriented. There are no best practices for the private sector.

A: There is no profit in it for industry.

A: Best practices just give a picture of a given moment in a given location. Ten years later the situation has changed and will look different. We need to know what information is constant and what needs to be adapted when we put it in practice (somewhere else; in future time).

What is needed:

- various sectors need to be connected globally
- Involve private business enterprises
- Informal practices that are legal and administratively acceptable
- Internal or external proposals for best practices

Discussion question: The European network is helping to create institutions in developing countries. Apart from experiences in the CATALYST project, have you encountered difficulties in other countries?

A: No

A: Try to involve local stakeholders. Have to take to account culture, institutional, political, etc. issues.

A: Will need to do baseline studies to get to know the real needs. What needs need to get adapted?

A: Example central America: student internship in Nicaragua

Discussion question: we are now mainly focused on understanding and assess the capacity. What can we do to better share capacity? Where are opportunities? How we can make sure that people share knowledge.

A: make information accessible in part by internalising/embedding it.

A: People like exchanges. We need to see from inside how it works. Participation can take place through gaming, simulation etc. so that people experience it and learn.

A: EU Funding EU level to exchange among countries outside of the EU is available at the university level but not at ministerial level.

A: Make resources accessible PLUS internalize the knowledge; dissemination, advocacy, trial runs, etc.

See EuropeAid website, Global Climate Change Alliance, Partners for Resilience

Discussion question: CATALYST has created an informal network. Is the Catalyst approach interesting to you? Will you pick up something in your coming projects?

A: Would love to be part of the practice but it needs funding.

A: we are good at including practitioners and scholars but how can we get policymakers more involved.

A: it is helpful to understand why some knowledge is not introduced in policy. "we do not speak the same language."

A: Most of the added value emerges from person-to-person meetings and not from virtual, internet platforms.

A: informal networks are crucial for gathering information. And by implementing the knowledge it helps to keep the network alive. This is the idea behind CATALYST-LOCAL which will be introduced next.

A: It is helpful to remember some organisations are not interested in sharing knowledge for free.

Session V: Follow-up to CATALYST

“CATALYST-Local” Community of Practice and Projects, Matt Hare, seeconsult

Presentation: http://catalyst-project.eu/doc/17_Catalyst_Local_Hare.pdf

- Locations for follow up projects: Italy; Jakarta; Guatemala floods/ volcano's; India- Himalaya; Mexico: Sierra Gorda; Bangladesh; and Taiwan
- UNESCO Urban floods in mega cities initiative

Feedback on practicability, potential additional regions and for ideas of funding including

- Identification of funding is not advanced. Partnering with the EU is important. The funding period for 2014 is not yet clear. Focus potentially on regional funding (west Africa)
- Funding global facility for DRR for ACP Countries (Africa, Caribbean and Pacific)
- DG ECHO: humanitarian aid and civil protection; European community humanitarian office regional projects; Organise proposals, target regions
- UN – CDF local: global capacity for local projects
- Should look for partners who are working with it.
- ACP global facilities
- Corporate proposals, non-state actors
- Climate Change Alliance
- Wetlands: analyse if local solutions fit in ecological systems; Building with nature
- Netherlands- Sahel collaboration: such as CLUVA project
- European Drought Center.
- Link with networks is the added value of CATALYST.

Closing talk: Paola Agostini, DG Research

Symposium on the CATALYST Project Results: Capacity Development for Natural Hazard Risk Reduction and Adaptation

European Commission – Directorate General for Research & Innovation, Brussels

11 September 2013

Agenda

08.30 **Registration and Coffee/Tea**

Session I: Introduction to CATALYST

09:00 **Welcome and Opening Address**

Denis Peter, Climate Change and Natural Hazards Unit, Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission

Demetrio Innocenti, UN Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) – Regional Office for Europe

09:20 **Review of the Meeting Purpose and Agenda, Introduction Round**

Matt Hare, seeconsult GmbH (Project coordinator)

Session II: CATALYST Results

09:45 **Overview of activities and outputs** - *Matt Hare, seeconsult GmbH*

Issues and opportunities in the regions - *Jaroslav Mysiak, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)*

Best Practices Papers

Introduction – *Cristina Serra, The World Academy of Sciences (TWAS)*

East and West Africa – *Jochen Luther*

Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ)

South and Southeast Asia – *Peter van der Keur,*

Geological Survey of Denmark and Greenland

(GEUS)

European Mediterranean – *Peter van der Keur*

Central America and the Caribbean – *Elisa Calliari,*

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

Research Gaps, Networks, Fostering Capacity Development

East and West Africa – *Jochen Luther, UFZ*

South and Southeast Asia – *Peter van der Keur, GEUS*

European Mediterranean – *Peter van der Keur; GEUS*

Central America and the Caribbean – *Elisa Calliari, FEEM*

10:50 **Break**

11:10 **Research Gaps, Networks, Fostering Capacity Development cont'd.**
Cross-Regional Synthesis on Research Gaps, Networks, Fostering Capacity Dev.
Humaira Daniel, UNU-Inst. For Environment and Human Security

Training Module on DRR & CCA - *Fons Jaspers, Alterra*

Stakeholders Advice for Policy Makers - *Raffaele Giordano, Water Research Inst.
Italian National Research Council*

Best Practices Policy Notebook – *Caroline van Bers, seeconsult GmbH*

Q&A

Session III: Communication and Dissemination

12:10 **Communication and dissemination strategy and activities** - *Cristina Serra, TWAS*

Lunch

12:30 **Lunch**

Session IV: Feedback on Results and Dissemination

13:30 **Panel discussion: Stakeholder Feedback on Project Results**
Chair: Jaroslav Mysiak, FEEM
Panel: Members of the CATALYST Think Tank and project coordinators

Session V: Follow-up to CATALYST

14:30 **“CATALYST-Local” Community of Practice and Projects: Bringing CATALYST**
knowledge products to the local level (countries, subregions and communities);
Winter Academy in Mexico - *Matt Hare*

Roundtable Discussion: Proposed local projects and ideas for further projects
(Lead in to Thu. 12 Sept. Workshop)

15:30 **Break**

Session V: Summary and close

15:45 **Summary: Feedback and Discussions** - *Matt Hare*

16.0 **Closing Words** – *Paola Agostini, Climate Change and Natural Hazards Unit,
Directorate General for Research and Innovation, European Commission*

Participants

Paola Agostini	DG RTD I.4 Climate change and natural hazards
Elisa Calliari	FEEM
Raffaele Giordano	Water Research Institute (IRSA), Italy
Ugo Guernacci	DG RTD I.3 Management of natural resources
Alfonso Guitierrez Teira	EC, DG CLIMA, Unit C.3. (Adaptation)
Matt Hare	seeconsult
Hans Jorgen Henriksen	GEUS
Demetrio Innocenti	UNISDR Europe, Brussels
Fons Jaspers	Alterra
Thomas E Lannoy	DG ECHO
Edward Lempinen	TWAS
Juan Perez Lorenzo	EC, DG CLIMA, Unit C.3. (Adaptation)
Jochen Luther	UFZ
Yordanka Mincheva	DG ECHO
Scira Menoni	Urban and Regional Planning DASTU- Politecnico di Milano
Marta Moren Abat	International, Regional and Bilateral Relations Unit, DG ENV
Jaroslav Mysiak	FEEM
Jozias Blok	DEVCO C.2 - Climate change, environment, natural resources, water
Laura Giappichelli	DG DEVCO C.2 - Climate change, environment, natural resources, water
Sophie De Conick	DG DEVCO C.2 - Climate change, environment, natural resources, water
Denis Peter	DG RTD I.4 Climate change and natural hazards
Rossella Riggio	DG RTD I.4 Climate change and natural hazards
Daniel Schweigatz	seeconsult
Cristina Serra	TWAS
Jos Timmerman	Alterra
Caroline van Bers	seeconsult
Peter van der Keur	GEUS
Frank van Weert	Wetlands International/Partners for Resilience
Jeroen Warner	Wageningen Univ.
Efthimios Zagorianakos	DG RTD I.3 Management of natural resources

Annex 2: Criteria for best practices

Criteria for best practices (presented in deliverable 4.2 CATALYST Workshop reports, p. 72-73) could include one or more of the following:

- Embedded in a country-wide and even regionally/continentally mainstreamed legal and institutional DRR/CCA framework with the national and regional governments on board or leading it;
- Compliance with a sustainable development framework;
- Definition of standards that influence the standards and practices of other actors.
- Using or referring to clear definitions of key terms (such as risk, vulnerability, DRR, etc.)
- Acknowledgement and application of (public) participation at various levels and stages in the decision-making and implementation process (in order to incorporate especially local knowledge and representative views of all population groups, etc.);
- Where donors not only act as donors that want to see value for money, but where they engage as facilitators and on a long-term basis and take over those activities (such as procurement or recruitment) that beneficiaries are not capable of at the moment;
- Focus not only on short-term post disaster relief but also on long-term preventive measures;
- Sharing their results and methods and ensuring their activities are sustained and rooted in the respective target community (formal and informal spokesmen on board).
- Authorship and therefore ownership by local/African authors;
- Benefiting from secondments which are also typical for the German Development Cooperation (GIZ61, a bilateral development agency) that allow for renewal and exchange from “inside”.
- Acknowledgement of a difference between the rural and urban context and ability to transfer approaches from rural to urban areas (from different geographical areas in general);
- Addressing both the source and the receptor area of a hazard