

Local Programme Advisory Committee Meeting
Review of UNDP DRMP Programme Document for 2010- 2015

Date: 11 March 2010

Time: 10.00 – 12.30

Venue: CoES meeting room, Lohuti 29, Dushanbe

Participants:

1. Khaybullov Latipov, Chairman, Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defence under the Government of Tajikistan (chair)
2. Rastislav Vrbensky, Country Director, UNDP Tajikistan (co-chair)
3. Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, ARR/Programme, UNDP
4. Sultonnazar Kholiqnazarov, Chief of staff, CoES
5. Alisho Shomahmadov, Head of IMAC, CoES
6. Oleg Pilkevich, Head of Rescue Training Department, CoES
7. Jamshed Kamalov, Head of Protection of Population and Territories Department, CoES
8. Nemat Abdurasulov, Head on Department on International Relations, CoES
9. Manzura Nazaramonova, National Programme Officer, SDC
10. Mahvash Kalandarova, Project Officer, DFID
11. Abdurahim Muhidov, HFA Coordinator, UN/ISDR
12. Goulsara Pulatova, Regional Coordinator, UN/ISDR
13. Malik Ajani, Programme Coordinator, FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance
14. Peter Thominski, Programme Advisor, DRMP GTZ
15. Nancy Snauwaert, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, UN
16. Khusrav Sharifov, DRM Programme Manager, UNDP
17. Shahlo Rahimova, Project Analyst Project Analyst, UNDP
18. Karina Davidova, interpreter

Agenda of the Meeting

#	Subject	Duration	Presenter
1	Introductory remarks	10:00 – 10:20	Mr. Rastislav Vrbensky, Country Director, UNDP Tajikistan Mr. Haibullo Latipov, Chairman of the Committee of Emergency Situations
2	Presentation of achievements to date	10:20 – 10:35	Khusrav Sharifov, UNDP DRM Programme Manager
3	Presentation of the 3 rd phase of the DRM Programme	10:35 – 10:50	Khusrav Sharifov, UNDP DRM Programme Manager

4	Discussion of the Programme Document	10:50 – 11:50	All participants
5	Wrap up	11:50 – 12:00	Mr. Rastislav Vrbensky Mr. Haibullo Latipov

Copies of the Disaster Risk Management Programme Document phase III, were shared with strategic partners in Tajikistan. Heads of these agencies as well as the Chairman of the Committee of Emergency Situations and Civil Defence under the Government were invited to the LPAC meeting to comment on and review the final draft of the programme document for 3rd phase of the UNDP's Disaster Risk Management Programme.

I. Introductory remarks

Mr. Khaybullo Latipov opened the meeting by welcoming participants in the premises of CoES office. He reminded the participants that purpose of the meeting is to review the new Disaster Risk Management Programme Document for the 3rd phase, covering period of 2010-2015.

Mr. Rastislav Vrbensky welcomed all participants and informed that UNDP has signed a Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP) with the Government of Tajikistan covering the period of 2010-2015. Five priority areas have been identified for CPAP and Disaster Risk Management is considered as an integral part of one of the priority areas, since Tajikistan is a highly disaster prone country. From 1997 to 2007, conservative estimates indicate that the country experienced over 200 landslides, mud flows, earthquakes and other hazard events resulting in over 866 deaths and annual losses averaging \$28 million per year. He reiterated that up to this date, two phases of the DRM programme have been implemented, where first phase of the programme covered period of 2004-2006 and second phase 2007-2009. During these two previous phases, the Programme has implemented over 30 different scale projects, including projects with minor budget of few thousands USD up to large-scale strategic projects with the budget totalling over 1,5 mln USD. The total sum of the projects implemented by Programme during the reporting period is over 8,5 mln USD.

He briefly outlined some of the major achievements of the Programme during previous two phases of the Programme, emphasizing the contributions made towards capacity building of CoES. In particular, Mr. Vrbensky noted the establishment of IMAC within CoES with the joint support of SDC and UNDP. Specific inputs of the programme into strengthening of professional and technical capacities of other Departments within CoES had also been noted.

With the support of ECHO, Programme managed to achieve such a major and strategic result, as development of National Disaster Risk Management Strategy, which has been submitted to Government of Tajikistan for review and approval.

REACT partnership, which has been supported by Programme, is considered as one of the “good practice” model for DRM coordination.

Mr. Vrbensky highlighted that duration of the third phase of the Programme will be for 2010 - 2015, covering a total of 6 years. The duration of the Programme has been expanded, in line with the duration of strategic documents, such as:

- United Nations Development Assistance Framework;

- Hyogo Framework for Action;
- National Disaster Risk Management Strategy;
- UNDP Country Programme Action Plan.

Programme will be implemented in two sub-phases: first sub-phase will be implemented during 2010-2012. Program progress will be evaluated in 2012 and output targets for 2013 - 2015 will be identified as a result of the evaluation. As in previous phases, the Programme will continue strengthening capacity of government structures, concentrating on CoES as key beneficiary of the programme.

II. Overview of the 2nd phase achievements and presentation of the 3rd phase of the DRM Programme

Mr. *Khaybullo Latipov* passed the floor to Mr. *Khusrav Sharifov*, who presented the overview of main achievements of the Programme during its 2nd phase and presented Planned Outputs for 3rd phase of the Programme for 2010-2015 (Annex 1).

III. Discussions:

Mr. *Khaybullo Latipov* thanked Khusrav for presentation and opened the floor for discussions.

Ms. *Goulsara Pulatova*, congratulated UNDP and CoES with the development of such a comprehensive programme document, covering 6 years period. Ms. Pulatova continued by presenting her preliminary comments:

- An agreement has been signed on the establishment of the Central Asian Coordination Center on Disaster Response and Risk Reduction between three countries of the region, namely, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan. Kazakhstan is ready to provide the venue and covers some of its running costs. Kyrgyzstan and Tajikistan understand the importance of the Center and are ready to send their representatives, however both countries face lack of funding. Therefore, ISDR suggests that Programme includes support of Tajikistan representatives for at least three first years;
- In frames of “Safe schools” campaign, ISDR is planning to assess the seismic vulnerability of all the schools throughout the country. ISDR is aware of the efforts made by different organizations up to date and urge DRMP to include this item under one of its objectives. This should be done under a more coordinated manner and under the government leadership;
- Disaster risk insurance is not a priority among the population of Tajikistan who are very poor and are made poorer with each natural calamity. Therefore, ISDR invites UNDP to look in this issue and bring it up for general attention and consideration. ISDR on its turn is ready to share the results of a study, which was jointly carried out by ISDR and World Bank (GFDRR) on a subject of catastrophe Risk Financing Options in Central Asia.

Mr. *Peter Thominski*, noted that Disaster Risk Management Programme of GTZ has been active in field of contingency planning, rescue team establishment and mitigation activities on local level in Zeravshan valley for the last 2.5 years. Therefore, GTZ is ready to share all the experienced gained during this period, which can be useful for UNDP DRM Programme. He also added that special attention should be paid to collaboration between CoES and National Red Crescent Society during emergencies.

Mr. *Malik Ajani*, underlined that all the achievements of the Programme presented during the meeting testify the willingness and readiness of CoES to cooperate and collaborate. He also added

that FOCUS recognizes and appreciates the transparency reflected in UNDP's work by presenting the new phase of the DRM Programme. Further on, he provided the comments related to the Programme Document:

- To clearly understand the gaps and sustainable accomplishments of the previous phases in relation to the proposed phase, it is suggested that a section be included to clearly state what was not accomplished and what was completely handed-over to the government in the previous phases. Furthermore, this section should also include what is planned to be handed over to the government by the end of the five-year third phase of the program and what gaps will still remain. This will certainly assist donors in Tajikistan to lobby to their respective headquarters to assist in reducing the current USD 10 million funding gap of the program as well as help the CoES to lobby to the national government to appropriate budget support to sustain responsibilities that will be handed-over;
- Most of the indicators / results, indicated in the action plan of the document were quite vague and as they are now, are not measurable. Therefore, consideration should be given to providing more details on the indicators / results – perhaps with numbers or percentages;
- It was encouraging to read that the UNERT continues to remain a priority. Given the geographic isolation of many communities in the country, perhaps emphasis can be also given to the establishment of pre-positioned emergency stocks throughout the country rather than just the one UNERT in the southwest of the country;
- The plan did not mention the role of media. This is quite critical to the government and communities in both emergency preparedness and response. Therefore, the suggestion is to include the development of the role and relationship of media with the government and communities in both emergency preparedness and response;
- It was also encouraging to see that the private sector has become a priority in the plan with regards to disaster recovery. However, we must recognize that the private sector not only has a significant role in disaster recovery efforts but also plays a significant role in other phases (preparedness, relief etc.). Therefore the suggestion is to expand this part of the project to include those additional phases;
- Perhaps the following is related to other agencies but it is important to understand how this program links to their critical work in disaster risk management:
 - o How does the program coordinate/affect disaster risk management capacity building in schools?
 - o How does the program coordinate/affect disaster risk management capacity building in hospitals?
 - o How does the program coordinate with the role and responsibilities of the Tajik Army in emergency management?
 - o How is this program complimenting existing bi-lateral agreements between the Government of Tajikistan and the governments of other countries?

At the end he once again emphasized that developed Programme Document is very comprehensive, and provided comments will just contribute to its strengthening.

Mr. Sukhrob Khoshmukhammedov, noted that Programme Document, currently does not include planned financing from UNDP BCPR, which will decrease the current deficit in the budget. He also pointed that Programme Document covers the vast range of activities and currently has a large deficit in the budget. Therefore, provided comments on improvement of the document will be considered, however integration of additional activities will lead to bigger budget, correspondingly

to larger deficit in the budget. He underlined that implementation of the Programme will mainly rely on the donor support, as only 10% of the previous budgets of the Programme have been covered by UNDP and other 90% was covered by donors. In addition, he reminded about the planned mid-term evaluation of the Programme, which will allow adjusting and possibly expanding Programme interventions.

Ms. Manzura Nazaramonova, supported suggestion of Malik Ajani on integration of the information on accomplishments and unachieved targets of the previous phases in current document. In addition, she listed some suggestions and comments from her side:

- Programme Document should clearly reflect the responsible parties in implementation of the activities. Moreover, document should indicate all other partners, to be involved in achievements of the planned results;
- She inquired whether needs of the CoES have been analyzed and considered in development of the Programme Document;
- CoES should play a leading role, while UNDP playing supporting role.

Mr. Sukhrob Khoshmukhamedov, replied that in frames of second phase nationalization of the Programme was set as one of the main results, however due to different issues, result was not achieved.

Mr. Khaybullo Latipov, mentioned that achievements of the Programme have been presented in different forums several times. However, Programme may consider another presentation of the results to key stakeholder.

Mr. Peter Thominski, added few more comments, such as:

- Tajikistan is a disaster prone country and at the same time poorest country in CIS, which makes country dependent on external donor funding. However, more efforts should be undertaken to avoid the dependency of the country on donor funds;
- Change in wording and phrasing of the document might be considered. For example, Action Plan indicates that: "Crisis Management Center established". Nonetheless, this is Government responsibility and as international community we can only support Government to achieve this result;
- The Programme Document does not reflect the responsibilities of the Government.

Mr. Khaybullo Latipov, in reply to *Mr. Thominski's* comments underlined that results indicated in the document are in a form of support from UNDP side to government initiatives. He also noted that majority of the activities, results and outputs are generalized in the document, since it cannot cover all of them in detailed manner. As for Government's leading role and nationalization of the initiatives and coordination structures in the country, he mentioned that the Governmental Programme on development of the Emergency Situations system for 2009-2014, foresees the nationalization of all the existing DRM related coordination structure. CoES would highly appreciate if all international partners would contribute in achieving results included in this governmental document.

Ms. Manzura Nazaramonova, inquired if copy of the Governmental Programme on development of Emergency Situations system for 2009-2014, could be shared with participants. She highlighted that

availability of the Governmental Programme within SDC, as a donor agency, would allow SDC to review and evaluate submitted proposals by different agencies to SDC for funding, considering the priorities identified in the Governmental Programme.

Mr. Khaybullo Latipov replied that electronic version of the abovementioned Programme is available on official website of CoES. However, it would be more rational if proposals related to DRM field would be reviewed by CoES, prior to submission to donor agencies or funding decision is taken. This approach was successfully applied to project proposals submitted to ECHO for funding in frames of DIPECHO V programme. Therefore, CoES would highly appreciate support of donor agencies in integration of this approach.

Mr. Rastislav Vrbensky, concluded that as most of the partners noted, a short timeframe was given to partners for review of the document. Thus, UNDP would highly appreciate if comments will be provided by partners in writing, but during coming days, to enable soonest finalization of the document. In terms of comments, Mr. Vrbensky summarized the provided comments and provided following feedbacks:

- UNDP DRMP staff will meet with GTZ DRMP staff members to oversee the possible experience exchange between two programmes;
- Suggestions and comments provided by FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance will be reviewed internally to see to what extent provided comments can be integrated into document, as it was already mentioned before;
- Additional comments of ISDR are expected in writing;
- In terms of presenting the previous accomplishments of the Programme, it should be noted that UNDP has numerous regular and on-going monitoring and evaluation tools and processes. However, this issue will be discussed internally and a decision will be taken on the process of how to present the accomplishments of the Programme;
- As for comments related to Government's leading role, it should be highlighted that philosophy in implementation of the Programme is to strengthen Government's leading role. The Programme Document outlines specific activities with clear results, which are addressed to capacity building of Government. Nevertheless, current capacity of the Government should be taken into consideration.

Mr. Khusrav Sharifov, added that provided timeframe for presentation of the Programme accomplishments was very limited and made it impossible to present every single achievement. He noted that this document should not be considered as a stand-alone project document, used for fundraising. For every single activity indicated in the document a separate detailed project document will be developed.

Mr. Khaybullo Latipov closed the meeting and thanked all the partners for participation.

Annex I: Power Point Presentation: DRMP phase II achievements and phase III planned results.

