



# Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017



*18th-19th May 2017*

*Oslo, Norway*

# Table of Contents

Executive Summary	3
Introduction	4
RCRC and the urban agenda	4
New Urban Challenges	6
Presentations and panel debate	6
Case Studies	8
Sharing urban experiences	8
Group Discussions	11
Participant-led sessions	11
Key Outputs	13
Value propositions and Workstreams	13
Next Steps	15
Where do we go from here?	15
Annex	16
1) List of participants	16
2) Workstreams	17

---

## Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop 2017 - Summary Report

Report author and photo credits: Marianne Mosberg

*For feedback and more information, please contact:*

Aynur Kadihasanoglu, American Red Cross, Senior Advisor Urban DM: [aynur.kadihasanoglu@redcross.org](mailto:aynur.kadihasanoglu@redcross.org)

Sandra D'Urzo, IFRC, Senior Officer for Shelter and Settlements: [sandra.durzo@ifrc.org](mailto:sandra.durzo@ifrc.org)

# Executive Summary

---

As a follow-up to the first RCRC Urban Collaboration Platform Workshop held in Copenhagen in 2016, a second UCP Workshop was held in Oslo on May 18th and 19th 2017. The workshop gathered nearly 30 urban experts from 14 National Societies around the world, in addition to representatives from IFRC, ICRC and the RCRC Climate Centre, to validate and strengthen the collaboration process and help advance knowledge and practical skills in urban resilience.

One of the key insights emerging from the workshop is the importance of leveraging the added value of RCRC when taking on new urban challenges, including the unparalleled outreach and access, the vast network of volunteers and branches, community presence, and role as auxiliary to government. The speed of change and extent of uncertainty in urban contexts require us to be flexible and agile at all times. Innovation, smarter use of technology, partnership with different urban stakeholders, participatory design and community participation can help us find new and sustainable solutions to urban challenges. Workshop participants identified and endorsed five ‘value propositions’ that will guide the Urban Collaboration Platforms’ efforts in the years to come, including:

#1: RCRC can be the lead/expert organisation in recognizing and responding to **”new urban challenges”** (i.e. urban refugees, mass migration, returnees, social inclusion).

#2: National Societies should aim to **localize disaster management systems in cities** through strengthening local (district/neighborhood) preparedness and emergency response capacities; increasing community engagement and participatory approaches; maximizing local resources.

#3: Leveraging our auxiliary role to local governments, the National Societies should create **connections between diverse communities and the key city actors** (including, city authorities, municipalities, private sector, small businesses, schools, vulnerable groups), and be the convener of key elements of Disaster Management systems.

#4: RCRC should strengthen its role and quality of recovery services through **mapping of collective existing expertise and identifying required skill sets** to be mobilized in recovery operations.

#5: RCRC can broker access to city residents and amplify the views of the various urban stakeholders and populations to **drive meaningful innovation**.

Several National Societies volunteered to take the lead to move forward the work streams and co-leads of the UCP will follow up with them to ensure the continuity and delivery of results. The Kenya Red Cross Society offered to host the next Urban Collaboration Platform meeting in Nairobi in early 2018.

# Introduction

## *RCRC and the urban agenda*

We are currently witnessing an unprecedented urbanization process in nearly all parts of the world, that combined with processes such as climate change, population growth and globalization is placing a growing number of people at risk of harm caused by natural and/or man-made urban hazards. Along with governments, international development and humanitarian agencies and civic society organizations, the Red Cross/Red Crescent (RCRC) family is progressively engaged in addressing risks and building resilience in urban areas, in addition to responding to major urban disasters and assuming a prominent role in urban recovery/reconstruction efforts.



The RCRC Urban Collaboration Platform (UCP) Workshop held in Oslo on May 18th and 19th, 2017, resulted in the endorsement of five value propositions that will guide the Urban Collaboration Platforms' efforts in the years to come, focusing on taking on new urban challenges, localizing disaster management systems, linking urban citizens with municipal authorities, mapping existing skill sets within RCRC and fostering meaningful innovations through participatory approaches.

The workshop gathered nearly 30 urban experts from 14 RCRC National Societies around the world, in addition to IFRC, ICRC and the Climate Centre. Each of the 5 regions was represented by at least one National Society, in the attempt to incorporate and maximize



global, regional and country-level insights. The workshop design was informed by the feedback received from the potential participants ahead of time. Over the course of two days, the participants discussed a whole range of urban-related topics, such as urban risk and vulnerability assessments; urban preparedness, response, recovery and reconstruction; urban policy and advocacy; innovation and participatory approaches; earthquakes, fires and heat waves in cities; stakeholder engagement; disaster (micro-)insurance in urban areas, and urban conflict and violence. Experiences from urban programs in Kenya, Nepal, Indonesia and Haiti were shared, and participants were introduced to Habitat III and the New Global Agenda, the Global Alliance for Urban Crises and the Tehran Call for Action, as well as new tools such as IFRC's PASSA Youth and GDPC's City Resilience Assessment and Coalition Building toolkit. Four participant-led group discussion sessions further allowed participants to delve into specific urban challenges and learn from each others' experiences.

Among the key insights emerging from the workshop is the importance of leveraging the added value of RCRC when extending into urban settings, including our network of volunteers, community presence, role as auxiliary to government and our outreach and access. It was suggested that the auxiliary role should be strengthened at sub-national levels, especially at municipal/city level. Urban challenges require a focus on governance and rights, it was argued, and the RCRC movement should consider partnering with new stakeholders in settings where it can be challenging to advocate effectively on behalf of the most vulnerable urban citizens, such as refugees and informal settlement dwellers.

Furthermore, the speed of change and extent of uncertainty in urban contexts require us as RCRC to be flexible and agile at all times. Innovation, smarter use of technology, partnership with different urban stakeholders, participatory design and community participation can help us find new and sustainable solutions to urban challenges. RCRC should link beneficiaries with relevant authorities and service providers, and encourage and facilitate meaningful participation of citizens in policy development and decision-making processes. Our efforts

should aim at strengthening social cohesion, even in cities, and promote the needs and interests of the most vulnerable and marginalized urban citizens.

### ***RCRC Urban Collaboration Platform***

*The Urban Collaboration Platform (UCP) is an informal network that aims to help Red Cross/Crescent (RCRC) National Societies to be better informed, better connected and better engaged in understanding and working in urban context. The platform has been led by the IFRC Secretariat and American Red Cross (ARC) since early 2016, with strong support from several National Societies (NSs), the RCRC Climate Center and Global Disaster Preparedness Center (GDPC). The first output of the UCP process was the Urban Assessment Workshop hosted by the Danish Red Cross in Copenhagen on 20-21 June, 2016. The participants of the workshop expressed a strong interest in expanding this kind of collaboration to other topics related to urban resilience and disaster risk reduction. Building on this momentum, and in cooperation with the Norwegian Red Cross, a second workshop was organized in Oslo in May 2017 to validate and strengthen the collaboration process and help advance RCRC knowledge and practical skills in urban resilience.*

# New Urban Challenges

---

## *Presentations and panel debate*

« Only a few years ago we crossed an important threshold. More than 50 % of the world population now live in urban areas. This will continue to increase in the years to come, and it requires us to rethink our role as a global movement», **Sven Mollekleiv, President of the Norwegian Red Cross**, said in his opening remarks to workshop participants. He emphasized that new urban challenges - such as large-scale influx of refugees and internally displaced persons to urban areas, growth of informal settlements, climate change, urban violence and conflict - calls for new and innovative approaches, fruitful partnerships, strengthened capacities and smarter use of technology. «I also see it as increasingly important to facilitate social cohesion and promote understanding. When people are living in poverty and have nothing to lose, they can easily be recruited into action that they don't really want to be doing. Development of violence, terrorism and conflict is also a question of preventing through understanding,» he argued, and emphasized that we should not only focus on *urban risks*, we should also focus on *urban opportunities*.



**Lars André Skari, Norwegian Red Cross**, further emphasized the need for the RCRC movement to take on new urban challenges by changing the way that we work and delivering even better than what we do today. In terms of responding to urban risks - «the RCRC movement is a ‘sleeping giant’» he argued. The aim is to make full use of the RCRC's enormous potential in the future, maximizing skills and increased capacity to deal with urban crisis.

In a presentation on the Habitat III conference held in Ecuador in 2016, **Aynur Kadihasanoglu, American Red Cross**, highlighted the growing realization that urban areas are not only characterized by risks and threats, but that they should also be seen as hubs of innovation and opportunities that can help lead us on environmentally sustainable, inclusive and resilient urban development pathways. Aynur further argued that the RCRC movement can play an important role in this process by opening up space for vulnerable groups to engage with and participate in urban development processes, such as the development of National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPAs).

**Graham Saunders, IFRC**, presented the key objectives and strategic priorities of the ‘Global Alliance for Urban Crises’, an alliance of organizations and urban experts from across the world that emerged out of a series of consultations ahead of the World Humanitarian Summit in 2016. The alliance, of which the IFRC is a founding member, is committed to improving crisis preparedness and response in our increasingly urban world, and Saunders encouraged RCRC colleagues to consider how we can use the RCRC urban collaboration platform effectively to provide a common “voice” into the alliance.

One of the most concerning new urban challenges is the increase in number of armed conflicts in urban areas, their increasingly protracted nature, insufficient respect for International Humanitarian Law (IHL), lack of safe access and unprecedented humanitarian needs related to conflict and violence. **Evaristo De Pinho Oliveira, ICRC**, highlighted that protracted crises in urban areas have cumulative negative effects on lives and livelihoods, and humanitarian efforts need to consider both the direct and indirect impacts of conflict and violence. Furthermore, he argued, protracted crises are challenging the humanitarian-development divide, and requires us to be flexible in the face of uncertainty. In order to address urban conflict and violence, we need to recognize the sheer scale and the duration of the challenge, the multifaceted interconnectivity of essential services in cities, and the politics of a highly securitized operating environment. «The city has to be seen as a whole. Ethnic divisions in the city need to be considered to avoid antagonizing and dividing groups, especially vulnerable groups. If you start tackling only one small part of the problem you might exacerbate it», Evaristo cautioned.

On behalf of the **Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Marit Viktoria Pettersen** emphasized Norway’s commitment to global urban agreements, and highlighted the importance of the ‘New Global Agenda’ in guiding efforts towards inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable cities. Her recommendations to the RCRC movement in terms of urban efforts was to revitalize, strengthen and create partnerships (both vertically and horizontally); improve coordination; facilitate participatory planning and management; support integrated urban planning and use existing tools.

In the subsequent **panel debate** on global urban engagements, Kadihasanoglu, Saunders, Oliveira and Pettersen all agreed that the RCRC movement can and should play an important role in addressing urban risks. Echoing the remarks by Mollekleiv, the panelists emphasized however that we must not only focus on challenges - we must pay greater attention to urban opportunities and learnings to date within the movement. Iran RC as well as Syrian Arab Red Crescent, Philippines RedCross, Kenya RedCross and several other national societies have experiences and knowledge from working in urban communities for decades that can be built upon. Tackling urban risks requires us to focus on governance, where local authorities must be a part of the solution. Kadihasanoglu suggested that the RCRC movement should leverage its vast network to increase connectedness, and utilize the role as auxiliary to Government to an even greater extent than we do today. Adding to this, Saunders argued for a greater emphasis on the auxiliary role of RCRC at sub-national levels and recommended National Societies to work more closely with municipal authorities in cities. Oliveira, on the other hand, brought participants attention to the role of RCRC as an advocate for the most vulnerable. National societies are and should be part and parcel of social fabric, and are uniquely placed to raise the voice of the people. Furthermore, he argued, the movement needs to adopt new skills and modes of working which is flexible and adapted to new challenges. «The machine has to be adapted to the new reality», he said. Finally, Pettersen recommended the RCRC movement to consider partnerships with new organizations and cooperate more closely with municipal authorities across the world.

In the closing remarks to workshop participants, **Tørris Jæger, Norwegian Red Cross**, thanked all for their active participation and contribution to moving the urban agenda forward, and stressed the importance of partnerships, within and outside the movement. Jæger reiterated the need for the RCRC movement to strengthen our expertise in addressing urban risks. Our responses need to be tailor made to fit urban contexts, and we should move towards a more holistic systems-approach that can better capture the complexities of urban settings. He furthermore suggested that more emphasis could be placed on the role of RCRC as ‘enablers’ that link beneficiaries with existing service providers, rather than providing services ourselves.

## Case Studies

---

### *Sharing urban experiences*

The number and scale of RCRC-led urban resilience-related programs across the world have increased substantially in recent years, and lessons learned from these provide important insights into the potential pitfalls and success factors that should be taken into consideration



when moving towards more resilient, sustainable, green and inclusive cities. Experiences from Kenya, Indonesia, Haiti and Nepal highlight the need for flexible and multi-sectoral approaches; partnerships; tailored responses; community participation; comprehensive urban assessment tools; innovation and user-centered design; focus on underlying causes of vulnerability and strengthening existing coping mechanisms, when addressing urban risks. A key role for RCRC National Societies could be to link urban citizens with existing government and other services.\*

## Kenya

The Nairobi Urban Resilience Programme aim at strengthening community resilience in informal settlements of Nairobi through a multi-sectoral approach. The project follows a community participatory implementation strategy, with a particular emphasis on youth engagement. KRCS is also increasingly focusing on innovation and finding new ways of engaging with the private sector - while stressing the importance of user-centric designs and including beneficiaries as active participants in the innovation process, to avoid doing more harm than good by introducing inappropriate or unsustainable solutions to societal problems. Recommendations emerging from the project and other KRCS urban experiences is the need for RCRC to move away from solely being 'service providers' to being 'enablers' - i.e. linking people to other service providers for a more sustainable approach; focusing more on documentation and knowledge management; linking with the Government at all levels; supporting the development of disaster management laws and regulations at national and sub-national levels; and developing guidelines for urban programming within the RCRC movement.

## Haiti

After an earthquake in 2010 destroyed most of Port-au-Prince city, an area referred to as 'Canaan' (the promised land) was identified as a relocation site, and the population in the area rose from 0 to 200,000 in just a few years. The informal settlements of Canaan is now seeing a high-speed accumulation of urban risks, calling for greater efforts towards strengthening resilience and the need to invest in risk reduction and preparedness measures. Lessons from the 2010 earthquake emphasize the need to address underlying causes of vulnerability and tailoring emergency responses to the complexities of urban settings. Responses must as much as possible be community based and strengthen existing coping mechanisms.

\* Case study presentations can be found in Dropbox, here:

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/3kk5tffrqry8xxn/AACdPBqSrELSHAH9ONjunyFWa?dl=0>

The Strengthening Urban Resilience and Engagement (SURE) project is a multi-hazard and multi-sectoral urban disaster resilience programme targeting 7 municipal areas at multiple scales. As part of the project, an urban risk assessment was conducted with 3,293 people, using an informal network driven methodology based on existing RC and non-RC tools (i.e. VCAs). Learnings from the project so far has identified a lack of urban knowledge and tested tools (requiring substantial investment and adaptation); a constantly evolving landscape of actors and actions (requiring an iterative and documented approach to management, decisions and relationships); and high expectations among stakeholders, incl. donor, government and citizens (requiring time and resources to navigate and manage needs, demands and incentives). The added value of RCRC in urban contexts was identified as the auxiliary role with municipal government (policy and resources); access to and engagement with 'hard to reach' vulnerable groups and urban citizens (voice); and position as interlocutor/convenor/facilitator between urban citizens, specifically vulnerable groups, and local and municipal government. Experiences from the project emphasize the need for a targeted approach to identify and engage with 'hard to reach' vulnerable groups in urban areas.

## Nepal

The Greater Jakarta Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Risk Management Project aims at strengthening community resilience through capacity building activities, flood mitigation and preparedness, climate information, safe schools and a solid waste management programme. Recognizing the complexity of urban contexts, the project focus on multi-stakeholder engagement and partnerships. Key lessons learned from the project include the need to be flexible in the implementation of activities and accommodate the schedule of urban beneficiaries (e.g. commuters). When it comes to urban context and the relation with disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, program planning should focus on particular aspect that concerns many practitioner including government and donors. Strengthening National Society capacity is also crucial, especially reg. climate risk management, coastal restoration, income generation, etc. Partnership with NGOs/civil society is needed in the field. The value added of RCRC engagement, was identified as the buy-in from local government, incl. recognition/trust and collaboration, and role in knowledge generation. A recommendation for scaling up urban DRR/CRM activities is to focus on a particular area of concern to beneficiaries, such as solid waste management, and to have formal engagement with local authorities.

## Indonesia

# Group Discussions

---

## *Participant-led sessions*

Urban challenges are complex and multifaceted, and may include anything from land right issues, informal settlements and migrant populations, to conflict, violence and crime. Tackling different risks requires different approaches. Through four participant-led group discussion sessions, a whole range of urban-related challenges were discussed at the workshop, leading to a greater understanding of the role of RCRC in addressing risks and leveraging opportunities.

### *Part I: Urban Vulnerability, Preparedness, Policy, Reconstruction, Advocacy and Participatory Approaches*

- Short operational timeframes could do more harm than good; response and recovery efforts need to be flexible and responsive to the urban context.
- We must avoid static perceptions of vulnerability. We tend to generalize vulnerability - for instance seeing women and children as always being the most vulnerable, however, in certain situations men might be the most vulnerable. Urban risk assessments therefore need to recognize that vulnerability is highly dynamic and differential within and across communities.
- We need to remember 'invisible' urban citizens such as migrants/commuters, slum dwellers, street children/homeless people etc., and
- RCRC should always be championing the needs and voice of the community.
- We need to leverage the added value of RCRC when extending into urban settings, incl. our network of volunteers, community presence, role as auxiliary to government and our outreach and access.
- We need to fully understand the complexities of urban contexts and not use the cookie cutter approach or copy-paste interventions from rural contexts.
- Great collaboration is needed in the urban context – how do we harness the expertise that exist in the Red Cross movement?

## *Part II: New tools and experiences for urban settings*

- ~ **The Tehran Call for Action:** Encourage all components of the RCRC movement to prioritize investment in DRR/M in urban context, and strengthening institutional and operational capacities.
- ~ **GDPC city risk assessment and coalition building tools:** GDPC has developed tools for how to assess community resilience city wide, and piloted it in Indonesia and Vanuatu. These tools will also build the skills of partners and a wide range of stakeholders.
- ~ **PASSA Youth:** A variation of the original Participatory Approach for Safe Shelter and Settlements Awareness (PASSA) tool, incorporating changes and additions to make it more suitable for young people between 13 and 17. Two successful pilots have been done in Manila and Costa Rica, now trying to scale up to 5 countries in Asia-Pacific and 5 in Latin America where 10,000 youth will be trained to be change makers and to implement micro-projects in their communities.
- ~ **Urban Cash Transfer Programme - Argentina:** Cash transfers were introduced after the floods in 2013. This first experience had a lot of challenges but the lessons learned led to improvements. Cash transfer systems are fast, transparent and allows for accountability standards. Community need to be involved in selecting beneficiaries, along with Government and other agencies.
- ~ **Urban WASH:** update on the IFRC-led working group, by the German Red Cross delegate, with presentation of the workplan and strategy elaborated.

## *Part III: Urban earthquakes, conflict & violence, heat waves, stakeholder engagement and scaling strategies*

- The speed of change and extent of uncertainty in urban contexts require us as RCRC to be flexible and agile at all times. What we know or do one day may no longer be valid or enough the next day. We need to be prepared for the unknown.
- Conflicts no longer follow linear war-peace pathways - they are more fluid and unpredictable. In protracted crises we often end up doing one-year projects 5 or 10 times, rather than doing comprehensive longer term programs because it is more difficult to get funding for these. Multiyear planning and multiyear financing is required.



## *Part IV: Urban fires, assessments, evaluations and micro-insurance schemes*

- Micro-insurance schemes may strengthen the resilience of people and households towards shocks and stressors, but it is difficult to find private companies that are willing to establish small-scale and affordable insurance schemes for the poorest as it is not considered to be profitable enough. Other common challenges include a lack of awareness about the benefits of insurances, as well as religious barriers. RCRC could potentially link micro-insurance schemes with Forecast-Based Financing mechanisms.
- Prevention of urban fires require us to understand the causes of fire and work closely with community members to tackle these through for instance awareness raising activities, fire drills, or distribution of smoke detectors and fire extinguishers.
- Data collection tools will be different and you have greater opportunities to use new methodologies in urban areas. While you might normally rely on household information in rural settings, you might need to triangulate with other sources of information in urban settings.

# Key Outputs

---

## *Value propositions and Workstreams*

Through interactive group discussions, workshop participants identified a number of ‘value propositions’ to guide the RCRC movement’s urban efforts in the years to come. Five groups outlined 4-5 value propositions each, after which all workshop participants voted for their top five favorites. The winning propositions focus on new urban challenges, localizing disaster management systems, linking urban citizens with municipal authorities, mapping existing skill sets within RCRC and fostering meaningful innovations.

Other value propositions suggested by participants included championing cash-based approaches, sharing best practices, connecting areas of expertise within the RCRC movement (e.g. Healthcare in Danger, Safe Schools, Post-War reconstruction etc.), strengthening internal coordination, scaling up innovation and fostering partnerships.

Under each of the top five value propositions, workshop participants outlined action plans that include the scope for RCRC engagement; links to other RCRC pillar services; potential partners and priority activities in the first 1-2 years. Participants also indicated their

commitment to engage more or less actively in the various workstreams. (Please see all workstreams in Annex 2).

### ***Endorsed value propositions***

*#1: RCRC can be the lead/expert organization in recognizing and responding to "new urban challenges" (i.e. urban refugees, mass migration, returnees, social inclusion.*

*#2: National Societies should aim to localize DM systems in cities through strengthening local (district/neighborhood) preparedness and emergency response capacities; increasing community engagement and participatory approaches; maximizing local resources.*

*#3: Leveraging our auxiliary role to local governments, the NSs should create connections between diverse communities and the key city actors (including, city authorities, municipalities, private sector, small businesses, schools, vulnerable groups), and be the convener of key elements of Disaster Management systems.*

*#4: RCRC should strengthen its role and quality of recovery services through mapping of collective existing expertise and identifying required skill sets to be mobilized in recovery operations.*

*#5: RCRC can broker access to city residents and amplify the views of the various urban stakeholders and populations to drive meaningful innovation.*

The leaders of the five work streams were identified as the following:

- ~ Workstream 1: *None identified as lead*
- ~ Workstream 2: Mongolia, Finish and American Red Cross
- ~ Workstream 3: British, Netherlands Red Cross and Norwegian Red Cross
- ~ Workstream 4: American Red Cross and Norwegian Red Cross
- ~ Workstream 5: Kenya Red Cross

# Next Steps

---

*Where do we go from here?*

The Urban Collaboration Platform will continue to be a platform for sharing urban experiences, lessons learned and best practices within the RCRC movement, and will contribute to further strengthening of our capacity to address urban risks and new challenges. Linkages to other urban institutional networks within and outside the movement will be made when relevant, in order to tap into existing hubs of expertise and innovation. It was suggested to place more emphasis on the ‘green agenda’ and environmental issues in the next workshop.

The next Urban Collaboration Platform meeting will be organized by Kenya Red Cross Society in Nairobi in early 2018.

# Annex

## 1) List of participants

#	Country	Organization	Name	Title	E-mail
1	Global	IFRC	Graham Saunders	Head of DCPRR	<a href="mailto:graham.saunders@ifrc.org">graham.saunders@ifrc.org</a>
2		IFRC	Ian O'Donnell	Team Leader IBC	<a href="mailto:ian.odonnell@ifrc.org">ian.odonnell@ifrc.org</a>
3		IFRC	Sandra D'Urzo	Sr. Officer for Shelter and Settlements	<a href="mailto:sandra.durzo@ifrc.org">sandra.durzo@ifrc.org</a>
4		IFRC	Ela Serdaroglu	Lead, Shelter	<a href="mailto:ela.serdaroglu@ifrc.org">ela.serdaroglu@ifrc.org</a>
5		ICRC	Pascal Hundt	Head of Assistance Division	<a href="mailto:phundt@icrc.org">phundt@icrc.org</a>
6		ICRC	Evaristo De Pinho Oliveira	Head of the Water and Habitat Unit	<a href="mailto:eoliveira@icrc.org">eoliveira@icrc.org</a>
7		Climate Centre	Julie Arrighi	Resilience Advisor	<a href="mailto:julie.arrighi@redcross.org">julie.arrighi@redcross.org</a>
8	Argentina	Argentine RC	Rodrigo Cuba	DM Advisor	<a href="mailto:rcuba@cruzroja.org.ar">rcuba@cruzroja.org.ar</a>
9	Finland	Finish RC	Niina Kylliäinen	Program Officer for Asia	<a href="mailto:niina.kylliainen@redcross.fi">niina.kylliainen@redcross.fi</a>
10	Germany	German RC	Wolfgang Friedrich	Advisor Construction, Shelter and WASH	<a href="mailto:friedriw@drk.de">friedriw@drk.de</a>
11	Haiti	Haiti RC	Michel-Ange Floresta	President of the North Department Regional Committee	<a href="mailto:ma.florestal@croixrouge.ht">ma.florestal@croixrouge.ht</a>
12	Hong Kong	Hong Kong RC	Eva Yeung	Manager, Local Emergency Service	<a href="mailto:eva.yeung@redcross.org.hk">eva.yeung@redcross.org.hk</a>
13	Iran	Iranian RC	Mansoureh Bagheri	Director of International Operations and Programs	<a href="mailto:bagheri.m@rcs.ir">bagheri.m@rcs.ir</a>
14	Indonesia	American RC	Andre Napitupulu	Greater Jakarta Urban DRR Project Manager	<a href="mailto:andry@amredcross.org">andry@amredcross.org</a>
15	Indonesia (Asia Pacific Office)	IFRC Asia Pacific Regional Office	Melanie Ogle	DRM Delegate	<a href="mailto:melanie.ogle@ifrc.org">melanie.ogle@ifrc.org</a>
16	Kenya	Kenya RC	Safia Verjee	DM Program Manager	<a href="mailto:verjee.safia@redcross.org">verjee.safia@redcross.org</a>
17	Mongolia	Mongolia RC	Sugarmaa Gantugs	Disaster Management Program Officer	
18	Nepal	British RC	Jill Clements	BRC Country Representative Nepal	<a href="mailto:jillclements@redcross.org">jillclements@redcross.org</a>



#	Country	Organization	Name	Title	E-mail
19	Netherlands	Netherlands RC	Raimond Dujisens	Program Coordinator Partners for Resilience	<a href="mailto:rdujisens@redcross.nl">rdujisens@redcross.nl</a>
20	Norway	Norwegian RC	Ansa M. Jørgensen	Head of Recovery Programs	<a href="mailto:ansa.jorgensen@redcross.no">ansa.jorgensen@redcross.no</a>
21			Øivind Hetland	Senior Advisor Disaster Risk Management	<a href="mailto:oivind.hetland@redcross.no">oivind.hetland@redcross.no</a>
22			Javier Barrera	Head of Global Programmes	<a href="mailto:javier.barrera@redcross.no">javier.barrera@redcross.no</a>
23			Marianne Mosberg	Consultant, DRM	<a href="mailto:m_mosberg@hotmail.com">m_mosberg@hotmail.com</a>
24			Christina Amaral		
25			Lars André Skari		
26			Torris Jaeger	Head of International Department	
27			Sven Mollekleiv	President, Norwegian Red Cross	
28		Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Marit Viktoria Pettersen	Senior Advisor Disaster Risk Management	
29	Sweden	Sweden RC	Patrick Fox	Head of Disaster Management and Policy Unit	<a href="mailto:patrick.fox@redcross.se">patrick.fox@redcross.se</a>
30	USA	American RC	Aynur Kadihasanoglu	Senior Advisor Urban DM	<a href="mailto:aynur.kadihasanoglu@redcross.org">aynur.kadihasanoglu@redcross.org</a>

## 2) Workstreams

Workstream #1: Responding to new urban challenges				
Scope of RCRC Engagement	Links to other RCRC Pillar services	Key Partners	Priority Activities 1-2 years	Commitment
Develop a specialist team	Resilience Roadmap	Research institutions	Document experiences - incl. Success and challenges	<i>Commitment to all priority areas:</i>  <b>A:</b> None  <b>B:</b> 3 - Raimond+NCRC - Øivind - Jill + BRC  <b>C:</b> 9
Campaign/ Advocate	Shelter, PASSA and PASSA Youth	UN Agencies (UN Habitat, UNHCR, IOM, ILO, UNICEF)	Develop Plan of Action based on assessments	
Work with affected and host communities	Migration/ Refugees/IDPs	Private companies/ business	Leverage new technologies	

Workstream #1: Responding to new urban challenges				
Reaching the most vulnerable, the 'invisible' urban citizens	DRR/CCA	Relevant Government Agencies	Assessment to address common urban issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- FRC</li> <li>- Eva + HKRC</li> <li>- Rodrigo Cuba</li> <li>- Safia+ KRCS</li> <li>- Aynur+ARC</li> <li>- André</li> <li>- Melanie</li> <li>- Sugermay</li> <li>- Climate Centre when climate related (C or B)</li> </ul> <p><b>D:</b> None</p>
Innovations/ Innovate	Community Engagement and Accountability	Beneficiary rights groups	Risk Assessment integration into urban planning	
Strengthen RCRC Movement research and evidence base	Urban VCAs/ Digitalization of VCA	Financial Institutions	Evidence base for RCRC Niche/ added value	
	Psychosocial support to families	Sister National Societies	Urban Contingency plan development	
	Fire		Environmental impacts	
	Slums		Context analysis	
	Livelihoods		Collect best case studies on urban issues at all levels to disseminate	
	YABC - Changing community mindset			
	Urban micro-credit and insurance schemes?			

Workstream #2: Localization of DM services (district/ neighbourhood level)				
Scope of RCRC Engagement	Links to other RCRC Pillar services	Key Partners	Priority Activities 1-2 years	Commitment
Increase DM Training for municipal authorities	Emergency response	Municipality universities	Develop training programmes for municipality and CBDR	<i>Commitment to all priority areas:</i> <p><b>A:</b> 1 - IRCS</p> <p><b>B:</b> 2 - KRCS - Øivind</p> <p><b>C:</b> 2 - Jill + BRC - Eva +HKRC</p> <p><b>D:</b> 3 - FRC - Aynur+ ARC - MRCS</p>
Better neighborhood DRR/Disaster Response Teams	VCA, Assessment tools	Urban planners	Collect and store templates for contingency plans	
RCRC Branches engage in city risk assessments (training, mentoring)	Health/WASH/ Shelter	Global alliance for urban crises	Awareness raising	
Safe and healthy living in urban areas (waste, pollution, energy, mobility..)	Engage Youth as first responders	Grand Bargain concrete	Dialogue with city municipalities	
Use the municipal/ RCRC contingency plans to better respond		Partner with each other	Using/creating same key messages with similar image for the public	

Workstream #2: Localization of DM services (district/ neighbourhood level)				
			Resourcing (Municipal) budget	<b>C: 2</b> - Andre - Ian

Workstream #3: Connecting (communities) with city-level authorities/actors to leverage auxiliary role				
Scope of RCRC Engagement	Links to other RCRC Pillar services	Key Partners	Priority Activities 1-2 years	Commitment
Study government disaster response plan, identify areas for community participation	Contingency/ Response/ Preparedness plans	People, CBOs, Gangs etc. (Urban violence)	Preparing contingency plan for the city	<i>Commitment to all priority areas:</i>  <b>A: 3</b> - IRCS - Julie - FRC  <b>B: 3</b> - MRCS - KRCS - Øivind  <b>C: 2</b> - Eva+HKRC - Ian  <b>D: 3</b> - Jill+BRCS - Raimond+ NCRC - NorCross
Long(er) term planning of city development; voice of communities; making any decision risk-informed	Operational Excellence working group	IFRC, ICRC, movement	City-wide DRM strategy that clearly articulate role of RC branch	
City-level agreements (that reflects national law/status)	Most pillars; Drivers of risk (any risk), Processes/ contingency plans	Rockefeller/UN Habitat Resilient Cities initiative	Analysis of municipal/city structure to enhance specific RC/Govt partnership	
National <--> Local	Leadership course under Solferino Academy that could focus on 'Localization of Auxiliary Role'	Mayors/ Alliances of Mayors	Study/analyze existing response/ preparedness mechanisms at government and community level (include local NGOs), identify the gap	
Based on auxiliary role of NSs, the scope of engagement should be at the level of preparing law and regulations for the country		City networks, e.g. ICLE, UCLG (40, etc.)	Mapping/analysis of key city decision making processes and link to DRM with clear role for NS added value (evidence) + influencing (\$, Policy, Partnership)	
		UN	Strategic support to N.S.	
		Government	Clarity on what Humanitarian Diplomacy may entail; benefits, pitfalls, approaches --> Toolkit?	
		Other humanitarian organizations		

Workstream #4: Mapping expertise/skills in urban recovery				
Scope of RCRC Engagement	Links to other RCRC Pillar services	Key Partners	Priority Activities 1-2 years	Commitment
Map opportunities and limitations to RCRC Urban involvement based on mandate	(Optimize) Competency framework	Professional networks (land, legal, economy)	<p>Map skill-sets we ideally would need (urban in general) based on RC mandate and potential entry points in an urban disaster context.</p> <p>Define urban expertise and prepare mapping of existing expertise within the movement.</p>	<p><i>Commitment to all priority areas:</i></p> <p><b>A:</b> 4  - MRCS  - Eva+ HKRC  - Jill+BRC  - IRCS</p> <p><b>B:</b> 3  - FRC  - Safia  - Julie+ Climate Centre</p> <p><b>C:</b> 4  - NorCross/  Øivind/Ansa  - Wolfgang+ GRC  - Argentina RC  - Melanie</p> <p><b>D:</b> 2  - Aynur+ARC  - NorCross</p>

Workstream #5: Innovative approaches for a meaningful city-level impact				
Scope of RCRC Engagement	Links to other RCRC Pillar services	Key Partners	Priority Activities 1-2 years	Commitment
Facilitate access to urban communities	Cross-cutting, i.e. all	Innovation hubs	Innovation challenges at national level	<p><i>Commitment to all priority areas:</i></p> <p><b>A:</b> 2  - Andre  - MRCS</p> <p><b>B:</b> 2  - Ian  - Raimond+ NCRC</p> <p><b>C:</b> 4  - Jill+BRC  - FRC  - Climate Centre+Julie  - Eva+ HKRC</p>
Amplify priorities of most vulnerable urban people		HCD Firms	Mapping and documenting of community level innovations that has potential for scale up	
Documentation , Knowledge management, Learning		Maker spaces, fab labs	Innovation cross-learning within RCRC	
		Slum dwellers international	Formalized partnerships with private sector (techs or not)	



## Workstream #5: Innovative approaches for a meaningful city-level impact

		City residents or local association	Rapid testing of innovative solutions	D: 1 - KRCS+ Safia
		Private sector	Stakeholder partner mapping	
		Think tanks	Facilitate design consultancies between communities and companies	
		Municipalities	Correct design processes (human centered, city plans, communications)	
		Engineering and design firms	Guidelines on how to innovate with communities	
		Universities	Global consultation process in various settlements	
		Private sectors R&D labs/hubs	Document innovation failures too!	
		Innovators and designers developers	Youth engagement	
		Innovation funds/foundations	Develop skills in managing complexity	