Task 1: Enhanced regional institutional capacity and coordination in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation measures

1.1. Enhanced DRR knowledge: through exchange of experts with their peers in EU selected countries

1.2. Improved institutional DRR capacity and coordination at regional level, as result of participation of IPA beneficiaries to the peers’ exchange
Task 1: implementation - process

- **Consultation** with all 8 beneficiaries through surveys and direct interviews:
  - Identified DRR needs and subject areas vis-à-vis HFA priorities
  - Profiled the officers to attend ExP (at least one senior expert);
  - Identification of the EU host country/host institutions which best comply with the needs identified by the IPA Beneficiaries.

- **Exchange kit** developed and **tailored for each exchange**
  - “Information note” to participants (travel tickets; accommodation arrangements; working agenda with agreed specific objectives and training material.
  - Background documents on main topics identified
  - **Guidelines** for exchange programme/study tour and introduction
  - Application (registration) form and Participant’s evaluation form
  - Certification
Task 1: implementation

Some statistics:

- 16 participants in exchange/study tours from 8 beneficiaries
- 4 of participants were Director Generals (DG)/deputy DG in beneficiaries organizations
- 25% of Women participation
- Average exchange lasted 4-5 days
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY (WB&amp;Turkey)</th>
<th>HOST COUNTRY/INSTITUTION</th>
<th>WHEN</th>
<th>SUBJECT AREAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Albania</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>8 - 11 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Netherland</td>
<td>14 -18 July 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>27 – 30 May 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The former Yugoslav</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>27 - 31 January 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>19 – 22 June 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1 – 3 October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kosovo*</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>7 – 11 October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>26 - 31 January 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* This designation is without prejudice to positions on status, and is in line with UNSCR 1244 and the ICJ Opinion on the Kosovo Declaration of Independence
Summary of findings

• High satisfactory level, from beneficiaries and from host countries/institutions, content related and regarding organization of exchanges

• the level of commitment for successful implementation was very high from beneficiaries and from hosts
Impact prospects:
All participants from beneficiaries were of an opinion that they would recommend this activity to others very much and hope for follow-up project.

3.
YOUR SELECTED SUBJECT AREAS FOR EXCHANGE PROGRAMME (TOPICS OF EXCHANGE/STUDY TOUR IMPLEMENTED) - TO WHAT EXTENT DID THE STUDY TOUR GAVE YOU ANSWERS TO YOUR QUESTIONS AND CREATED NEW IDEAS FOR YOUR FUTURE ENDEAVOURS?

(results from feedback/valuation form for participants)
Quotes from participants

• from Croatian DUZS: “All objectives were reached and all previously posed questions answered, but conversations during meetings gave us many more ideas on how to further approach the risk analysis issues and even how to organize additional risk prediction bodies as well as to establish mechanisms that would allow us to better communicate with scientific and other agencies and governmental offices in Croatia.”

• From Macedonian CMC: “Representatives of the institutions in the system for crisis management in Finland that was running expert talks were willing to share their experiences, knowledge, open to answer all questions about national policy and legal framework, importance of the decentralization in disaster risk reduction, cooperation among national institutions etc. One of the main topics was the role of community in disaster response within the local self-government, improving risk assessment and monitoring of disaster risk and hot spots.”
Recommendations/considerations

• There are number of projects at national levels that would deserve promotion as suggested by participants, such as “Growing up in safety – Tinoni’s house in Lisbon” and “Amadora’s projects” in Portugal;

• Turkey commented: “after the programme, relationships between visited institutions and researchers who participated in the activities should continue which would allow the development of new projects”;
Recommendations

• **Exchange of DRM experts** (EoE) between SEE and EU countries shall be **further encouraged** by projects supported by the EC and UN for capacity building and alignment of civil protection standards.

• Future exchanges shall **consider a longer duration**, involvement of **more participants** and support of a “**return**” exchange for the EU hosting countries to the SEE countries as well as the participation of relevant local level stakeholders and authorities (both in SEE and EU countries).

• **Bottom-up / participatory approach** in the EoE agenda is a key component for a successful capacity delivery.

• Framing the collaboration within the picture of international initiatives such as the HFA (and its successor) its pivotal to assure **international coordination and avoid duplications**.

• Future EoE shall carefully review on-going relevant projects and seek collaboration on common areas of work for **maximum resource efficiency**.
Available for your questions,
Cvetka Krajic Tomin, UNISDR Consultant
Cvetka.krajic@synergies.si