

Disaster Resilience Workshop At the Disaster Oasis Centre in Jogjakarta, Indonesia January 27-29 2012

The workshop took place at the Disaster Oasis, a disaster learning centre, where all the buildings are built to be disaster resistant and can serve as an evacuation centre in the case of future disasters. There were 70 local participants, including community architects and community representatives, and 25 international participants from Thailand, Vietnam, Sri Lanka, Japan, and the Philippines, for three days of in-depth exchanges on their various experiences of coping with disasters, both in terms of preparing for future disasters and rebuilding after a disaster. Local communities affected by the eruption of Mt Merapi in 2010 served as case study sites for field visits.

Day 1 – At the Disaster Oasis

After a round of introductions of all the participants, **Yuli from ARKOM**, one of the organisers of the workshop, gave a welcoming address: Welcome to this three day workshop. This Disaster Oasis is 20 km north of Jogja and 10 km from the peak of Mt Merapi. This area was built as an evacuation centre for the volcano. I am from the Jogja community architects group and we organised this workshop with UPC and friends from the five mountain communities from Central Java, and Rujak Centre for Urban Studies. We will open this workshop with a performance from the 5 Mountain communities. After the ceremony, we will return to this room to start the overview by Somsook and also Natasha. After that we will have a sharing session from each country. After lunch we will have focus group discussions, and then discussion about the meaning of disaster resilience. This venue encourages the spirit of sharing!

Mr Tanto from the Bundut Art Studio and coordinator of the 5 Mountain Network takes to the floor: Now I have a chance to learn about disasters many aspects, and in English, too! I can count the victims myself of tsunami and volcano. But every day children die, more than from tsunami, eruption and cold lava. Two years ago, we heard that a community from Bali moved to Sumatra, must become refugees – 150 families are now refugees. Disaster is like jazz music, so I had an idea to make a disaster look like an art performance. We are 8 people from the community of Five Mountains, living on the slopes of Merapi. When the eruption and cold lava comes, it is a disaster, but we also feel some passion, because new ideas come, new materials come, new techniques, new building without disaster and destruction of my country. Now we have a chance for new thinking. We tried to interpret disaster with a new thing, not just waiting for a stupid shelter boxes from America, which are hot and in which children cannot live. It's better to be moved to another village.



We head outside to an open area to watch the spiritual performance:



May Domingo, moderator: We would like to thank you for the touching presentation by the 5 mountains communities – it was very touching for us, while we did not really know what was going on, the action and seriousness really set the tone for our discussions over the next few days, drawing from the communities, so thank you for that.

Somsook: thanks to May, UPC and Arkom, friends from several countries, and Indonesia. The community representatives here from Indonesia are an important force, we have to keep stirring so that this force on the ground is a part of the meeting, with the internationals and mayors and community workers. I am very glad to be here, to be part of this important meeting, because disaster is an important issue we are facing in Asia. ACHR always views disaster as an important aspect of community organisation, and this is the right country to host this meeting, Indonesia, that faces so many disasters all the time. You must be rich, in disasters and experience, and local wisdom, and people who know how to deal with it. The question is how this local wisdom and community strength and knowledge can be part of the knowledge, to deal with disasters, as this power is being more and more taken over by external actors, development actors. How can the people build their resilience, and build their strength to work with local government, to deal with unpredictable problems and increasingly make it predictable with our knowledge and ability? It is not like that today because the power of the people, the power of the local, is decreasing, as the power of the central system takes over, takes over the power of the resilience of the people on the ground. These disasters are going to happen more and more in Asia, with the problems of climate change, Asia is one of the major risk areas.



So how will we look at this issue with a new way of management, a new way of doing? This way of doing is not totally new, but looking back at the strengths and knowledge of the people. Community people have the techniques and power, and hopefully through the discussion we can bring back the power of the people on the ground to manage disaster, to prepare, to change the situation in a more structural manner. We have the knowledge and capacity, only sometimes we don't know it until we come together and discuss and start doing, and the hidden knowledge comes out and starts pouring into a new possibility for society. I think you have seen that in Aceh, after the tsunami, and many places in Thailand too. We chose this city of Jogjakarta for this meeting because of the eruption of Mt Merapi, and as we heard from Tanto in the dance, the people have lived with that for a long time, they know the nature, the mood of Merapi. But in the modern day this has changed, because the power of management is not in the hands of local people as in the past, so you have to be relocated, to live in temporary housing, and the rehabilitation will lead to another eviction. Peter Swan produced a film comparing the tsunami process in three countries, and he called the film the Second Tsunami. So rehabilitation can be considered the second tsunami, which is worse than the first, the first is understandable because it is natural, but the second means people cannot stay in the same place. So people have to be relocated, further away, to smaller land, they may lose their sense of community, lose their system, and become an individual in a new complex society. So this is another disaster.

Rehabilitation can become a new kind of disaster. We don't want that. We want a way that solves the problem. For example with the tsunami in Thailand, many fisherman were living on land with unclear ownership, but through rehabilitation we can reorganize the community, secure land, good housing, good community systems, and it involves everyone.

So how can people who are affected become important actors themselves? They can become the new system – we must wake everyone up through the new survival process to rebuild a strong community, a strong life, and we can turn crisis into new opportunity by the people. In my opinion this is the key in disaster rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is unlocking a new system for the people. It is not so easy to do this everywhere – disaster happens so suddenly, on a big scale, in a situation where the government cannot understand, because they are very sectoral and each department does not talk to each other. But the disaster affects all, so the system of government cannot cope, and there are rankings and regulations for decisions and budgets,, so it is difficult to apply to a sudden and unexpected situation. So we see the gap between what the system has and what is needed on the ground – government is slow, and a supply driven approach doesn't match the demand.

Then, we have the development agencies that come with good intentions. They look at people as people in need, they take the welfare approach, give away things, see the people as helpless, suffering, in trauma, and the help always goes to individuals. It makes the people feel very helpless that they have to wait for assistance. Development agencies are helping but their help may not give people strength and the belief that they can help themselves. So this is another gap. Professionals can also be like development agencies if we don't understand people on the ground. But if we look at

the affected community as the subject, how we can bring development to the people and let them strengthen and stand up, give them knowledge, this can be another type of rehabilitation. Disaster has become an international industry, people come from Europe, they want to help with good intentions, but it is like we are being bombarded with good intentions, and where are the people on the ground who can help themselves and build their future?

Sometimes we just need a little change to build this experience. My example is Myanmar after Nargis – I went there very late after the cyclone, there were many processes already, many international agencies helped people to build houses, with architects and engineers, and they tried to design houses that can withstand cyclones, a wooden house. But when you look at the house it is just a box, 2.5-3.5 metres, there are lots of huts all over – what are you doing, architects and engineers, providing boxes? Tanto mentioned boxes provided by the government. Even the children don't want to live in these. Everywhere, after a disaster, its boxes, boxes, boxes. I had a meeting with community people in Myanmar and asked what they thought of houses built by the INGO. They said they were grateful as they didn't expect their government to provide houses. I asked if instead of the NGO building houses, we let the community build it, they said they would prefer to build it themselves. "We will survey our carpenters, we will know how to do it, we will check how much money", so we found the support to let the community do exactly what they wanted. With this money, the INGO can build 100 houses, but the people can build 300, so there is a lot of flexibility in the process, and that strength creates many other development possibilities. So it is not the amount of money, but the opportunity for the people to put together their efforts. It is very easy, natural – forget the box houses. Everywhere in the world we have so many architects and engineers still building boxes – we don't need them to do that. Let people think themselves what will be their temporary house – can we plan it? How and where to do it? It's very fun, and cheap and interesting to work with communities. Government will say "no, you don't have the knowledge, you must do this, do that". How can the government and professionals understand this and work together for new knowledge and new wealth?



Rehabilitation is not just physical, but the process of change, revival, bringing in new society and new systems, and as a result governments will have stronger communities, with participation, with stronger people on the ground. Communities who used to live scattered around, now have friends, systems, taskforces, small groups to deal with that and this. A disaster, if we don't manage it properly, becomes an eviction. For example in Bangkok, after the floods, people were told they are in the way of the water, they have to move, but actually it is the airport that should be moved! All of Bangkok is in the way of the water! We have the settlements, the cities: how can we find a way for people to live with nature? People can do that, be creative, and have power to manage so that every small unit of our people, has confidence as a part of the larger system.

So today we have a lot of groups who are facing this, working on this situation, and the countries at this meeting are particularly those with more disaster experience. Of course Indonesia is the key country. I hope that when you make the presentation, you can show your richness. We have Japan – a very serious series of disasters. We have Thailand, who have a process from the tsunami and they were able to link together – now whenever there is a disaster, the network is alert and they organize themselves to assist each other, through different networks. People see things from the eyes of the community, and the network can open up more space for the scattered communities affected to come together to think and work together. So most of the Thais here are from the community network – they are very active in the floods. There is also a mayor from a city affected by the floods.

We have the Philippines – some people were asking between the Philippines and Indonesia who has more disasters? Philippines and Vietnam are very kind countries, stopping cyclones before they reach mainland Asia. That means that you both have developed a lot of resilience and strength to deal with that. Sri Lank, a small island, has both man-made and natural disasters. The team here comes from a tsunami and flood city. So these are all groups with fresh experience of how to deal with disasters, so that communities are the prime actors, which means the local groups are able to manage the situation together. In this process we can sometimes get the central government to go with us, sometimes we cannot, like in Merapi, where we're still negotiating. In Japan I don't know how much we can do rehabilitation, or if we have to wait for a resolution to the nuclear problem.

But all the discussions can help find a direction for our regional development. Disaster rehabilitation will still become a big industry – how can we bring up this issue into that floor? How can we make this a new substance of the world of disaster rehabilitation? How can we explain it properly, so we have a good conclusion, a good belief, and so that we will gain more than we lose. Otherwise, what we lose is too much – all the assets, the deaths, all the things that we have, are gone, the farmers can lose their land and their jobs, their income. The loss is not only the immediate physical loss, but everything – your assets, your life, your future, your community. In the government way of thinking, building community is not important – we have to bring our knowledge together and bring it into the agenda for disaster rehabilitation in our country. How to change the dominant way of doing, from temporary houses which turn out to be permanent, how can we make humans live in boxes? We don't need to do that – we can find the way from the knowledge in this room and find the way to set the agenda for the region. I think we have enough knowledge to do that.

ACHR is involved in disaster, since the tsunami – MISEREOR tried to get all the groups to help those affected, and we started linking the different countries to share the experience. We had a sharing session between four countries in Phuket, then in Sri Lanka, then in Indonesia, with a lot of meaningful knowledge. Indonesia have done good work in Aceh, and Thailand, and Sri Lanka too, and we put together this knowledge, and bring it to the people's process on the ground. Once we can understand and analyse the knowledge, it can grow and become a new system, a new seed of understanding, for us and for larger society, in a world more uncertain and facing more disasters. When I visited the village in Myanmar, they did a dance performance, and a young man said that actually the cyclone was not too bad, because they used to live scattered, and now they have a process to reorganize themselves and live together. We can do that, depending on what we do in this meeting and whether it is on a large or small scale – of course we will continue after this meeting and I hope ACHR can find way to support the people-driven system further, we are just a part of making this process possible. So how can we move from rehabilitation up into a stronger course, where people can be freer and people can have the energy and ability to take care of themselves?

Natasha from UNESCAP: I will speak a little about what climate change adaption and resilience means from perspective of an international organisation. We look at sudden shocks, and things that happen over time, and we need to consider both in regards to resilience, for example, sea level and temperature changes. So as communities we need to consider things that will happen in 10 years too. When we define resilience, in a sense, it is the answer to vulnerability – the exposure to risks. If you live in an area of marginal land, you are at more risk, but it is also the capacity to respond – so if you are living alone, with no one to turn to, you are not using your full capability, so it is important to strengthen community so that you reduce vulnerability and increase resilience. The question is natural disaster – but this raises question of what is natural about a disaster? Now we have far more people than ever before, and they way we live makes us far more vulnerable, so we have to look at these disasters in a new way. Other disasters, like extreme weather events, they used to happen, but now they will happen more often and more severely, so we need to find solutions for dealing with it.

- Asia is the region most at risk – the climate, the ring of fire, and also the biggest population of people living in risky area. A weather event is not always a disaster – **the same storm in Japan and the Philippines will kill 17 times more people in the Philippines** – so it's about how people react. So disaster is also human made and can be changed by human impact.
- **Resilience** is broader than stronger houses – yes, we need to look at physical infrastructure, but we also need to take into account the economics, so that communities are economically stronger: what kind of livelihoods do they have, how would they be affected by disaster? We need mechanisms to secure ourselves – the middle income and rich have insurance, so surely the savings systems could be used in a new way for insurance.
- **Social aspect:** alone, you are not very strong, but together there are so many things – things that ACHR has been promoting: collecting information, linking up with the right people, organisations, government, forming a support network, in terms of physical and psychological aspects.



- **Political factors** – when disasters come, they worsen the structural system, so we need to link up to larger structures so that all needs are met, be inclusive, participative. So resilience has many aspects – once communities can address all these aspects, they are more resilient not just to natural disasters, but to any shock that comes in a more uncertain world – political or economic crisis.
- It is very true what Somsook said about the **disaster industry** – a lot of money is generated, so let's try to pay attention to these resources that are generated. You need to be prepared for these fly-in people who don't have much info, and say to them, "here is the house design style that suits our lifestyles, here are the people, here are the materials", so it is about being prepared for these people coming in.
- UNESCAP with some partners is developing the **Quick Guide** for policy makers on climate adaption – to tell local governments how to make the link to communities that are ready. So we want to list all the experiences and good solutions, and where you want and need to link up to the larger system, so that the policy makers start to link up to local communities.

May: disaster can either be a danger or an opportunity. After one disaster, another can come through the agencies or through the more powerful people in our community or country, the most obvious is eviction after disaster. People have already lost everything and they want to go back to their land, but the bigger powers prevent it. This is danger of disaster after another disaster. It can also be an



opportunity, and this is what we will be sharing today, relying on each other and our local strengths. For this, the people have to be at the front. The second point from Somsook is about the gaps in disaster response from the different actors – the first big actor is the government, but it fails due to bureaucracy, mindset and programs, which are incompatible to what people want. The second are development agencies who mean well but their way of helping makes people more dependent and individualized. How do we respond and move forward? We have so much experience in this room of people doing and thinking collectively for themselves. This is what we want to put together, to know where we want to go as a region, how do we put this on the agenda, to make other actors see that this is the way for people. We are more resilient if we work and act together as a community. Resilience is not just about responding once disaster strikes, but preparing beforehand as a community, and how we move on after the disaster. Do we go our separate ways or do we try and rebuild together?

Katy, Merapi community representative: we do not consider the Merapi eruption as a disaster, as it brings benefits, even though I lost everything. We can work together and are now stronger. We are against evictions as the land is more fertile after eruption, so we are taking advantage of the fertility of the land, and we have our own wisdom for preparing for eruption, so we are fighting the government about relocation. We are now already farming and growing plants, we are not afraid, even if we live in the sides of Merapi – we have the hunch, we know the way Merapi will erupt, we know the heat, we know when the dangers come. We believe Merapi is guarded by our great, great, grandfather and we believe he will not harm our people, so we have our beliefs to defend ourselves from the dangers. So we are working side by side as families with our neighbours.

Mr Suwoto, village chief from Merapi area: I am very honoured and proud to be here speaking with you and having the conference in our neighbourhood. I would also like to express gratitude to Arkom and steering committee for holding the workshop here. I coordinate 10 villages, of which 8 were affected by the eruption and the government proposed relocation – only 5 accepted, the other three did not. The 5 villages agreed with conditions – they decide the location, and secondly they would like land with the certificate. Now they are still in the process and waiting for realization of process from the government. As the head of the village, I am in a difficult position, as I am also a representative of the government, and must make sure that government plans are realized, but as elected head must ensure that the villagers' wishes are met. Those who accepted to move, their houses vanished and so it was easier for them to move. For those who did not accept, we need to give more information than what media coverage has provided. From the three villages, 450 families have returned to their own site, and are independently building their houses, with no assistance at all from the government. I also returned to my old home. We declined the



relocation because our land boundaries still exist, and we lived there for generations, and also relocation is not a guarantee that we will have a better future elsewhere. The government is still trying to convince us to move. There were 5 people who died in their area from the eruption, but only 1 was from the village, the rest were in a refugee camp, so the location is not necessarily dangerous, and we will fight to the end to stay in the same site. One key factor for still being together is that we are united and organized. The people are working together – the rich and the poor are collaborating, without assistance from the government. We are declining relocation with our reasons – the local government hasn't prepared the special planning yet for the area, but the villagers have done their own mapping, highlighting the dangerous areas. We are back to normal life, raising livestock. The government has not provided economic or infrastructure assistance, and the people are trying to show the government that they are able to live independently together.

Country presentations

Japan: Sachiko Motomochi, local coordinator for AMDA (Asian Medical Doctors Association, an NGO) My home town of Otsuchi was directly affected by the earthquake last year. The tsunami affected three prefectures. My home town has a declining population and population has fallen even more since the tsunami. One third of residents are elderly. Now 10 months after the disaster we are still clearing the town. I was working as a local coordinator for AMDA, a practical local network – providing medicines, supplies, food and water. After 6 months, people relocated to temporary housing near the mountains. After the tsunami there were many temporary businesses and mobile stores. One place was Oraga (meaning Myself), to try and encourage people to stand up and open up businesses and create opportunities for work and have exchanges and study tours. We need to try and keep youngsters in the town. We had meeting of the government side to try to help – falling population, failing businesses, and the government suggested making a 40.5 metre embankment. They did not provide good information. The government recommended to move the centre of the city towards the mountainside, or make a very high embankment. It was a starting point for discussion with victims.



We are starting to build some community places – similar to co-housing, incremental housing reconstruction, which can be moved to permanent site later, one unit as a clinic and the other unit as a community space. We set up the project in June and also rehabilitated the local community. AMDA is also helping on health and wellbeing. At first it was very difficult but now we are using the local network. The community centre is not finished yet but we are hoping to have events like furniture making, so many people are involved who are concerned about community events. In December was the opening ceremony of the community centre, like a local festival, with 100 people joining, making mochi and holding a Christmas festival. Now it is a free space, not a big space, 3m by 6m, but it is enjoyed by the people. The local community has started planning with local people about what they want for this free community space, like parties, a small library, cooking classes. Key challenges remain: jobs and funds, building safe structures, as well as health, self confidence, and keeping traditions alive, connecting to the administration, and the role of NGOs.

Somsook: is the quality of networks and the quality of the revival better when you provide a community centre? Does the physical revival of the centre help people?

Sachiko: it's a tiny space but easy to find and understand visually so it's a big change. Also the community centre means many people can join and it's important for connecting and making processes for the community network.

Question from Indonesia: what about the relationship amongst the stakeholders?

Sachiko: local government is not actually working well now. That is why I am helping with non-government side.

Natasha: the community centre is movable and expandable. Are people considering this for their houses?

Yes, it is like a model house and people are considering it for their house. It is only a framework that can be a house, a shop.

Question from Arif, Indonesia: do you face any difficulties in recovering? Are there any challenges, is it as clear as you told us?

Sachiko: We had to wait for three months to get permission. It is hard. Many people are struggling about where to live after temporary housing.

Philippines, presented by Jocelyn: we have had 8 major disasters in 11 years, including the trash slide – I was a victim of this disaster.

The Philippines people's network has developed their own process of initiatives to assist the communities that were victims of disaster.

- 1) Start by getting data and mapping to get to know the people and let them think about their future.
- 2) Introduce the importance of savings so people start saving to be able to rebuild their lives.
- 3) Try to form an association or organisation at the neighbourhood level so that they can act together, and talk about next steps. There are different solutions from the community: immediate solutions like getting materials and borrowing money, then, transferring to another site in a temporary house, and in the longer term thinking about permanent housing, so some communities have bought land, like mine did, where they feel they will be safe to live together.

Question from Indonesia: do you involve the local government as a stakeholder? How can you do this? Secondly, you showed a map of danger areas, but there are many people living in that area – will they follow your instructions to move to another area, or reject? How can you convince them?

Josie: local government is open to this kind of partnership. We work very hard to convince them and little by little, the government understands our aim and practice. In the disaster case, our experience is that the Federation is viewed as a competition, as the local government is afraid our process competes with them. The Federation is trying to help them to get an understanding, but it takes time. Anyway we don't wait for the government, we make our own solutions.

With regards to the hazard map: the flood prone areas are also without security of tenure, and we told the people living there that we are trying to find a solution to put them in a safer place, which is why we did the land research, because they know that the local government will evacuate them at any moment. So as an alternative option we are trying to relocate them to a nearby site.



Regarding resistance from the community to move, we used to face the same thing in Bicol. When the government told them that they were being evicted due to threat of disaster, the community resisted, but then the Federation entered. This was a shoreline so it was a high risk area. When we entered it was a matter of explaining to the community the advantage and disadvantage of transferring to different area. These communities always think of their resources – if you transfer to new site with no resources for your family, there is resistance, but if you try to explain the positive and negative sides, you can have alternative solutions to issues, especially jobs, and then they are the ones who agree to transfer to keep their families safe. Also, in this hazard map area, along the river, when we told them that you have to transfer to another place because of the risk to your family, the cost is expensive so there was resistance because of this. So in our experience we explain the pros of cons of moving and staying and then it is their own choice.

Indonesian question: who made the hazard map, the government or community? And based on experience in other countries, the map from the government is not used, people use their own experience and techniques instead. What is your experience?

Paulo, FDUP engineer: the map was made by the community members of the barangay, the Urban Poor Community Alliance, with key leaders from the associations within the barangay, and then through focus group discussion we identified areas at risk of dangers. So the community made the map. The NGO role was to present the map with Googlemaps and borders.

Josie: we identified vacant plots of land and we used the maps to lobby the government, as government always said there was no land. When we identified the land they could not say that there is no land.

Natasha: here it was community mapping of floods – what if it is a disaster that never happened before? Or people are moving to new area, so they cannot use community process to identify dangerous areas, or certain areas of volcano are unstable? Community history is one thing, but what happens if it's a new area or the situation has changed after the disaster? You probably can never be 100% safe but what can you do to help?

Josie: in the case of Bicol, because it was a disaster area, when we purchased the land for relocation, we complied with all the requirements (permits, certifications) from the government

agencies like the Science bureau and others. They inspected the land and certified that the land is safe for relocation so we complied with all government policies in Bicol.

Janet: we link to ESSC – Environmental and Social Science Centre and the Geoscience Bureau – they study the land we are going to acquire, and they can give us advice. Like in Davao, the community was at risk of flooding, but the community resisted relocation as the new site was far from sources of income, so instead the community made a plan and a design that would adapt to the situation, like stilt houses. So it's a process of the community adapting to disasters, with the help of agencies.

Thailand experience:

Thailand was badly affected by floods in 2011, and as a result of this experience the communities developed their disaster response mechanisms and systems. While the government did have relief plans, donated materials did not always reach the people who needed them or people received goods which they didn't need.

- **Aramsri from Nakorn Sawan:** In the case of Nakorn Sawan city, there were many communities badly affected by the floods. The community networks organized their own flood shelter centres, for the benefit of a total of 1,839 households in the city. These shelters provided supplies, kitchens, and sleeping places, as government shelters were insufficient for the demand. As a result, a community disaster relief mechanism has been established in the city, with the following aims: 1) connect and link different groups and networks at the province and city level to address disaster rehabilitation and planning for future disasters; 2) set up a disaster fund with a management team; 3) gather data and information for planning future disaster responses and also respond to current disaster. The disaster fund was established with contributions from the savings groups, from the Thailand national slum network, and with a seed fund from ACHR.

- At the national level, there is also a disaster network, with two aims: firstly, to connect people and build linkages, between communities (both affected and not affected) and with local organisations, and to build a management system at the community/district level to address future disasters, whilst integrating their plans with those of local authorities. This means building understanding at the local level, by carrying out surveys and mapping. A coordination centre with clear division of roles should be established, and data should be collected in coordination with local government offices and communities. A city fund should be established, and a plan for disasters should be drawn up, in conjunction with the city development plan. This process requires meetings with the various organisations to build understanding of the situation, analyse problems, and plan for the future, as well as visits to affected communities.

- **Somsook:** the flood highlighted the scale of the community capacity. At the national level we tried to open up the floor so that all the communities prepare themselves ahead of time. The government will little by little bring in policies, but it is better that the communities have their own plans and then use these plans to negotiate with government activities. We organized a national workshop last month and the community invited the minister, so most of the communities have started their plans and are investigating damage and developing long, short and medium term plans, before the government actually starts implementing. This is a movement that has started at national and local scale.

Sri Lanka: There are many types of disasters in Sri Lanka – flood, landslide, tsunami, cyclone and drought. In 2011, eight cities were affected by floods. There are many institutional set ups at different levels at the national, district, community and sub-committees levels. The ACHR/ACCA model of the Urban Slum Upgrading Program (USUP) is an alternative to the national structure of responses. Batticaloa had civil unrest from 1983-2009 and tsunami and flood in 2010. After the flood, we established a disaster management team at the community level, profiling a community disaster profile, through the Disaster Management team.



Sri Lanka community representative: in 2009 Sevanatha and the USUP program helped us to establish a savings group and I am the secretary of one group. In Batticaloa district there are 2000 Women's Bank members, and with the savings they give loans for livelihoods. Now we are looking at problems, such as some households needing toilets and housing, and now 38 houses have received a loan and 17 houses are completed. Now we have established the fund, it helped last year in the

floods, which were the worst in 100 years. In this flood the community and society helped with donations. The women's society is working very well, and the men are participating too. The municipality also helped them to establish a disaster committee, and we want to initiate processes.

Municipal Commissioner for Batticaloa: in Sri Lanka, we are also establishing a system for protecting people from disasters. Occasionally we have a flood situation. We also experience drought. In 1978 we had a cyclone that caused 1000 people to die. We experienced a tsunami for the first time. Normally after disaster we have people who are displaced and come back after two or three days. But after the tsunami, we established a disaster management centre, and 25 districts have a centre. At the grassroots level and municipality, we establish a committee to respond to disaster. We have established emergency committee and evacuation training, and an early warning system. In Colombo they have a warning system. We have done hazard mapping done by the government. In Batticaloa district we have some climate change impacts, so some organisations are helping to adapt e.g. UN Habitat for mitigating the effects. We have studies and they proposed some programs and they agreed to support it, and a Norwegian agency will implement the project, which is ongoing now. Batticaloa is a pilot city they selected and after that want to spread to other cities and establish a national policy from this experience.

Vietnam:

Community representatives from Vinh city and Ha Tinh city:

- On average, Vietnam suffers every year from 9-10 cyclones and 6 floods, and in the central part they suffer 6-7 typhoons and 3-4 floods. Usually after a typhoon many houses collapse, and the flood level can be head height. Few households have boats and they have to live on their roofs and wait for donations by boat or helicopter. A lot of infrastructure was damaged.
 - Vinh has received ACCA small project funding and so before the disaster were already familiar with the ACCA community-driven approach. When disaster hit, we already had the experience and could organize our community to do disaster rehabilitation. Initially, when we made the proposal with the assistance of community supporters, for ACCA disaster rehabilitation money, we tried to get support for rebuild houses and income generation. However, we had already received external support in cash, 5,0000 USD, and food and clothes, but they split this money without considering the level of suffering of each household, including the money donated by Thai communities.
 - When the ACCA money came, we had community meetings and checked specifically in each household the extent of damage following disaster, so that the money was distributed according to need, for a grant or loan. The community had already contributed labour to repair road, so we decided that the community could receive loans for income generation. The cohesiveness of community members was enhanced and the ACCA money that was repaid has become a community development fund for the community. The ACCA money used for livestock, poultry, fisheries, and also restoring some houses.
 - **Community rep from Ha Tinh:** I suffered from the same flooding in October 2010. After the floods, the community received 1300 gift bags from different donors and one ton of rice. However, for food, there was only rice. But there was no assistance for houses affected by the floods. So ACCA money was used to provide low interest loans for repairing houses, but it covered just women union's members, but then 76 out of 80 joined the savings network and they set up a CDF. The loan from ACCA is used not just for housing repairs but also for income generation – it depends on the household what is their priority for using the loan.
 - **Vinh community rep:** Our community has 45 households which every year suffers from typhoon or disasters. Before the floods/typhoon, we are warned by the weather forecast, so we try to dig or bury their belongings, and after the floods we can dig them out.
- Somsook:** how do you work with the government?
- Actually there is a CDF at the ward level, so the ward and the committee discuss how to use the revolving funds. In Vinh, apart from the CDF (from ACCA money), the savings of the community member are also used as a revolving fund for community members to borrow (same in Ha Tinh). We have monthly meetings of savings group to consider which household should be prioritized in borrowing money.



Indonesian question: do you have some effort to plant some trees by the sea or build a dyke?

- Both cities are a bit inland, not by the sea, but around 10km from the beach. Both communities were affected by flood and typhoon. But the whole country is affected – from March each year there is a full typhoon on the whole coastline. Philippines serves as a protection from the typhoon. There is a mountain between Lao and Vietnam, so Vietnam suffers most. Regarding planting trees, we have the flooding protection forest. With support from the Red Cross, the community also planted a forest near the river, and one of the projects in ACCA is to plant a mangrove forest to prevent flooding. The big change is that community people themselves are concerned about the safety of the mangrove – depending on the weather.

Indonesia

Mr Ridwan, from Aceh: Following the tsunami in Aceh, the community went to the government land office for land entitlements, to get the land certificate. The government's reconstruction plan after the tsunami was to create three new cities far from the coast, 40km from where we lived. Then in collaboration with the professionals supporting us, we submitted a concept plan to the national government – that people could stay where they were, and create buffers, such as 500m of mangrove, then empty space, then a coconut grove, then another buffer, then more coconut trees, then the settlement, more coconuts, then evacuation centre, then buffer, then village, and here you could have hill or high buildings for evacuation. This was submitted to national government and was accepted. So in the capital of Aceh people could maintain their land.

- Another thing was to link the 23 villages, by inviting all the village heads in March 2005. 12 villages linked to form a network called Village Solidarity Network (JUD), and after a while all 23 villages joined in, and negotiated with the government, and the government tried to persuade us to move, but we replied if you move us to mountain and it erupts, where will we move, the sky? So the government accepted that we could stay and the villagers made a declaration as this was the first movement by the people, so it was heavily covered by the media.
- **Wardah:** Aceh is a gender segregated society, so the role of women is undermined, and we (UPC) invited women to play a role including in house building. We invited experts from Chile and Guatemala to teach patchwork skills, where people recall the memories, and then they visualise it through the patchwork. Women were participating in building their own houses, and they are active in construction. Bill Clinton, UN Special Envoy came to Aceh, and the government took him to our area.
- **Wardah:** Aceh was the first experience in working in post-disaster reconstruction, and it was an unprecedented disaster. Everyone was involved there, all of you here also contributed so thank you for that. At that time, Aceh had been a military conflict area for decades, since 1970s, so both horizontal and vertical fragmentation. The area where we worked was considered one of the strongest supporters of the separatist movement. We directly chose this area, because we knew it was likely the government would neglect the area because of the separatist groups there. The government idea was to take people far away from the hills, because those in the hills were separatists, and the ones living at the bottom of hill support them, so the government wanted people to move to barracks where the army could control everything and weaken the separatists. When we entered the area, government declared 2km construction free zone along the coast. We talked to people about whether they want to relocate, and the people said they wanted to go back because their dead are buried near their houses, and in January 2005 people had returned already to their village. We made this very public so the media covered the fact that people want to return to the village and maintain their roots – it was symbolic, to tell government that people have their own initiatives and ideas about how to reconstruct their lives.
- When we worked there, first we wanted to understand the context, and then think what could we do to contribute? It was a military conflict, neighbouring villages didn't know each other, they also had conflicts. So our role was not just about fixing houses and giving water and rice, but how to contribute to bring peace to military conflict area. So that was why we chose the area. Also we saw that this was a society that was highly gender segregated. So that was another issue that we focused on and deliberately wanted to change. We think that through that, the people can maintain their links to their land and history, and so very early on we linked the villages to get them together. ACHR invited us to a regional gathering and we took the village leaders to Sri Lanka – that was one way to link them, to see that



they were not alone and could share and be stronger. When we build houses, we believe very much that it should be owned by the people, they should be the main subject, the doer, so we involve them from the beginning, including Yuli and Cak Cak. Community organizers lived with the communities in tents, intensively developed relations and trust, and then the technical team came and developed models of houses, and we made it very open, discussing with masons about materials, sand and so on, prices, and we put it in writing. This was a way also to change social relationships, not only a way of keeping the people to be busy (as a remedy for trauma), but we also needed to really understand the context, the social and political situation, not just build houses for them, but actually reconstructing the life of the people and using it as an opportunity to make it better.

- After Aceh we also worked in earthquake affected areas in Java and Jogja, and the mud volcano disaster, where 40-50,000 villagers have to relocate because their villages are drowning in mud from a oil drilling error. There was a survey by Victor Davis from the UK, he said the mud will stop only in 2032, and the land will subside 90m deep. This is really human made disaster, but the company is very safe because they bought everybody, the parliament etc... the lesson we learnt is that disaster is also an opportunity, a blessing, if we understand the overall context, we don't look at it just partially, that these people are just victims, and we provide water and houses and leave and move to another disaster. We have to really understand the context and approach it as a way of reconstructing lives. It can happen if you give trust to the people, to their ingenuity and local wisdom, as you saw this morning and in the presentations, and if we believe in the strong and general participation of the people in all aspects from the beginning to the end, this can then be a blessing and a big opportunity. What we learnt in Aceh, if we did it in the normal community organizing approach, we could not have reached 23 villages and done infrastructure and agriculture. This is a big opportunity, a stage to reshape the community and the society, and change it into something better for the people, as long as you can understand the overall context and the vision of the people.

Question from Ake of 4 Regions Slum Network (from Thailand): what is the situation now with land certificates now in Aceh?

- **Wardah:** when the tsunami happened, the government land office claimed it lost all the data, but it was not the case, they had all the documents in a safe area, so we suspected that there would be manipulation about land. We did mapping and community sketching and also computerized mapping, and we submitted it to the government land office, and other groups did the same thing. But the government turned it down, said they want to do it themselves with their own equipment. We said they were wasting people's money, the people did it themselves, the government has to accept and so now they have the land certificates.

Somsook: what did Merapi people learn from Aceh?

Wardah: we learnt from Merapi actually. Here there are two approaches. Arkom has same approach as we did in Aceh. The 5 Mountains Network is different, or it complements, the other approach. The Network of the 5 Mountains really implement the principles I said before, the trust in the ingenuity of the people. They did distribute relief supplies, but only for one month, we did 3 months in Aceh, the government did so for 2 years in Aceh, we didn't believe in this. After one month, the villagers linked to each other, the villages that were safe helped the others.

The villagers that were affected moved temporarily, to villages where it was safe – people to people helping. They started also with the cultural expression, with the stories about disaster, from generation to generation, they tell about what to do if there is a disaster, through dancing and singing and cultural expression. In the community where we are going tomorrow, where the mountain erupted, they got big stones from the mountain, and the villagers changed them into sculptures which they can sell. So they have the creativity to change disaster into economic opportunities. This complements our approach in Aceh.



Group discussion: what are your key learning from today's sharing? What are the most important things that have to be done for communities to move forward in building resilience against disaster?

Thailand/Sri Lanka and Vietnam group discussion:

Somsook: how to we get people in the process, how to link up with other groups?

- **Aramsri**, Thai community representative: the importance of this international sharing is to meet people facing the same problems, sharing the same heart. We need opportunities for these meetings and exchanges, to think through the problem together.
- **Somsook**: the Thai sharing is interesting – how we got a collective process of cleaning up, of contributions, helping each other, need to have a process of setting up our own fund. We see the importance of bringing people together to repair their communities, and the value of networks.
- **Vietnam**: key learnings: 1) the pro-activeness of the communities to organize themselves to deal with disaster, 2) the communities are proactive in offering proposals to the government on the relevant issues, 3) we are very impressed with capacity of communities in organizing themselves and their solidarity in doing so, 4) neutral help between community members is still good in Vietnam's rural areas, but that community spirit is being lost in urban areas.
- **Thailand**: we realized the significance of forming groups and peoples networks in the recovery process, and also in dealing with important issues in policy and negotiations. 2) people need to be given opportunities and platforms to exchange their problems and knowledge, and to find directions to deal with problems of disaster. 3) there should be cooperation and partnerships with



other community groups and other actors from outside the community, to create a network of participation to deal with disaster. 4) communities need to create funds to help them to manage the problem of disaster. This fund could possibly link with outside funds. 5) a plan needs to be made and people need to be prepared to increase their knowledge in order to deal with disaster in the future.

- **Sri Lanka**: 1) we are impressed with the pro-activeness of people in taking destiny into their own hands and moving fast after the disaster, gathering their own data and materials, 2) we need to create funds so that we have our own money, 3) we need to do consultations with people, listen to the peoples' needs when talking about housing and infrastructure, 4) people can do a lot themselves, immediately, without waiting for the government.
- **Aramsri** agrees with the point 4 of Sri Lanka, as in many cases we heard this morning, the people had a quick response right after the disaster. Networks are more important than dealing with each community individually.

Question 2: What are the most important things that have to be done for communities to move forward in building resilience against disaster?

- **Sri Lanka**: we need to get the communities linked with government officers, get the community data and field information from the community level, and governments can have the correct information. The government can share the information that they have like the early warning system, maybe a joint disaster management committee, 2) important to raise awareness in communities of the structures and processes that the government has in place, 3) stakeholder coordination needs to be improved.
- **Anh**: in Vietnam there are public speakers that the government can provide information to the households. Not just for disasters, but general information dissemination.
- **Somsook**: but this is a one-way information from government to people, so having a committee is better so that information can be shared in both directions. But not just a joint committee, the community should still have their own processes.
- **Sri Lanka**: we can get a community action plan about the disaster situation by sharing information, doing a joint action planning. Also every settlement needs a disaster centre, but it can also serve other functions. Communities should also have a safe place that can also be used for other purposes.
- **Thailand**: 1) create a platform for people to exchange experiences and to find a direction for management of disasters. 2) partnerships need to be formed with both agencies outside and from within, to create a collaborative network for dealing with disasters. 3) there is a need for an exchange of information at all levels in preparation for disaster – to build up knowledge and be prepared, and form a network in which the members share their resources to support one another when needed. 4) communication needs to be made to the public to create understanding and disseminate knowledge, and create assistance between groups.
- **Natasha**: we want public perceptions to change, so that people don't view us as victims, but capable actors.

- **Vietnam:** 1) we need to have a community meeting to share the experiences and learnings from this workshop back in Vietnam. Also we need to discuss community plans for disasters at the monthly savings group meetings. It is important to have representatives of the local government and CDF to participate in the local meetings so that there is understanding by both sides of the community plan. Also need detailed classification of housing so that we can prepare which houses will need more help in case of disaster – assign one household to look after another, for example, if necessary. Then mobilize community resources through savings, but also disaster fund is a useful idea.

Group two: Philippines and Japan and Indonesia:

We are aware that there is a human component in disasters – especially now that natural disasters can be induced by humans. So the management and community role is an important part in coping with disasters. Secondly, information is a key component, because when communities have no access to information, they cannot plan after disasters. So access to information, whether from within the community or from outside, will determine the solution that is taken by the community. Evacuation needs to be organized from the perspective of the community, as regards what is safe and where – this leads to another question of whether to relocate or stay. Local wisdom and the knowledge of experts and professionals and agencies all matter: e.g. in the Philippines there are a couple of state bodies that keep information about whether an area is safe or not. So these are two sorts of information that communities should have: from within and from outside.

Question 2 (answered by community architect students from Indonesia): professionals and experts should get closer to the community, they should be able to listen to the community. Communities should have objective access to the risk factor of their area from government bureaus, like in Philippines. We should build closeness locally and regionally. Communities need to find a way to wake up the government, and the government needs to be aware of the community’s capacity and ability. In Japan’s experience, at the time of disaster, the government was confused as to what to do – this was a time when community could help. Community networks can mediate between communities and government, and establish channels of information. One way of setting up networks is through savings groups, especially for women, and then build up negotiating power with government.

Group 3 (Indonesia): the key learning is that victims of disaster can have some adaptation through their local wisdom. We can see the disaster from a positive point of view – we can stand up from disaster and recover from the disaster together.

Peoples’ organisations need to be strong and good. We learn from the previous disasters and from the local people, so that we can stand up from ourselves without having to wait for others help. We help each other totally, not just for our own gain or specific purposes. The government should not just make decisions, but try to facilitate the people because people have their own point of view about the disaster so the government should become facilitator not the decision maker.



KEY LEARNINGS FROM SHARING SESSION	MOVING FORWARD TO BUILD RESILIENCE
---	---

- See the disaster from a positive point of view, disaster as an opportunity to reform the structure (social, political, economic).
- Pro-activeness of people in taking destiny into their own hands (moving fast after the disaster, gathering their own data and materials)
- Trust people's local wisdom
- Significance of forming groups and networks in the recovery process, and in dealing with important issues in policy and negotiations
- Importance of savings for strengthening the community and leverage fund. Communities need to create fund to help them manage disaster. This fund could link with outside funds.
- Establishing close coordination and collaborative work with different stakeholders (a joint disaster management committee)
- Importance of learning from one's experience.
- The importance of access to information (ownership of information) → to determine solution is taken by the community. Example: evacuation needs to be organized from the perspective of the community, as regards what is safe and where – this leads to another question of whether to relocate or stay.

- A joint disaster management committee
- Increase awareness of community and broader understanding on environmental situation
- Build networks on community level
- Build partnerships with different institutions and stakeholders coordination needs to be improved.
- Build regional network of disaster prone countries to support each other
- Create a platform for people to exchange experiences and information and to find a direction for management of disasters.
- Professionals/experts should work closer with the communities.
- NGOs/Professionals/experts should facilitate community's alternative solution



Live Tweeting from the workshop

During the workshop, Elisa from the Rujak Institute of Urban Studies was live-tweeting the discussions and events, from the opening words of Somsook and Natasha to the performance by the Five Mountains Art Group, and updates on all the country presentations. There was a lot of feedback, comments and questions, as Elisa reports here.

Some of these were inspired by the country presentations. For example, Indra Wihodo (@indra_handayani) was inspired by Sachiko-san's presentation and it reminded her colleagues of the Japanese story. We were also introduced to Kumiko Homma (@kumikohomma), who is an activist in Japan post-tsunami and an artist who is involved in Project Fukushima!. We were introduced to her via Grace Marcellina (@great_gracious) who retweeted our tweets.

There was response from Irfan Toni H (@irfant), a government official who is working in BNPB (National Disaster Mitigation Agency). He informed us that there will be Asian Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction (AMCDRR) in October 2012 hosted by BNPB. The conference site is www.5thamcdrr-indonesia.net. The idea of the conference is to strengthen local capacity on Disaster Risk Reduction. Toni also revealed that he is willing to discuss further outside of Twitter.

There was also a long discussion between a professional architect, Setiadi Sopandi (@cunggs) and the official twitter account of Changemakers in Indonesia (@changemakers_id), a program of the Ashoka Foundation. Setiadi Sopandi asked how conventional practices and students can contribute and fit into the activities. Is post-disaster relief already a complex industry? He also found it unfair when 'an activist' implied that architects are ignorant and alienated from post-disaster development. He wanted to know whether there is any need from this particular workshop to encourage designers in many kinds of post-disaster development (I find his reactions interesting, since he always used the term 'development'). He also stated that post disaster development is already a new industry or even a discipline - which needs special expertise and workers. But at the end he agreed that coordination is an important key to a successful post-disaster development, since it is politics which makes things complex, while survival and design are not. He ended his comments by giving an example about some young designer tried to do a good by making designs for post-disaster reconstruction in Yogyakarta in 2007 and Merapi in 2010. But in the end these designs were impractical. Another example was when he was preparing an exhibit for 'Deployable Architecture' from famous architects and designers, which he thought were out of context.

Day 2 – field trip to Kali Tengah Lor village, 4km from peak of Merapi

The group visiting Kali Tengah Lor travelled in a convoy of open top jeeps, which allowed us to see close up the devastated areas and drive across the river which had been filled with sand and ash from the eruption. We also drove past temporary shelter settlements, which are barrack-style bamboo constructions.



Yuli: This is the highest village near Merapi. There are 161 households in 4 neighbourhoods. Mr Suroto, the village chief, explained yesterday that 4 villages oppose relocation. When the eruption happened, the villagers voluntarily evacuated, and there was only 1 death, a disabled person who was unable to move.

- This whole village was affected by hot steam and lava, up to 15km downhill. During the eruption, people moved to the government shelter for two months. They were unhappy with the conditions so they moved back, and could find boundaries of their houses and their land so they came and rebuilt their homes in the same place as before. The main village industry is dairy, and with compensation money from the government, they bought new cows, and once the grass had grown back they returned with cows. The government shelter was supposed to be for one year. The government plan is to build housing– 36m square per household, with 30 million rupiah in money for construction. This village doesn't want to relocate so they don't get government assistance.

- The reason that Community Architects decided to help this village is because villagers wanted to return and rebuild without help. So the architects together with the villagers decided to rebuild the houses one by one – they reused old materials, and after that they waited for further support. The ACCA proposal was made successfully. More people came back so construction was faster, and a local organisation also provided support. ACCA money was used to speed up construction, e.g. to buy any materials that were lacking.



- **Anh:** so did they budget for all 161 households? Did the community discuss how to use these funds? Yes

- The same process also happened in 2 villages down the hill – they are not part of ACCA though. The ACCA fund was for emergency processes. The second stage of the community architects' help was to carry out mapping in 4 villages, showing strengths, weakness, and opportunities, as they needed to find out how to make the village strong again. During construction and mapping, the government issued a plan called **Disaster Risk Area III**, which included this area, so the government want them to move but the people didn't want to. So the government refused to provide water, electricity and won't let the community be part of the Sleman Regency administrative area, the government issued many threats.

- The second process of mapping included the issue of the government threat, so they decided to make the community self-sufficient, and they identified key issues and used the ACCA funds – for road, drainage, water supply. They also understand the consequence of the government threat and so they included it in the mapping.

- **Anh:** what about electricity?

- We are in Jogja province, and 1 km away is Central Java province. In Central Java province the government allowed villagers to stay, not relocate, so the village here negotiated with a village in Central Java for electricity – a clever solution. At the end of the day, they also asked for electricity registration from the other city in Java, which accepted to give it to them, but the village remains part of Jogja.

Meeting with village chiefs and representatives in the temporary mosque.

Mr Suroto, village head, and Tomiwon, Harinto, Pah Narto, Pah Sumamo: thank you for coming and welcome to all participants.

- There was previously an eruption in 2006, and because of this previous eruption, it was easier for the government to ask people to relocate in 2010 (because eruptions are more frequent). There were some volunteers from the community development department at Jogjakarta University who came to teach the community to reduce their disaster risk, after 2006. In October 2009 there was also an evacuation practice. And the next year, in 2010, the volcano erupted. Because they had already trained, there were no casualties in the two villages.

The eruption created new valuable resources: For the sale of sand from the eruption, one truck is valued at 150,000 rupiah. Of the revenue, 60% goes to private sector, 40% goes to public sector, and this is divided as follows: 15% to district government, 40% to the community, 20% for the village government, the rest is for mitigation.

- The reason we asked to come back here is because we make a living from farming and cattle. The government compensation was only 100 m square of farmland, which is not enough for our activities (and also located far away). Thank you all for coming and we ask for your support and pray that we can live happily ever after here.

- **Diane: could you explain more about the land situation and posters against relocation?**

We already have a certificate of land ownership – this was provided after the 2006 eruption. There was a national land certificate program. After the 2010 eruption we also got a provincial land certificate – but we are not allowed to live or settle on the land. But we have been living here since 1800.

- **Question from Thai group: some of the farmland must have been destroyed completely? How did the village organize to give land to those who were now without land?** Actually, after the eruption, the conditions were not too bad. The boundaries were still visible and it was easy to plant crops again. This village is already back to like how it used to be.

- **Vietnam: how did you organize to evacuate?**

This man is the coordinator of evacuations. Like shown in the film about Merapi, the people already had indicators of when the volcano will erupt, and they had training in 2009 in evacuation. Then we had a meeting to assign coordinators and make groups, and planned who will lead the groups. First we collected 5 people per neighbourhood to be on the evacuation team. We also had an emergency logistics team. And we established meeting points. We made a list of communities and the names of households and we keep this list. With regard to evacuation planning, we had meetings between stakeholders of the community, and made lists of names in each neighbourhood. The RT chief makes the list of names, as he knows the people in the neighbourhood.

We set up an information centre – I am now head of the information centre in this village. When we receive information from the national centre about the volcano activity, we pass it on the neighbourhood chiefs. After that, we evacuate people who have a high risk profile first such as pregnant women, children, the elderly. The list already identifies those who are high risk.

- **Anh: what about transport? Does the government provide support?**

In the meeting, we also listed our own sources of transport. If we don't have enough, we will ask for outside help. The government is not asked to provide transport as it is too slow.

- **Thailand: could you tell us the eruption indicators?**

Firstly, the weather gets very hot. Secondly, the birds fly away from the mountain – a week before. The ash and the coal become darker, there is ash rain. This is knowledge that has been passed on for generations. When the birds fly away, it means we have one week. Without the government information, we already know when the volcano will erupt.



- **Question from Indonesian participant: did the government put an early warning system here? Where would you plant bamboo so it can serve as an early warning?**

Bamboo has been growing here since before the first settlement came here in 1815. It is an early alarm: before the eruption, a lot of ash will come out, and it is heavy and weighs down the bamboo so it cracks, which alerts people. The government alarm is already not working when needed, because the ash gets too thick. Bamboo is the last minute alarm – it means evacuation is very urgent.

- **Question from Indonesia: why did the cattle not survive, despite the evacuation plan?**

The president had already promised us compensation, so we did not take the cattle.

- **Anh: Could you also evacuate rice and food?**

We only took our valuables and important certificates. There were food supplies in the shelter.

- **Question from Philippines: in 2006 and 2010 there were eruptions here, and you got government assistance and ACCA assistance. So what are you doing to prepare for the next eruption, since Merapi erupts every 4 or 5 years? In Philippines we also have the Mayon volcano. After the communities there returned to their homes after the eruption, we organized savings groups there to prepare for the next eruption. So if Mayon erupts again, the community will have funds already for reconstruction. What about here?**

First we will explain what we did after the eruption. After the eruption, we moved from one shelter to another, 7 or 8 times. At the time, we weren't sure whether to come back or not. Two months later, we had a meeting to decide whether to come back, and we decided yes. Before coming back, we

cleaned up the village of debris, with the help from volunteers. Then we moved back – we decided to work together to build small houses for some people in the village. We organized the village into teams for economic activities and reconstruction. The first activity was farming. We cleaned the former farms and grew vegetables, and also timber near the river. We grew grass for cattle while we waited for the cows. We supply 2000 litres of milk a day to a Jogja factory. The first cows we had were not from the government, but we pooled our money to buy cows. Also we have a fishery for catfish. We asked for government help to start the fishery. We also have small home industries for traditional food and drinks, and a small scale construction material industry. When we finished economic relief activities, we set up cooperatives, for example for cattle and other businesses. For the reconstruction activities, we set up a construction team for houses and infrastructure, especially roads and bridges. There used to be 8 bridges, now there are 3. We haven't started any savings yet, as we got no compensation from the government. After we finish reconstruction we will start savings.

- **Question from Thailand team: do you accept this cycle of eruption and reconstruction?**

In every region of Indonesia, there are disasters. As long as there are no casualties we live with it.

- **Maurice: Merapi means “celebration” – it signifies how Merapi gives people life, makes the soil fertile.**

We believe that Merapi eruption is not an eruption, but Merapi doing some cleaning up inside.

Our savings are not in the banks, but in our cows. In the past we always saved our cows, but this last time the government promised compensation. This is why an early warning is important to us – so we know to save our cows.

- **Natasha: when was the last time that you had to rebuild from scratch? And if you face constant reconstruction, why do you build with expensive concrete blocks which cannot be salvaged after an eruption?**

This is the first time that we've had to rebuild completely. But sand and cement is cheaper than bamboo, because it is here on the spot. We don't mind rebuilding, because it's God's will.

- **Natasha: we saw trucks taking ash away. Who benefits? Government or corporations?**

The sand in the river belongs to the government and to the people. So the money is transferred to the head of the village and passed on to the people. We usually use this money for reconstruction.

- **Anh: Have all homes finished reconstruction?**

The eruption happened in October 2010, and we started the cleaning process in February, the construction in March. We've already rebuilt almost all the houses, just a few in each village left. All the people have come back, including the youth.



- **Question from Indonesia: what about the schools around here?**

It is impossible for children to walk 8km to school, so some children no longer go. The government is not allowing teachers to return to the nearest school, so for those who have no transport, they cannot go to school.

- **May: is the mosque permitted by the government?**

We rebuilt it by ourselves. Some NGOs wanted to give us money, but after the government issued the special decree preventing us from returning, they didn't give us money. So we used community contributions to rebuild it.

- **Question from Diane: what advice would the community give to the government about dealing with the next eruption?**

Yorsi (a local student who studied disaster management): We already gave a thick proposal to the president – and the summary is that relocation is not the answer. 400 villagers wrote this proposal with Yosi's help. Merapi is not the problem, we must face it. But we cannot have a structural response. Law 24 says we must relocate. A few days ago we discussed with the Sultan about getting rid of law 24, and having a new law about living harmoniously with nature. The Sultan said they will

discuss it, and they will not ban people from returning but will allow people to live with nature. NGOs and community representatives met with the Sultan for a discussion session on “living with harmony”.

- **Question from Diane: since we have a community leader here from Aceh, I wonder if he has anything to add, since he faced relocation too. Does he have any advice for the Merapi communities?**

Mr Ridwan from Aceh: I agree that disaster is part of nature and the will of God. But the post-disaster impact between Aceh and Merapi is totally different. In Aceh we lost everything, even the land, and it took a long time to replant crops. Here it is easier to replant things. In Aceh it is more like we are newborn. In Merapi it is more like nature. At the beginning, Yuli, Wardah and Awi were confused as to how to start. But we fought as this is our land. In Aceh, the government wanted to relocate us far away, too far for making a living. So in that sense, Aceh and Merapi are the same. We had the same experience with the land certificate: we could have a certificate but were not allowed to stay on the land we owned. The organisation effort in the two places is also different. In Aceh, the disaster was sudden and the evacuation happened after the disaster. People were scattered and needed more time to reorganize themselves. Before we returned, the community youth build temporary housing so that we could back, with 20 persons per house. My advice is to never move from your land and leave your living (much applause). Thank you for having us and does Merapi have any suggestions for Aceh?

- *Mr Barono from Merapi:* Let’s fight together, because we agree, we share a common misery. Although the government insists we should follow the rules, we believe people can overcome it. Wise men are everywhere, one day they will appear to overcome the problem.

We then split into smaller groups to discuss four key questions (reported back to the whole workshop on day three).



Day Three – Reflections on Fieldtrips and Moving Forwards

Following on from the successful field visits and community exchanges, on day three we returned for the two groups to report back on their experiences and what they learnt from the case studies, with particular reference to the following questions:

- Question 1: How did the affected groups cope as a community with the disaster?
- Question 2: What issues and problems did the community encounter while coping with the disaster?
- Question 3: How do they plan to cope with a possible future disaster, do they have a common system?
- Question 4: How do they see disaster?

The team who visited the Kali Tengah Lor village present first:

Vietnam explains what we saw and discussed at Kali Tengah Lor on day two and concludes on how the affected groups coped as a community:

- Following the 2006 eruption, the community were trained by external professionals/NGO about how to evacuate. The community already had tradition to work as a community before the eruption, so that when they were equipped with this additional knowledge, they were able to organize themselves very well. So in 2010, there was only one casualty, a disabled person. Not only did they learn from the externals, they also practiced in 2009, and the practice was very meaningful.
- They could disseminate information about the warning signs of the eruption to different communities, and they also divided into different groups with leaders for evacuation. They had the inventory list of households, and divided into groups according to the list, and each group had team leader. They also classified those needing special attention such as the pregnant, elderly, children.
- One interesting thing is the signs before the eruption – one week before, the birds fly away, the clouds are darker, the rain is darker, due to the ash. Temperature increases. Those are the symptoms in order. In the end, if the bamboo cracks, due to dry and hot climate, that means the eruption will be in hours. So that way, in 2010 they were able to organize the evacuation in a timely way to make the community safe. One very important thing, when they organize evacuation themselves, they look at the resources within the community, if that is not enough, they will look at the external help. The good thing was that when they evacuated they stayed together, so the whole community system was together, the leader, the committee, so they could discuss and commit themselves to come back. Perhaps others might be scattered in different places so it's not easy to organize themselves as a community.
- When they returned, they first thing they did was to clean the whole site, and after that they organized two committees, one in charge of economic relief, the other in charge of reconstruction. First they built some small houses, and then they grew some vegetables around the houses to survive, and then when they received assistance from others they used an incremental approach in terms of recovery.
- One of the very impressive things is that the community rely on themselves, not on the government. The local communities look at disaster as a natural event, they live with it, they don't want to relocate, they see the disaster as an opportunity because the land is more fertile. We also asked whether there is any change in the community before and after: they said they have a tradition to live and work as a community, and they feel that they are closer and friendlier, and after the disaster they also organize a cooperative.

Philippines: what problems and issues the community faced:

- There were two types of evacuation shelter: barracks, where all services are provided, temporary houses, one shelter per family, no food, no services, so they had to go to the barracks to get services. The shelter was too crowded, not all water was clean which led to illness, food was not like being at home, they had to live with people with different hygiene habits. Not all the relief supplies reached the people.
- Sense of restlessness: they felt they couldn't stay in the shelter longer than they needed, so three months afterwards they moved back to their village as they were not comfortable, they wanted to move on and seek their own resources, but this return means they cannot get government services. The government considers that they no longer exist in that community as they disobeyed the law, they will not get basic support of basic social services and infrastructure. They still get medical assistance but not electricity, but they were able to get electricity from another provincial government. Most of the problems arose in the temporary shelters. And now the problem is that the government doesn't recognize them but they can live without.
- Not all disasters are god-given, many of the disasters are caused by man, because we abuse our environment. There is opportunity in disaster – opportunity to organize people together to build better houses and cohesion.

Thailand: how is the community preparing for future disasters?

Mr Sumario and Herry said that there were three things people are doing to prepare for future eruption:



- 1) every community leader will strengthen the organisation and assign responsibilities – like information dissemination and division of roles.
 - 2) they still believe more in following natural alarm signs than in the government's early warning system. When the lava flows the early warning system doesn't work.
 - 3) they will strengthen community information links and also community radio. Those near the top of the mountain can inform those lower down the mountain. They are organized as Aware Merapi Community which can provide information by walkie talkies – the organisation has already assigned the jobs. They designed an evacuation route. They do everything independently, even the mitigation – they tried to get the government involved in mitigation but were not successful.
- In terms of longer term plans for reconstruction, they have no savings group, they see cows as their savings, next time they will evacuate their cows and they can sell them. For savings, it's also a cultural thing – if I have money, I will give it to the village. 100% of the construction is done by the community. They will also give money for mitigation.
 - The people earn a good living from dairy and farming, they can eat the vegetables, they use the local materials for construction, but still they don't have enough to save.
 - How is disaster viewed as an opportunity here? It is like a new baby being born – it leads to increased resilience, start from the beginning, and sand is an opportunity.

The Muntilan team report on their experience:

We firstly saw a show by the community that reflects relationship between humans and nature. The



humans and mountain become one – in nature. The human is inseparable from the mountain – this understanding is a tradition and well kept until now. Muntilan people therefore see the eruption as a blessing. It is true that there is some panic, but they try to calm themselves in reacting – they are much calmer than people who are not familiar with the volcano. As a metaphor, the left hand is a volcano, the right hand is daily life. When both palms meet together, it is life. The shape of both hands together is the mountain.

The community lives in the vicinity of the river which had flows of

volcanic material from the eruption. Some of these materials flooded the village and destroyed it. Mr Manto introduced us to his community, when they eruption struck, they stayed and continued activities. They see the eruption as a partner – the eruption is a phase or process of the mountain, so they were not scared. After the eruption was finished, they stood up and regained their life. An example of standing up is to continue with a new view, such as making sculptures. They used stones from the eruption which they see as a blessing. In this view, the mountain was not a disaster but providing an opportunity for a new livelihood. This shows to the general public their resilience. Through this effort they have been accepted for example through an exhibition supported by UNESCO.

This is the river near the community where they collect the stones for sculpture. The photo shows the level of the older bridge – the river used to be 15 m deep but now it is full of sand. The people collect the sand as an economic opportunity. This is one reason to refuse the relocation plan of the government. Working is one way to overcome trauma. Their work has been exhibited and the works are deep reflections of their personal experience of disaster. This also allowed a chance to organize themselves to work together in collecting sand.

The second discussion took place with Ismanto, the master sculptor who trains community members. The most important message they want to share to government is their tradition in three key concepts: **pray, be aware, and run**. It is not true that they are completely not scared, but these three steps help. The most difficult issue after the eruption is that ideas, suggestions and policy from outside will unlikely meet the needs of the locals. They don't feel supported by the government, even after the eruption. So they don't feel the benefit of science, of knowledge, of professionals, that is

present outside their community, because what helps them to overcome difficulties is common sense, local resources, eagerness to work. The living conditions in the community are liveable: they raise cattle, have a fishpond. They used available materials to repair the houses.

Bridge rehabilitation was done by the government and professionals – but it creates a new problem: because it costs 8 billion rupiah and it has a lot of weakness: it is made of slippery steel plates and the minimum structural requirement, 0.5 cm steel plate, so it is very risky for the user. It is a toll bridge – 2000 rp to pass. This is the typical response of the government and the powerful in response to disaster in Indonesia – it creates some worry, a kind of help that is not accepted by people.



As in Kali Tengah, people live together with volcano, the disaster gives livelihood opportunities. They earn a living from volcanic materials and at the same time they solve the problem of volcanic sand in the river. The theme is forgetting trauma through artwork by keeping the mind and body occupied. The importance of tradition is mentioned in their way of coping with disaster – “*pray, be aware, and run*”. They accept that the most difficult issue has been outside ideas and policies from the government that are not sensitive to the needs of the people.

Country reports on reflection and action plans

Sri Lanka municipal commissioner: in our country, people are afraid of disasters. From here, we have learnt how to positively approach disasters. The government has a disaster management system, and early warning system provides early warning through towers, media, and government departments. But they are not concerned with community organisation. We can address community organisation too, and prepare early warning. The government organisation prepares disaster plan, in consultation with experts – but also have to consult the community. We already prepare some things like food. But we need to involve people e.g. in the selection of safe places, not just government selecting them. Emergency management and operation must concern people in temporary shelters. Some people don't want to stay in camps. We need to try and give temporary shelter. People's needs must be recognised. We need stakeholder cooperation – including INGO, UN agencies. Lastly, management of post-disaster activities, sometimes government wants to relocate people, declares a buffer zone for the danger area. We have to consider peoples livelihood and aspirations with regards to relocation. After resettlement, we have to consult with the people with regard to housing and temporary shelter, and through community participation can build the housing. We must provide livelihood through community organization, and community organization is useful. We must also consider people with regard to infrastructure reconstruction.

May: in Sri Lanka, the government has already a well-established disaster response system, but this reflection shows that community needs to play a bigger role in reconstruction and preparedness, considering local wisdom, doing hazard mapping, consulting people about relocation, let people have a hand in selection of location. The emphasis is on giving community people a bigger part in disaster resilience.

Philippines, Josie: we would like to set up regional, national core working groups. And we will have a workshop to convene communities that have experienced different disasters, to consolidate their experience in coping. We will gather community experiences of types of disasters, as there are many types of disaster. Afterwards, we will have a regional and local level meeting to share consolidated experience to other communities with risk of disasters. So we will share our learning from the workshop to other places. Also organisation and awareness raising on community driven disaster resilience, preparedness, rehabilitation, reconstruction, and draw up plans of action at different levels. We will lobby for community representatives in local disaster coordinating councils, and lobby to divert government budget and resources towards collective community action on disaster

preparedness/mitigation, like regular canal and river cleaning, setting up community based early warning systems, like systems for measuring flood levels, rather than only immediate relief.

May: The Philippines has many types of disaster, so we see the need for a more expansive awareness in more communities, not just those that are already affected, which means sharing of experiences, and of how affected communities coped with disaster. The second point is that through this network of risky communities, the communities can initiate community level actions to mitigate disaster like early warning disaster systems that communities can set up.

Sachiko from Japan: In Japan, most communities are under shock. Two big points I learnt: the working word is “vulnerability” for me – thinking about the future. At the moment, nobody is concerned about future disasters, just thinking about the present. So we need to move forward to see how we will cope with future disasters. Secondly, connections, at the community level, and also NGO and government, are very important. I have much confidence from your many stories about the community people who have many skills and can prepare for the disaster and make a new life and new roles. It’s really important – focus on making community gather ideas and skills to help each other. NGOs and government have to connect to the local people and make some good relations with them. So now I am thinking about how to connect with NGO and government, as government policy is very propose from the community side.

Vietnam team: at the community level, the two community leaders will return to organize their communities to share what they learnt in this workshop, from the Merapi communities, how they prepared for the disaster, during and after the disaster. Together our community will discuss in detail our own awareness and understanding of disaster, not only the losses that disaster can bring, but also the opportunities. After that assessment, we will prepare a disaster plan. The awareness of communities, what we learnt here is self-reliance on their own resources, rather than relying on external resources – this is the key important thing we want to disseminate. In order to do so, apart from physical resources communities already have, we discussed about setting up a community disaster fund, a reserve fund to use in disaster.

Mr Tran, Vinh community leader: we will organize a regular practice of how to respond to disaster – so that everyone can learn the skills and how to coordinate with each other, also with regards to rehabilitation after the disaster. Then we will network with other communities in Vietnam to share this. Actually, one community in our city, about 45 household, have already set up a disaster fund, and we will replicate this to other communities.



Mr Le Van from ACVN: at the national level, ACVN has 100 city members, most of them facing disasters. So we will write the stories from this trip, and disseminate them through our journal, so that the leaders of those cities can know about the community approach to disaster. Secondly, we will emphasize in our disseminations that they should change the way of looking at disaster: at the community level, and the leadership level, to look at disaster as a part of life, as an opportunity, not just as losses and damages. The next step will be a kind of quick guide for our communities to do a kind of assessment of their strengths and weaknesses, as Merapi community have done, so that we can know our resources and capacity and what we face, in order to prepare. In two weeks time, we will have the national community forum, where we and community people from different cities will come, and we will have a special session on disasters so that we can share lessons learnt from this trip, and so that cities can discuss the disaster aspect too and start the work in their cities. Another aspect is that we want to do disaster response policy advocacy, in order to build community disaster resilience. In March the Ministry of Construction will organize a national workshop on disasters, and ACVN will present the cases learnt here, and how relocation is like a second tsunami, and should not happen – if disaster is seen as a part of life, it is not necessary to relocate people and make life harder. In my city, there is one case that the city wants to relocate, and 40 households agreed to relocate, but the city doesn’t have budget to buy land, there is no support, so it’s better to take any approach where people can live with disaster. The community leader from Aceh said to never leave the place where your life is – and secondly, the Merapi community said that people/community are wise and can do anything they want.

Thailand: a disaster centre needs to be established at the community level in areas prone to disaster – to provide immediate response to those affected by disaster. It can also coordinate between

themselves and concerned agencies. The centre can prepare long term plans to deal with disaster and present the idea of disaster management by the people. The centre should urge pro-active action – e.g. advocate policy to include community participation in disaster management, alongside the concerned agencies. A disaster fund should be established, a resource for managing disaster, and strategically, it is an efficient way to organize people, and to form partnerships with concerned agencies. There should be a systematic gathering of data and mapping of expected disaster, as well as development plan at all levels.

Indonesia: we learnt that there are methods of organizing communities involving different actors in society who are outside the community, including experts, artists. The common factor between the different cases is the community as a source of solutions. This experience also increases solidarity and empathy, and makes us more confident and more prepared for the next disaster. This also influences advocacy and working with communities in future. This broader understanding and self reliance in mapping and understanding the whole context in disasters, will help to prepare an alternative community plan. We see disaster as a spiritual event, a reminder from our maker about living in harmony with nature, adaptation. We see the change within society, economically, politically.



Our plan is based on these insights: we are looking forward to a more participatory planning process with government. Improving community capacity on information, mitigation, savings and overall organizing of own resources. We learnt from regional exchanges, including savings ideas from the Philippines. We would like to share this knowledge to other communities who can make it as common knowledge – through schools, through community, through simulations with showcase and models, to share the technical knowledge.

May: there has been a change in perspective by participants – disaster is a part of nature. We are trying to influence not only at the community level, but also planning to share with government, a new perspective of looking at disaster. People plan a community response – relocation is not always the solution. Solutions can come from the community, setting up funds, preparing – these actions have been reflected in county presentations.

Just one question: how can we support each other as a region? How can the regional network support you in implementing your plans?

Maurice: last month was the second anniversary of the Haiti earthquake, and half a million people still live in camps, there are 200 cases of cholera a day. There are more aid workers in Haiti per head of population than any other country in the world, yet still they lag so far behind in recovery. When we brought people from New Orleans to Asia and they visited Banda Aceh and Thailand, they told us their main message to take home, was that in New Orleans, people were waiting for the government to give a house, to repair the city, to do this and that. In Asia, people don't wait – they just get in and do it. If the government says there's a buffer zone, they say no, we are going home to our heritage, our income. In other words, in Asia, we are at the forefront of people based solutions. You saw throughout the world last year, the world is changing, and people need to be a large part of that solution. Governments, even with good intentions, are not capable, with all their money and resources, and what I'm hearing here is so rich in people's process and experience, so we are at the forefront of this people's movement. Maybe you can suggest how we as a region, at the forefront of this change, can help each other, and advocate this process to an increasing number of international groups who see this as an international solution. We have Natasha here, she is on our side, advocating for us. What would you like to see as support from ACHR at the community level, national level, regional level?



We finished off the workshop with a visit to Borobudur, the largest Buddhist temple in the world and now a World Heritage Site. Then we attended a dance performance performed by disaster-affected community members at Tanto's Bundut studio, which is near Borobudur.



International Participants:

Philippines	Jocelyn O. Cantoria	HPFPI Bicol coordinator
Philippines	Janet Bascon	HPFPI Mindanao coordinator
Philippines	Juan Paulo Genzola	FDUP engineer
Philippines	May Domingo Price	PACSII architect
Sri Lanka	K Sivanathan	Municipal commissioner, Batticaloa
Sri Lanka	M Fenoza Fazmil	Community mobiliser, Sevanatha
Sri Lanka	K Kalawathi	Women's Coop Treasurer, Batticaloa
Vietnam	Nguyen Thi Van	Ha Tinh city community representative
Vietnam	Tran Cao Cuong	Vinh City community representative
Vietnam	Le Van Thong	Architect, CDF coordination unit
Vietnam	Le Dieu Anh	ACCA coordinator
Thailand	Aramsi Chansisok	Nakhon Sawan community rep
Thailand	Tarasan Thongfak	CODI staff member
Thailand	Nattawat Chaninnuam	Bangrakam Mayor
Thailand	Tair Pornthep	Coordinator of NULICO
Japan	Sachiko Motomochi	AMDA NGO
Thailand	Diane Archer	ACHR secretariat
Thailand	Somsook Boonyabancha	ACHR secretariat
Thailand	Maurice Leonhardt	ACHR secretariat
Thailand	Natasha Wehmer	UNESCAP
Japan	Mr. Kazuyuki Usuzawa	People's organisation Oraga Otsushi
Japan	Mr. Takuya Ueno	People's organisation Oraga Otsushi
Japan	Mr. Keiji Kakogawa	interpreter

Indonesian Participants:

Wardah Hafidz	UPC Jakarta
Edi Saidi	UPC Jakarta
Muhammad Nawir	UPC Makassar
Kiki Sriyanti	UPC Kendari

Hesti	UPC Kendari
Guntoro	UPC Porong
Andi Syafrullah	UPC Makassar
M Arif	UPC Porong
Nur Halimah	UPC Porong
Saipul	UPC Surabaya
Nyi Nyoman Sariani	UPC Surabaya
Daeng Sampara	UPC Makassar
Ridwan Husen	UPC Aceh
Marco Kusumawijaya	Architect and Urban Planner, Rujak Center for Urban Studies
Elisa Sutanudjaja	Rujak Center for Urban Studies
Dian Tri Irawaty	Rujak Center for Urban Studies
Ivana Lee	Architect, Ciliwung Merdeka
Rizky Darmadi	Surabaya Community Architect, East Java
Amalia Nur Indah Sari	Surabaya Community Architect, East Java
Mohammad Cora	Makassar Community Architect, South Sulawesi
Rahmiyatal Munaja	Makassar Community Architect, South Sulawesi
Sriana Delfiati	Yogyakarta Community Architect, DIY
Artha Hermawan	Yogyakarta Community Architect, DIY
Sugiantoro	Kampong Bantul
Adi Susanto	Kampong Bantul
Sarmini	Kampong Kalitengah Lor
Warno Sumardi	Kampong Kalitengah Lor
Heri Styawan	Kampong Kalitengah Kidul
Karti	Kampong Kalitengah Kidul
Endah Pertiwi	5 Mountain Communities
Sitras Anjilin	5 Mountain Communities
Pangadi	5 Mountain Communities
Endri Yuliasri	Yogyakarta Riverbank
Sri Wening	Yogyakarta Riverbank
Suroto	Head of Village Glagaharjo, Sleman
Staff Village Glagaharjo	Village Glagaharjo, Sleman
Sutanto	Studio Mendut Artist, Muntilan, Central Java
Ismanto	Artist Five Mountain Communities, Central Java
Setyo Dharmodjo	Architect, YAKKUM Emergency Unit (YEU) Yogyakarta
Paulus Bawole	Architect and Urban Planner, Architecture Dept. Duta Wacana Christian University
Eko Agus Prawoto	Architect/Bamboo Expert
Sugianto	Yogyakarta Labour Solidarity
Heri	WALHI Yogyakarta
Eko Jalil	FOREKA Yogyakarta
	Badan Penanggulangan Bencana Daerah (BPBD) DIY