THE BROOKINGS INSTITUTION

SHAKEN, DROWNED, DISPLACED, BATTERED AND BRUISED: NATURAL DISASTER TRENDS AND CHALLENGES

Washington, D.C.
Wednesday, March 28, 2012

PARTICIPANTS:

Moderator:

NAN BUZARD
Senior Director of International Response & Programs
American Red Cross

Panelists:

ELIZABETH FERRIS
Senior Fellow and Co-Director, Brookings-LSE Project on Internal Displacement
The Brookings Institution

SUSAN JOHNSON
Director General for International Operations
Canadian Red Cross

* * * * *

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. BUZARD: Good afternoon and welcome. I would like to encourage -- I like to sit at the back of the room personally, but I would like to encourage all of you to move up to make our guests feel a little bit more welcome. So if you're interested and willing, let's move up and make it a little bit more closer, intimate gathering on this rainy March afternoon in Washington, D.C.

Thanks very much, all of you, and a big warm welcome to another thought provoking Brookings event. I will say this, unsolicited by Beth -- that I encourage all of you to tell your friends and families to get on the e-mail list. There's some really, really, wonderful things that happen here in Washington and this is one of them. So I hope this meets your expectations. I'm excited about this panel and what we're talking about. Today we're going to be launching two important reports.

One: the Brookings London School of Economics 2011 Annual Review of Natural Disasters. I think it's the second one in the series. This takes a close look at some of the implications of the disasters that happened in 2011, many of which took place in developed countries and had very high financial costs. This report is co-authored by Elizabeth Ferris on our left, senior fellow and co-director of the Brookings London School of Economics Project on Internal Displacement. I think Beth is well known to many of you. She has written -- I want to say extensively, but I think almost exhaustingly, on many, many issues related to human rights, forced migration, disasters, complex emergencies, climate change, and recently, authored a book just out last year called, *The Politics of Protection: The Limits of Humanitarian Action.* In my opinion she is one of the better things about Washington, D.C.

The second publication that we're going to look at today is called, *Predictable, Preventable* -- has a whole subtitle but I'm going to call it *Predictable and*

Preventable. And it turns our attention towards an issue that while known and certainly critical to populations affected by disasters, is often not included in our top issues when we do respond and does not get the kind of support and attention it certainly requires and deserves.

This report explores some of the dynamics of best practice of interpersonal -- of protecting people against interpersonal and self-directed violence during and after disasters. For this, we're joined by a friend and colleague, Susan Johnson, the director general of the Canadian Red Cross. Susan has worked in the Red Cross movement for 14 years, including time in Geneva. It sounds like jail. It's not really. In Geneva -- some Red Cross people going, hmm. No. In Geneva, as the head of operations for the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, and then in New York as our chief diplomatic officer of the International Federation and the Red Cross, Red Crescent with the U.N. and the diplomatic missions.

She also spent many, many years in the field, primarily with Oxfam. She is a leader in our community on issues ranging from international disaster response law to health care and emergencies, to gender equality, and has spoken around the world on key issues related to response and development. It's a very warm welcome to have her come down below the 49th Parallel and join us here in the belly of the beast.

And I think without further ado, we will start this with two presentations, followed by a really open question time. And we look forward to your questions. And if you don't have any, I have lots.

MS. FERRIS: Thanks, Nan. And thanks to all of you for coming out on this rainy afternoon. It's a pleasure to introduce this report. We spent a lot of time working on it. It was written by me and my co-author, Daniel Petz, sitting here modestly in the front row. And I will deflect any question I can't answer to him because he did a lot

of the statistical analysis in particular.

You know, we started doing this a year ago, and when we looked back at the year 2010, it was all about Haiti and Pakistan and trying to draw some of the comparisons between those two disasters. But when we looked back on the last year, we saw a very different pattern. By some standards it was a lower or a better than average year.

There were fewer natural disasters, 302 according to the U.N. in comparison with 384 on average for the past decade. There were many fewer casualties, less than 30,000. And you remember 2010, was 300,000 or so. So fewer casualties, fewer people affected, fewer disasters in themselves, but it was the most expensive year ever in recorded history in terms of natural disasters.

A total of an estimated $380 billion, of which Japan alone made up $210 billion of that. The reason perhaps it was so expensive was the fact that most of the mega disasters occurred in rich countries, developed countries. So we use that lens to analyze the pattern of disasters last year. We call the report, *The Year That Shook the Rich.* And it did shake several major rich countries.

The year began with major flooding in Australia that affected some 200,000 people, and geographically a huge spatial area. I don't know if you have the reports, but there's this neat little map on page 18 in the introduction, which we didn't produce, but got permission to use. It's one of those with the -- I don't know, what are they? -- Roman numerals, Arabic numerals? The xviii.

in the portrayal of the spatial coverage of the disaster, and you'll see the pattern of coverage of the Australian floods is much larger than the size of the country of the United Kingdom, really dwarfing most of the other disasters. That's not necessarily the most important measure of the severity of a disaster, but does give you an idea of the

extent in which it occurred in Australia.

About a month later, in New Zealand, was a devastating earthquake in Christchurch, which followed a very serious earthquake in September 2010, which together damaged over 100,000 homes. The Christchurch population is 350,000. What does it mean to damage or destroy 100,000 homes and certainly at least half of the buildings in the city's center?

In Japan, of course, recently there have been a string of commemorative events. On March 11th, an earthquake, tsunami, nuclear disaster. The earthquake itself produced relatively few deaths in Japan, perhaps -- definitely due to the innovative role of Japan in developing anti-seismic technologies in building construction. But the tsunami cost almost 20,000 lives. While Japan and Japanese government generally gets high marks in Japanese civil society for their response to the disaster, the handling of the nuclear thing, the information that was provided, the questions about what the government knew, what TEPCO knew, how they communicated with each other and with the public, raised questions that I think will be with us for some time.

Then there was the United States where there were 14 separate billion-dollar disasters. Or to put it another way, there were more disasters costing over a billion dollars last year than the whole decade of the 1980s. There was flooding in the northern Mississippi, in the southern Mississippi; you know, terrible, deadly tornados that struck the middle of the country; there were floods; there was drought; there were wildfires, the worst wildfires in history in the state of Texas, in the state of Arizona, in the state New Mexico. Hurricane Irene finally culminating, you know, a whole series of things which was a mild year for hurricanes, which is what usually hits the U.S. the hardest.

So when we started looking at disasters in rich countries, we looked at OECD, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, which together

makes up about 14 percent of the world's population. It's about 14 percent of the world's population. Over the past decade, less than 2 percent of those affected by natural disasters come from OECD countries, but 62 percent of the economic damage. You know, the simple truism that disasters tend to kill less people in developed countries and cost a lot more. Rich countries in general have better developed systems for a response, tend to have well-trained staffed natural disaster response, or management organizations, protocols in place for mobilizing military and police forces. That happened in all four of these disasters.

Better access to insurance. But you know, there were some real differences. In Japan, for individuals affected by the disaster, about 18 percent were covered by insurance. In New Zealand, it was over 80 percent. Government policies requiring insurance make a difference. (inaudible) I think that there's a lot more that could be done to look at the role of insurance, not only in compensating people from losses incurred because of disasters, but encouraging or discouraging them from building in disaster-prone areas.

Yet, even in developed countries, we see similar patterns of discrimination and recovery. Homeowners everywhere seem to have a better deal -- a better time of it than those who rent or those who may not possess legal title to their homes. Also, similar patterns -- surprisingly similar patterns of outbreaks of personal violence, particularly sexual and gender-based violence, domestic violence, which is the subject of the report that Susan's going to report, although, of course, they look globally.

When we started looking into the question of the economic costs of disaster, intuitively it makes sense. It will cost more in rich countries because there are more buildings, there are bigger buildings, it costs more to replace those buildings. But you know, as someone who has followed natural disasters for a long time, but only

looked into how the costs are estimated, I was really shocked at how little transparency there is about how economic costs of disasters are measured.

Different organizations use different standards, and few report how they measure the economic costs in any detail. Now the costs of rebuilding a building, you know, brings up the question of is it worth what it cost when you bought it or what it costs to replace it? This is something that insurance companies deal with all the time. But looking at some of the secondary impacts, there are different ways of measuring.

How many jobs were lost? What are the economic costs of changes in property values after an earthquake, for example, some of the longer-term costs? The World Bank has done some fascinating studies in Zimbabwe and Mexico, for example. What are the costs to a society when kids who step out of school because of the disaster and never go back? And indeed, that's been the pattern in some developing countries at least.

One study done on the cost of tornados in the U.S., which was done before last year's string of tornados, found that the highest economic costs of tornados wasn't the destruction of buildings, it was the time lost for hurricane warnings and watches, the time taken away from jobs to take cover when the alarm sounds. So there are different ways of measuring the costs.

Most estimates of economic damages are based on government figures. So, of course, you would expect more accurate figures from, say, government authorities in Australia than, say, Somalia or Haiti or countries that don't have the capacity or the tradition of collecting statistics on a range of economic indicators. It seems that there may be a tendency to overestimate the costs of disasters immediately after they occur. I mean, some of those buildings that look totally destroyed may, in fact, be able to be repaired.

At least in some countries there may be political motivations, maybe unconscious political motivations, to overstate the extent of economic damage in order to trigger assistance from the central government or even internationally. So the question of economic damages is one that isn't quite as clear as certainly appeared to me a couple of years ago.

There are also some positive gains usually experienced by countries following a disaster. You know, there are winners and losers, and people in construction industries, for example, may be some of the winners. Globally, it appears that the costs of disasters are increasing, the economic costs, due to urbanization, more growth in disaster-prone areas, you know, in long coasts, for example. It seems that the economies that are most susceptible are not necessarily the poorest.

Economists talk about an inverted U-shaped curve where those rich countries are able to recover. Poor countries didn't have much to lose anyway, but those in the middle may not have taken the steps necessary to guard against the costs of disaster or be able to recover.

Again, staying with the theme of economic costs are the costs of prevention. One of many cases back in 2002, the government of Mozambique appealed for $2.7 million to prepare for floods and got about half that amount. But when the floods came, they received $100 million in emergency assistance and pledges of $450 million for recovery. You know, that gap between prevention and trying to raise money for prevention in comparison with the costs of response and eventual recovery is striking. For developed countries, I think it means engaging in a very difficult cost-benefit analysis of how much do you invest in low-probability but high-impact events such as the Japanese tsunami, which was much higher than the models that were making the predictions in Japan assumed.

Overall, looking at the patterns of humanitarian funding, there are also questions raised about what happens in rich counties and developed countries. Last year was a relatively low year in terms of the total amount of money given for humanitarian causes. Again, this is with the normal caveats: using U.N. figures, U.N. financial tracking (inaudible). But about a fourth of the total amount of money was raised in 2011 in comparison with 2010 because of Haiti and Pakistan, which together accounted for 96 percent of humanitarian funding in 2010.

But last year, you know, when you look at international humanitarian funding, roughly half of it went to Japan, think about that, where it made up less than 1 percent of the total economic losses that Japan experienced. If you take the number of people affected by a disaster and divide it by the total amount of humanitarian funds generated, a rough calculation, the international community contributed about $1,800 per affected person in Japan, about $24 per affected person by drought in East Africa. Think about that for a minute. Certainly, Japan received offers of assistance from dozens -- 160 countries and international organizations -- eager to help, wanting to help. There's this generous outpouring of compassion. You see the images on TV, you want to do something. But is that the most cost-effective use of limited humanitarian funding?

Could developing countries make a pact with each other that they might express solidarity? You know, this sounds trite, but send cards and flowers, but save your money for the really poor country where it makes a difference between life and death in a way that it wouldn't after Hurricane Katrina in the U.S. or perhaps after Japan.

Very briefly, the report then looks at one particular kind of emergency, drought. Last year, we looked at volcanoes. Drought kills more people, affects a large area, but tends to cause less economic damage. Drought rarely destroys built infrastructure. Buildings rarely collapse because of drought. Potentially, almost half of

the world's surface covered by dry land is susceptible to drought. It's particularly difficult to collect statistics. When does a drought start? When do you know this isn't just a little dry spell or a couple of dry days? And again, different standards used by different data collection instruments.

It's difficult to measure casualties of drought. You know, how do you know how many people die because it's dry and because they are simply poor? Hard to measure the knock-on effects of drought. I'm from Texas and remember talking with my brother-in-law over Christmas, who's a car salesman, and he said to me, well, he said it with a Texas drawl, but he said, I typically sell three or four tractors a week here, about 150 tractors a year. I haven't sold a one in the last year. Everybody's land is dry, they don't have anything to plow.

Is my brother-in-law's loss figured into those economic statistics even though he lives a couple of hours away from the area affected? Measuring the impact of drought is difficult. We look at Somalia, of course, that deadly combination of conflict and drought, and find that, as much as guns and violence -- physical violence kills people in Somalia, the action of insurgence groups by denying access to humanitarians, to find out what's going on, to publicize what's going on is equally deadly. Although, of course, warnings in Somalia did occur about a year before the outbreak of famine was declared.

Finally, we look at one particular group. We chose the elderly this year, in part because of our concentration on developed countries. But there we found, also, it's a universal pattern. The older people are invisible. They aren't seen by many in providing humanitarian assistance.

The elderly are more likely to die in disasters and the aftermath of disasters, whether it's Katrina or Japan or other countries as well. The fact is the population on the Earth is aging. Today, about 11 percent of the population is over 60.

That's going to double in the next 20 or 30 years. More and more people are old or going to be impacted by disaster. Elderly people are not only frail, sometimes have mobility problems, chronic diseases, but sometimes it seems that there's almost a social Darwinism at work.

We think in terms of humanitarian assistance. If your assistance is limited, do you help that little 2-year-old or the 80-year-old frail person? Do you consciously or unconsciously decide, oh, I'll help the kid or the person who's got a productive job rather than the old person? And that may happen on the part of old people as well. I know if I were in a disaster and it was choice between giving me water and giving my beautiful granddaughter water, I would certainly say give my child the food or the young person.

So how that dynamic works out, I think, would be interesting to explore a little further. And yet, the elderly bring wisdom and experience and often indigenous knowledge that can be helpful not only in responding to disasters and long-term recovery efforts, but also in minimizing the risk of disasters themselves.

Those are some of the issues we touch on in the report and we hope you find it useful. I think there's some great photographs and charts in it, thanks to Daniel. But anyway, thanks.

MS. BUZARD: Beth, thanks. Well, for those of you who are looking for thesis topics or additional research, I think we've just heard about 20: ethics, economics, there's a lot there to unpack. Thank you.

Susan? Welcome.

MS. JOHNSON: Yes, ma'am. Well, thank you very much for inviting us to be here,and really, congratulations on this. I have not yet read it, of course, but I'm certainly looking forward to it, and I very much enjoyed your remarks right now. There is a

lot in there that speaks a lot to the world that we as Red Cross national societies occupy both in our domestic realms as the disaster responders in Canada, but also in terms of our work internationally. So there's certainly a lot there.

But I am very pleased to be here. It is my first time ever at Brookings. But particularly, I'm pleased to be here because of the work that some of my colleagues have done. In particular, I want to introduce Gurvinder Singh here with the Canadian Red Cross. Gurvinder's, speaking of leaders, a leader within the Red Cross movement on the issues of violence prevention, and has been working with the Canadian Red Cross for many, many years now, and really working, well, with us, but also with a lot of partner national societies on helping national societies come to grips with the issues of interpersonal violence, which we think is a key issue. And that we, in the Canadian Red Cross, are very proud to have colleagues like Gurvinder and others in the Canadian Red Cross who've really, you know, seized this with two hands and have been out there on the edge, pushing that this issue be recognized and that we come to grips with it as a national society and as a broader Red Cross movement.

Gurvinder is, in fact, the main author of the paper that we have, this report which we were very proud to be highlighting here today. It really does speak to a lot of the hard work that Gurvinder and colleagues have been involved in, and other national societies in the Americas.

I have, as Nan already mentioned, been with the Red Cross for a few years now, and before that with Oxfam. I've been, as I'm sure many of you, in a lot of tremendously difficult places.

I'd have to say, of course, the first thing is that, as I think we recognize, often when the worst things happen, the best also happens. People reach out to each other, they help each other, even if they have very little they help each other in whatever

way they can. We see tremendous acts of compassion and caring. Unfortunately, I think one of the things we've done recently is to sort of pull back the cover and show that at the same time as that is happening, unfortunately, in too many cases, something else is also happening, which is the people who are vulnerable are, in fact, being exploited, and that the safety and security of people can actually be undermined by violence in the wake of the disaster. And this can be abuse, exploitation, harassment, discrimination, both from other survivors, but then also very terribly, in fact, also sometimes by the people who have come to assist.

At the Canadian Red Cross and the International Federation we've been working with a lot of national societies, as already mentioned, and we worked together to issue this report. And we've been concerned about this phenomenon for some time, and we decided to pull together our experiences and to issue this report, which really addresses a number of things, but starts with a short portrayal of what, in fact, are the issues. What's the problem and why is this happening? Itthen goes on to offer a little bit of analysis of -- an offering of how can we begin to deal with this as disaster responders, as organizations that have a mandate, a responsibility to be engaged. And you can see, I mean, it's not long, it's an easy read. I recommend it, of course, and it's, I would suggest, a beginning. I think it's a beginning of an exploration I hope for many of you and that will offer you a way of entering into some issues and looking at what we could be doing.

So just a few words on what is the issue. Violence can thrive, of course, in any circumstance. We have that in our cities, in our communities, in our families, sadly in any circumstance. But certainly in the chaotic conditions that follow disasters we do see -- we have absolute evidence of there being interplay between the disaster environment and the chaos after a disaster and increases in violence, Whether that

violence is women being attacked in shelters, or boys being beaten and nobody doing anything to prevent that, or girls trading their bodies for food assistance, or older men or older people being so desperate that they actually choose to end their own lives. So the issue of violence following disaster, in our view, needs more attention and action from humanitarian actors.

I'd like to just emphasize that we see this as a global trend. This is not something that happens only in the Haitis or the Honduras or the Pakistans of the world.

Now, we are very proud to have had the Haitian Red Cross and the Honduran Red Cross contribute to the report we've issued. But we're also very proud of the fact that the Canadian Red Cross has also contributed to the report, and that we recognize in our own country, when we're involved in disaster response in our own country, we also can see that there is an increased violence following disasters.

Perhaps to link to some aspects of the work your speaking to today, we see this in statistics coming from Australia, New Zealand, and here in the U.S. post Katrina, that if you look at the reports of abuse, that there is absolutely a correlation. But we do talk in the report about our own experiences in communities in Canada because Canadian Red Cross is very much a disaster responder in our own country as is the American Red Cross here. So we are 24/7 responding to individual house fires, community evacuations from flooding, forest, chemical spills, whatever it might be, and we do see a pattern. We hear from mayors, community leaders, that long after an emergency is, in fact, over that they do see increasing reports of domestic abuse following disasters. That's a challenge for community leaders and for people in the communities in terms of how to deal with this.

Now, we understand the risk of violence and disasters driven by a combination of shocks. There is the lack of basic -- access to basic services. There is,

of course, the collapse of what might have been some fragile protection systems in the community. There is the stress on individuals and the communities themselves. There can be a reliance on very harmful coping mechanisms, like the use of alcohol or drugs, which can, of course, distort behaviors.

There's the very family separation itself. You can have children separated from their families, families split up in all kinds of different ways and, of course, , it comes to mind the fact that, in many post-disaster environments, we have very crowded, insecure environments in which people are living in very crowded shelters. In those shelters there is an opportunity, and sadly taken up sometimes by some, to misuse power. That can be the informal network or the very formal network that exists within those communities or, again, it can be the international or local assistance that comes to work with the community.

This violence can occur in camps, in shelters, in homes, and on streets. It can be perpetuated by strangers, neighbors, and family members themselves. As I've already said, even aid workers have been accused of exploiting the very people we're supposed to help, and I'll mention more about that in a minute. Of course, anybody can be vulnerable to violence, but women, children, and other marginalized peoples are, of course, at particular risk.

First, they suffer the disaster and its consequences and then the risk of violence, which is followed all too often by a lack of care and protection when they actually ask for help. Without basic personal safety, humanitarian efforts designed to improve lives and livelihoods will always fall short. I think we have to realize that even just the threat of violence alone will impact the ability of people to access the help they deserve and to begin rebuilding their lives. In this context, we've referred to violence as a disaster within a disaster, and that's how we see it.

So that's just a short portrayal of what's the circumstance we're trying to address here. So what's the remedy? Again, I don't think we're trying to pretend that we actually have a recipe or a complete solution, but we do think there's some interesting approaches we could take that would make our response more effective. I'd like to summarize that in essentially we would be promoting that we take a public health approach to dealing with violence. Why a public health approach? Well, our view is that like cholera or malaria or malnutrition or other public health problems associated with disasters, the factors that put people at risk for violence can be and must be addressed with the same urgency, attention, and resources.

Of course it's a complex problem, and evidence and experience shows us that violence and disasters in not inevitable. It's a predictable, public health problem that can be and must be prevented. When we talk about our public health approach to violence, we're talking about an approach which relies on comprehensive prevention strategies, integrates justice and human rights, and aims at reaching whole populations through primary prevention.

The design and implementation of prevention programs and protection systems needs to be strength-based, which is to say taking into account not only people's vulnerabilities, but also drawing on the capacities of people themselves. Countering the risk of violence means we move away from reactive strategies after violence occurs to a proactive approach to address the conditions that can, in fact, lead to violence.

I mean, a simple parallel is that, for instance, we know that cholera is a serious risk when people are living in crowded, camp conditions. So we don't wait for an outbreak and then respond. We actually invest proactively in hygiene education aimed at awareness raising. We invest in the systems -- the water and sanitation systems in the environment that would actually lead to reducing, mitigating the potential for there to be a

cholera outbreak.

That's what we would say. We would need to -- same approach in terms of addressing violence in these situations. It means having, for instance, population-based data gathered to better understand the problem, its scope, and the causes and consequences. The evidence needs to be used to identify risks and protective factors. We need to use our research-based interventions to pilot them, evaluate, and scale up.

We have to learn from our experience, taking a public health approach, we think, to addressing violence prevention across all aspects of the disaster program cycle: preparedness, response, recovery, development. We think violence within disasters can be not only as it is predictable, but it, in fact, can be prevented. And whether this is assisting with shelter or health care, delivery of clean water and food, or helping to create livelihoods, violence prevention needs to be part of the responsibility, the vision, and the action of all the disaster responders.

Our report highlights efforts being taken on the ground by Red Cross, national societies in the Americas to address violence and gives practical guidance on how to -- on how prevention efforts can be built into every aspect of disaster preparedness, response, recovery, and the longer term development. Of course, this can't succeed without the collaboration of local communities and leaders, including all of the stakeholders before a disaster strikes. So again, we use the public health approach.

This isn't something we can, you know, wake up the day after and think, oh, my goodness. We should, in fact, have already worked and developed a series of relationships. Those relationships network has to have been built much beforehand. In fact, working with the communities and local actors, you can identify risk factors, map the community resources that you can draw on in terms of the response, and actually have a plan for dealing with the violence that you can expect will, in fact, take place at some

level.

Moving beyond the Americas, let me just share that, right now, we're in conversations with the Kenyan Red Cross in Kenya. You might be aware of the situation there. You've pointed to the drought and so on. The Kenyan Red Cross has taken on a role with the Dadaab refugee camp, with the Somalia refugees in Northern Kenya. We're working with the Kenyan Red Cross right now to develop some targeted violence prevention programs utilizing some of the best practices we've outlined in this document and working with the Somalia refugee leaders themselves and the Kenyan Red Cross.

So just -- and as a tiny example of the kind of work we're involved in as the Canadian Red Cross, but it's the kind of thing that we think we know is really going to make a difference in terms of the situation for the people in the camps there, and as a tiny example of the kind of work we're involved in around the world, and that we think does show others what, in fact, can be done. This is not rocket science, it's not difficult. Well, it can be difficult because it can be a little bit uncomfortable. But get beyond that and deal with the issue.

I think as humanitarian organizations -- or people working in humanitarian organizations, we know we work in very complex environments, and we can't expect it to be responsible for or fix all the social programs that are present before a disaster. But I am also convinced that we should be expected to provide safety and security and protection for the people we do work with. And every humanitarian actor can start by ensuring that the disaster responders that they deploy to assist communities understand the issues and build prevention into their work.

This includes screening and education for staff and volunteers on the duty of care that we have towards those who serve. I think codes of conduct which many of us -- I'm sure most of us who are professional humanitarian organizations, disaster

responders, have codes of conduct, and that's good. I'm not against codes of conduct. I think it's an important tool to have in the toolbox. But it is not enough.

When abuse by humanitarian workers does happen, they have to be reported, they have to be dealt with. They can't be just, you know, swept under the rug and ignored because of the imperative of carrying on with the work. I think the organizations have to have a much more robust capacity to actually deal with those issues inside our own organizations.

So just to sum up, I mean, I think we've certainly made a contribution here to better practice in an important area. I really do think we have to work harder and better to support communities and ensure that everybody is safe, especially after a disaster. I think just to sum up, I think our view is that safety and security should be an expectation of all people effected by a disaster and it shouldn't be a bonus just for a few. Thank you.

MS. BUZARD: Absolutely. Now it's your turn. We'll take a couple of questions, and then we'll -- I think we'll take two or three at a time and then come back. Yes?

MS. WILLIAMSON: Hi, my name is Sarah Williamson, and this is a question for Susan. The report on violence is just fascinating and I think it dovetails with a lot of discussions that are going on, on how we prevent, for example, gender-based violence in humanitarian settings. In those discussions there seems to be a debate on the public health approach and where to start first: if we need to focus on individuals who are at risk of violence or if we need to focus on issues of culture and men and boys and things like this.

So I'm just wondering when you kind of look at the ecological model that has four different layers, I mean, where would you see putting the priority of resources?

Also, how does that play out in the Dadaab project, for example, about what levels you're working on?

MS. BUZARD: Give Susan a minute to organize her answer. Take a few more questions. Back, right.

MR. TIPSON: Thank you. Fred Tipson, I'm at the U.S. Institute of Peace working on disasters. Beth, I just finished your book on the politics of protection. But what's dramatic to me in looking at these issues is the psychology of protection and how it is so skewed, as you point out, to sort of the heroic response, but nobody's willing politically to support the investment that I would call the stoic dimension, which is helping people harden themselves to prevent the worst.

As you know, it's so cost-effective to invest in early warning and preparedness and so forth. But politically, it just doesn't seem to resonate. We spend a tremendous amount of money for OFTA to go in after the fact, but we can't get AID any money to do risk reduction in any significant way. How do you think -- how do you see that issue and how do you think we can change the politics or the psychology of the politics of humanitarian response?

MS. BUZARD: Okay, that was a hard one, too. So we'll take one more question and let Beth think about that one.

MS. FERRIS: We're looking for easy questions.

MS. BUZARD: Yes, sir? And then we'll come back to you to.

MR. MARTIN: Hi, name is Brian Martin. I worked at -- I was policy director and then chief of staff for Congressman Gene Taylor from Mississippi Gulf Coast, so I worked on Hurricane Katrina. I follow, you know, disaster policies and insurance and all these thing since then.

You know, one thing in talking about your domestic violence thing, we

noticed in South Mississippi that the second year after Katrina was worse than the first year. There was more -- we had suicides, murder-suicides, a lot of domestic incidents, and it wasn't necessarily people in FEMA trailers who still didn't know what they were doing. I mean, some of them were prominent families who on the -- outwardly seemed to have recovered. But obviously there was a huge -- there was a heavy trauma in the whole -- just over the whole community.

So I was curious as to whether you see that in other disasters? I'm looking at not just in that sort of immediate response, but to longer term mental health needs. Because we had, you know, just a crazy thing where FEMA actually assessed that we had mental health needs, but FEMA's not really in the business of providing mental health benefits. And so we needed HHS or somebody else to show up, and they never seemed to come.

So to me, it was like a longer term concern there than just the immediate, you know, in the shelters, in FEMA trailers, and immediately after. I'm interested in your remarks on other disasters.

MS. BUZARD: Susan, do you want to go?

MS. JOHNSON: Yeah.

MS. BUZARD: Please.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, I'm going to ask Gurvinder actually to jump in on particularly Sarah's -- Sarah, right? -- Sarah's question. I'll say a couple of remarks, but I think Gurvinder's got a lot more to contribute in terms of the model and the choices and so on. I mean, just a couple of remarks, though.

I mean, I think that -- I mean, one of the things around what happens when there is, you know, a mega event -- or not mega, I mean, to an individual family their house burning down is a mega event. And what we see often and one of the things

we say within the Red Cross, for instance, is anybody can be vulnerable at any time. And it's not a question of, yes; you can have pre-existing conditions in the sense of -- just by demographics or something. But even the most well off, capable person in certain circumstances can be a vulnerable person or their family can be vulnerable. And what I'm saying there is that you can even have, you know, very -- leaders in the community seemingly well off, their family has no evident economic or social issues, very much traumatized, and that can take some time to roll out.

And I think also what you see is that some of the tensions in communities that are there when a disaster strikes, I mean, really things get thrown up in the air to some extent. And as those things settle, that can bring about different kinds of tensions and dynamics within a community, some for the good and some not for the good. I mean, you know, and to use perhaps a particular example is you also have situations where a disaster environment for some can be actually quite liberating. I mean, we had this in Pakistan with, you know, some of the people who were affected by the flooding in Pakistan were essentially indentured slaves and the disaster in some ways is liberating because all of a sudden they're free. They don't want to go back. They don't want to be sent back to where they were. They are -- this is the moment. The same thing can happen for women, where all of a sudden some of the norms in the family or in the community are stripped away, and women have an opportunity or take an opportunity or an opportunity is there that women can take, and that can be fantastically liberating.

But once things start to settle and people expect to go back to the way it was, it's not so fantastic. And that can be very disruptive then to some of the patterns within families and communities. So of -- I can see it being -- of course, it's not natural that those things take time to sort of emerge in communities. In terms of the choices, I mean, I will turn to Gurvinder there on some of that, but I think that, I mean, it might

sound a little facile, but there's no one size fits all. I mean, it really is that you have to make choices in different -- depending on the circumstances you find yourself in. What other actors are there? What resources do they have? What are the needs of the community? What can you particularly bring there? So I'm not in a position to say, you know, we would always choose this, because it really is context.

I mean, what I think you'd be looking for is a holistic response. But what piece of that -- your best place to deliver in relation to other actors I think is something that really -- is really going to depend, and including the local actors. This is not always just the international community. But I'm sure Gurvinder's got a lot more intelligent words on that to offer.

MR. SINGH: I think she actually summarized --

MS. BUZARD: Wait for the mic.

MR. SINGH: -- really well is, I think what's happening, for example, in Dadaab -- do I need this? I might not. Okay. I normally speak very loud. In Dadaab, what's happening is the Kenyan Red Cross is leading the process. So they're undergoing an assessment process. What are their capacities? What are the capacities of partner agencies? And then looking at who can best contribute where, but looking at the different levels, the individual, family, community, societal levels, and then putting that together. It's not -- it doesn't always work smoothly. And different agencies are at different paces of work. But ultimately, over time, what we expect and hope is that together we can look at it ecologically.

In terms of the public health model the idea really is, is what we're doing evidence-based? Is what we're doing bringing in a justice, a gender, a health, and other perspectives? What that looks like and where the weight is varies by location, but the idea is we need to ensure that it's systematic, it's evidence-based.

MS. BUZARD: Beth, over to you.

MS. FERRIS: Yeah, on the question of prevention versus response, you know, and generally a response to disasters is largely driven by the media, you compare the both governmental and private giving by media coverage and you see that these mega disasters get lots of response. But smaller disasters can sometimes be just as devastating to a community, get much less money. So I think the answer to both prevention and to those smaller disasters is to set up systems that are somehow insulated from political popular pressures.

I don't think there's ever going to be a popular groundswell of let's do more for mosquito nets or zoning codes or whatever. But if you have systems funding streams, for example, from the U.S. Government or through multilateral systems, that are doing that important essential work, that don't depend on kind of the media coverage to generate -- it's kind of like parents who say to their kids going off to college, listen, we'll cover your health insurance, you deal with your party money on your own. You know, the party money they'll find some way of raising. But it's kind of the responsible thing to do to have that bedrock of support.

I say it's the same sort of issue for a disaster risk reduction. This is never going to generate that popular, enthusiastic, let's pour more money into this. Whereas the response is generous, and it is compassionate to respond.

I wonder if I could ask Susan a question.

MS. JOHNSON: Could I just add something to -- if you don't mind? Just to add to -- a bit to what you were just saying. Because I think that -- I mean, what I observed over the last little while around some of these large events in, you know, well-developed countries, it -- I mean, thank goodness, in fact, at this point still today, I think I can say that the Canadian government and many other governments do have in their

international official development assistance, you know, the humanitarian section which is buffered from the political intervention.

It does mean you've got professionals at -- CanadianRed Cross I'll speak of, who are doing, you know, an assessment of what are the needs? And where -- you know, and ensuring that on some equitable basis there is a response to -- this is not about the investment and preparedness and longer term risk reduction, but in terms of the -- actually responding to the small, micro, medium disasters, we still have that. And I say we still have that, I don't think there's any assurance we always will have that. And I think, you know, in Western governments there's a lot of talk and chatter and I can see some pressures to actually politicize humanitarian assistance, which is a huge concern.

The other thing I would add is that if you take a case like Japan, what we faced in Canada, and I think similarly here in the U.S., there was no question our government was not going to offer humanitarian assistance to Japan. They did feel pressured to offer somehow to help. But what we felt in Canada was this huge pressure from the general public. The general public just wanted -- and that I think you have to have some way of offering, yes, people a way of expressing the solidarity. But particularly in the Japan case, though, we also had the corporate sector which had big interests in being engaged in the response in Japan.

I think we're going to see more of that, which is just -- that's actually the point I'm trying to get to, too, which is I think we have new actors, corporates and others, who are coming into humanitarian response. And there's a bunch of norms that we've built up together in the humanitarian community as to how we work, which I don't think the corporate sector or some of the newer donors take -- find very interesting. You know, they're operating on different paradigms and blazing new trails, which we have to sort of come to terms with. But it's changing the terrain, I think, for us.

MS. FERRIS: The question I wanted to ask Susan or anybody is that I'm coming to think that it's all about shelter, housings, settlements. If you could get that right, then you would diminish a lot of the violence, the interpersonal violence. I'm thinking about Central America where I think there's a lot of violence in those temporary shelters. And Katrina, you know, there's a lot of uncertainty about where you're living.

So, I mean, is it all about where you live? If you had $100 to invest in preventing violence, would you put it in shelters?

MS. JOHNSON: I think it would be sensible to put some of it in shelter or sheltering. I mean, it's not just the individual house, unit, whatever it might be. It's the whole setup, and that's -- I mean, you can easily see that in the sphere of standards in terms of, you know, latrines and where are they, and then the lighting, and all those kinds of things. I think there's absolutely those very practical measures that are well-known that are important.

But I don't think that explains everything. It doesn't -- it can't be the only thing we invest in. I mean, because obviously -- like even in, you know, well-off communities, I'm sure not far from here people are living in decent shelter. It doesn't mean that they're not protected from abuse from family members or from neighbors or, you know, abusive power in some circumstances.

Now, how you decide what your investing, again, comes back to, okay, who else is there? And what are the other options?

MS. BUZARD: Anyone else want to respond to Beth's question or have new questions? In the back, in the green.

MS. WILSON: Hi, I'm Sarah Wilson. To respond to your question a little bit, I was in Sri Lanka just over a year ago looking at the northeast of the region and the responses to people who have been affected by conflict and also by the tsunami. A lot of

immediate assistance was into providing assistance on shelters, but what we were looking at was providing for people's human security needs longer term and what they thought was lacking.

And a very common theme from either groups of people who were affected for either those or different reasons was sustainable income. And obviously that comes up a lot, but it can be incorporated in part of the building shelters and how you go about doing that. But I think that giving people something to do and some kind of sense of a future is also a really important part of that, and that's where investment should be.

Also, going back to the comment about the media playing a role in how much money is given to what disasters, I think we have a responsibility as the humanitarian international community to provide better and more interesting information that people can actually latch onto. We could provide some really interesting information on personal case studies and wider impacts of providing malaria nets to make people more excited because they can more clearly see that if we provide money to Japan after a disaster, people's houses are rebuilt. We can see that very clearly in very simple ways. And we could actually do some more work maybe to help ourselves.

MS. BUZARD: Beth, I'm going to jump in just a minute about the shelter and settlements because it's so interesting. I think that, of course, a home or a house or a locked door or a place to store yourself and to sleep, all of those things are critical and I think that we see a lot being attached to homes and shelter because of that. But I think the income pieces are really quite interesting.

In Haiti, there are tens of thousands of temporary shelters that were built, and there's a portion of them that were immediately turned into rental properties because the rent was far more attractive or useful to that family than the actual house. Then when we think about doing kind of integrated neighborhood reconstruction in Haiti, or anyplace,

the house in some ways is the last thing. Because the house without some kind of social structure, economic structure, education, I mean, everything we know, but the house really becomes the last thing. I thought it was always the first thing.

So we're seeing, at least in some urban neighborhoods, that people are willing to live in a nasty -- I would think, nasty little place if other things are functioning. So I think that we still have a lot to learn about what actually makes communities more resilient. It's not just the house, even though that's a natural and critical piece of it.

We had a hand back there? Yes? Where did I see somebody before I cut them off? Yes, Fred?

SPEAKER: I'm not even sure how to phrase this question, but it really sort of piggybacks on the conversation we've just been having, but really looking at some of the issues you raise in terms of how disasters are measured in cost. I'm wondering: it's easy to say that it costs more in a developed country because, as you said, bigger buildings, more buildings, et cetera. Is there any statistical history of actually taking the measurement and making it sort of a relative measurement and saying, okay, well, in poor countries it may not in raw numbers be more expensive, but the impact of the disaster is greater because it takes longer to return to any sort of an economic function? Livelihoods are difficult to restore, which piggybacks onto what Susan's talking about in terms of violence and what the last speaker was talking about in terms of giving people something to do, so that it becomes a big package.

I'm also wondering, is there any sort of track record of actually looking at what the relative cost of a disaster is in terms of not just raw dollars, but the overall impact to society in terms of -- for lack of a better term, we, you know, think about resiliency, bounce back if you will, not just in terms of restoring a building but restoring society, restoring economic activity and all those sorts of things?

MS. BUZARD: Okay.

MS. JOHNSON: Can I go ahead? And feel free to jump in. But there have been efforts to measure the costs of rebuilding in terms of the GDP of the country, of the purchasing power, and so forth. But what there hasn't been, I don't think, has been an effort to tie that into the whole resilience thing in terms of the extent to which the rebuilding effort actually enables communities to be prepared for the next disaster or, you know, how it may eat away at that resilience.

But, you know, you can play around with the numbers, you know, the costs, you know, X-billion dollars' worth of damage and New Zealand is equivalent to X-million dollars' worth of damage in Country X. But I'm not sure it really gets at the underlying issue you're raising, resilience.

Daniel, I don't know if you want to say anything else about the economic measurements. No.

MS. FERRIS: Well, I have a question actually for Susan, too. One, clearly we know that disasters as much as anything exacerbate what's already a pre-existing condition for the most part. So (inaudible) question in some ways about the report is do you see it as a call for responders to be doing more?

Like when we think about responders, we think about shelter and water and sanitation and food, kind of these like big categories, like the big critical things that you move in with immediately. I think as disaster response and certainly recovery gets more sophisticated, or I hope it does, this becomes -- could be just as critical. But is this a call to be -- to have disaster responders have a different skill set? Or is it about networking with others that are doing it?

Because I -- sometimes I get concerned about responders kind of being expected to kind of rebuild the society in those first few weeks. And everyone's coming

in doing do this better and do that better and do that better, and there's just a point where you're substituting for something that is impossible to substitute. So that's one question. That's the hard one.

The easy one is any information about Japan? Because we heard so much and some of us who were there saw this, you know, talk about stoic and talk about very well-mannered and very calm situation under terrible duress, and I didn't hear anything about abuse in any way. I just wondered if anyone's heard that, because I think that's kind of interesting.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, your easy question, I can't answer, so I don't know. I have not. I don't know if others here -- I don't know, Gurvinder, if in our discussions or our looking at Japan if there's anything on that, and I'll come back to that in a second.

But I think in terms of what are we asking of disaster responders and disaster response organizations, I think we're asking -- yes, we are asking, we are demanding, we think it's not an unreasonable expectation that disaster responders themselves are better prepared. They have their eyes open. They have a different understanding, and I would say not only on this issue, but more of a sensitivity and understanding that you have to actually have a sense of what are some of the dynamics in the community. It's not a question of going in with, you know, we do our thing and this is how we do it. I mean -- well, and also if I think -- again, in the Canadian context, I mean, we have disaster responders who are working with communities in terms of, you know, organizing emergency shelter.

I mean, and not to say that everything's about shelter, but it is important that the people who have the mandate from the Canadian Red Cross to work with, you know, a community that's been burnt out or something, and all of a sudden we're putting

people into, you know, temporary shelter for a short period of time, it is important that the people with that responsibility mandate are doing that with their eyes open. That they are -- have an awareness to, you know, some of the not so pretty dynamics that could be happening within that community and that they take measures to mitigate that.

It also speaks toward the organization. This comes to some of the other work that the Canadian Red Cross has been involved in, which it, in a sense, is a foundation for some of this, which is ensuring that organizations themselves have taken seriously that every single person working for the organization, be that staff or volunteer, every single person we touch or relate to as beneficiaries are safe.

And so I think if, as an organization, you go through that process and that you have that capacity in your organization, and then it becomes in your DNA and it's not an extra kind of thing. It becomes part of what it is to be -- your nature as a humanitarian responder.

MS. BUZARD: We'll get right cracking on it.

MS. JOHNSON: Right cracking on it. We're going to fix that.

MS. BUZARD: Yep. Got two questions right here, in the front and to this side.

SPEAKER: Hi, I'm Abby. I just wanted to go back to you the idea of resilience. And something -- it seems to be that resilience is one of those new buzzwords that we've been throwing around, but we don't really actually know what we're -- well, you know, no one really has a uniform definition of it. And something that we've been -- or starting to tackle in the Interaction Disaster Risk-Reduction Working Group is having this conversation on resilience and talking about, you know, how do we define it? What do we mean by it? And actually how do we measure it? So I was just kind of wondering your thoughts on that.

MS. BUZARD: Another question in the front. We'll gather a couple.

MS. CUSHMITZ: Hi, my name is Marti Cushmitz. I'm a program officer at (inaudible) here in Washington, D.C. My question is, is there a difference in the response for the size of the community, if it's a small community or a large, urban city?

I guess the reason I'm asking this is I pause at that, if there's a social framework like there is in Japan and the smaller communities, that when a disaster strikes and you lose what normally would be your protections, like your house or your family or your income or maybe some sensitive of identity, whether the community framework will then keep violence lower. So maybe that's stronger in a smaller community than it is in a city.

MS. BUZARD: Let's take one more question in the back and then we'll mix it up.

MS. WEERASINGHE: Hi, my name is Sanjula Weerasinghe and I work at the Institute for the Study of International Migration. My question's tied to the one earlier. It's also in relation to Japan. I wanted to know whether cultural factors played a role in the visibility of the elderly and the assistance that went to the elderly?

MS. FERRIS: Maybe I'll start. You know, I think this whole emphasis on resilience is really interesting, I mean, the ability to jump back or to bounce back. But, you know, we never hear about the resilience of the rich. I mean, resilience seems to be a term we use with vulnerable communities somehow. I think we need to kind of unpack that a little bit and figure out if it's, you know, a way of maybe shifting responsibility, maybe look at the impact of recurring disasters, you know, maybe controlling for income or wealth and not just assuming that resiliency is something you encourage within poor communities, but something more universal in terms of the, you know, the size of the -- I think social frameworks and culture are essential. I think it's, you know, looking at the

difference in response in Japan of local communities compared with other disasters.

I mean, it's just remarkable, the degree of social cohesion the way in which communities pitch together, the bringing out the best in each other that I think Susan referred to earlier. And that may be more difficult to get in urban areas. I don't know how you plan for that, though, I mean, how you develop programs that can take that into consideration.

There was something else I was going to say, but I forgot. I'll come back to it.

MS. JOHNSON: The smaller communities versus larger communities, I mean, I think there are -- I can't pretend to know and I'm not going to pretend I know. I think I do know that people are at risk even in smaller communities, that it's not -- at least in my experience, that even in smaller communities, I mean, there is certainly an attraction to the fact that everybody knows each other and there's a certain kind of mutual assistance between families in a small community. But it sometimes can hide some pretty awful stuff. So I -- and I don't know statistically what would be true, so I don't know about the -- yeah, the smaller communities being safer places essentially or having more -- I mean, I can understand in a sense of having more robust kind of social networking or the social -- well, the interrelationships that would allow perhaps more protection than -- but as I say, I mean, even outside disaster environment, certainly in my country, I know awful things happen in small communities. And it does -- and the small community and everybody knowing each other doesn't offer the right kind of protection to everybody.

Again, culturally, I mean, depending on which culture we're talking about and what the norms are in the culture, what I consider to be awful things are in some cultures understood to be reasonably reasonable. Then on the question of the -- I mean,

one of the things I found interesting with -- and then you can speak more about it than I because you've actually been there a couple of times, I think, on Japan.

But, I mean, I did find interesting in the Japanese Red Cross -- well, the response of the country, the work the Japanese Red Cross itself was involved in, in Japan, I think at least highlighted to me, and I can't say it's the first time ever, but certainly proportionately highlighted to me the need for a response that is appropriate to an elderly population, and that there is a whole series of issues that the elderly population in Japan were facing, which seemed to be -- and again, I can't say unique, but they seem relatively new, if I could put it that way. And I think it really did challenge in many ways what we consider to be our norms and our approaches and so on in terms of effective response.

But I think you're the best placed here to say something about that.

MS. BUZARD: Well, I will say less about Japan, but I have been thinking a lot about an increasingly elder population around the world. And here certainly in North America we have, maybe not perfect, but we have an infrastructure and we have some systems of social security, et cetera. You now have people around the world in developing countries living longer without that infrastructure, without that safety social net. And I think we are going to see enormous vulnerabilities of the elderly that we are not prepared to manage, very high use of prescription drugs, I mean, a whole set of things as medical advances are happening in more and more around the world, and we don't have that.

So I think the entire response community and development community has a whole new paradigm to look at and we haven't figured it out and it brings up huge ethical issues. I mean, very much the same question that we have here in this country about what should you pay for? And how far? And who makes that decision?

These things are going to happen more and more across larger and larger and larger populations. I think my personal feeling is we're going to come not only to an economic crisis, but an ethical crisis because we don't know how to sort through that kind of decision making.

So I'll stop there. Martin? Is that a question? It looks like -- no. Yeah, okay. Well, I have a question about social media. Sorry, but I'm thinking about it.

Beth, are you willing to take it?

MS. FERRIS: Sure.

MS. BUZARD: Well, you mentioned it a bit in your -- and you think about it. I heard an interesting statistic recently: 5 billion mobile phones, 200,000 text messages sent every second. So in my time that I just spoke that sentence, a million text messages went around the world.

MS. FERRIS: But none from this audience, I'm sure.

MS. BUZARD: None from this audience. They're actually very well-behaved, thank you.

MS. FERRIS: Nobody's Tweeting?

MS. BUZARD: Enormous implications of the speed and volume and brevity of messages. And in a world where we see, to be very politically uncorrect, dumbing down of information already, we're now bringing it down to 23 or 27 or whatever the number of characters is. Curious both what you think -- both of you and anyone in the audience -- but what do we do about this information movement?

It could be a great thing. It is a great thing. Opportunities to share information, collect information here where there's need. Huge implications of erroneous information, et cetera. So I just would love your thoughts about how it relates to particularly disaster response and preparedness.

MS. FERRIS: I think we've seen some really interesting examples around Haiti with a lot of, you know, individual on-the-scene reports of tracking, of GPS mapping being done far away from the actual disaster site, missing kids appearing on Twitter with concerns about privacy, safety, safeguards of who is sending this information for what -- I think it's tremendous, exciting possibilities. And in Queensland and Australia when the floods occurred, I mean, the Twitter and the Facebook, they were the main sources of information.

It was information not just by ordinary citizens, you know, this bridge is out, don't go here, but also the government was very effectively using it. But, you know, it raises lots of questions. I remember talking with -- I think they had police in Brisbane who was really excited about their use of Twitter because they didn't need any clearances. We can just do it. Immediately we can get the word out. We don't have to go through all this vetting process.

You think, well, that's great but, I mean, there's maybe a reason for vetting processes. You know, the government is saying, it's okay to go here on the basis of who's assessment? So there are lots of questions.

But in general, I'm more positive than I am critical of any of these -- maybe because I'm now on Twitter and I spend hours every day trying to figure out how to cut out four characters to make my message fit.

MS. JOHNSON: Oh, these are great questions and certainly a mixed picture. There are certainly some fantastic things going on in terms of social media and what social media can do. And also there's the inevitability of it, like it is here, so kind of, you know, we'd have to embrace. I mean, there's a couple of things we point to in the Canadian Red Cross.

I mean, back to Japan. I mean, we were very proud. Our social media

people were very proud of the fact that when the Japan earthquake happened, that we moved really fast, and by like 7 o'clock in the morning we were out there in the Twitter universe in Canada. And our little Twitter message -- our Tweet I guess it would be -- went out there, I don't know, some ginormous number, I can't remember it. But it was like, you know, we were actually trending on the Friday. So that was exciting. But it was us riding a wave, too.

MS. BUZARD: It's Canada, you know.

MS. JOHNSON: Come on. You'd be excited, too. And it was fantastic. I mean, the sense that we were out there. I mean, we were sort of the go-to people. I mean, the media and the social media were referencing, you know, us and that's great. And so, I mean, that -- you know, but it was like a tiny, little (inaudible) message. It wasn't a lot of information.

Was it the right thing to be doing? I think in terms of actually wanting to capitalize on social media, it's fantastic. Now, can we actually use the fact that through that you build a network of, I don't know, let's say there's -- remember it's Canada. Let's imagine there's a million people out there listening to the -- seeing the Canadian Red Cross in the Twitter universe. Well, do you use the fact that through Japan, you built that base, and then you can use it for other things? So you have to have a proactive strategy of how you're going to use that (inaudible) now they've got that base. What messages are pushing out there? What dialogues are you engaging in, in the Twitter universe? Because that's what that allows you to do.

Of course, I have all of the similar concerns. Gurvinder over lunch was just telling me and showing me this very cool app, and I even know what that is, that we have -- well, that the British Red Cross has just launched, you've probably seen this, too, because you're very cool, on first aid. And so it's this whole application that anybody can

have on their iPhone or their BlackBerry, and it's like, you know, these -- you know, and so it's like the whole menu of all the kinds of things. And so you've got a certain amount of capacity then that is instantly in people's hands.

And for us, we're looking at how do we do something similar to have a violence prevention app? So that then you -- you know, you do have this handheld device with, you know, sort of this little encyclopedia of all the kinds of things that would be very good for people to have at their fingertips. So we embrace, and we do the best we can. And we use it to push the agenda forward.

MS. BUZARD: Got a little off topic, sorry. But I think it's just so topical.

MS. FERRIS: Can I just ask how many of you are on Twitter?

SPEAKER: I wanted to ask Susan what trend (inaudible).

MS. JOHNSON: Come on, you know that.

MS. BUZARD: Yes?

MS. MIRIAM: Hi, this is Marina Miriam. I did some work on Katrina Disaster Housing. But this is totally back to the Twitter, social media thing, like here in D.C., when we had the earthquake, the only thing that was working was texting and Facebook, at least where we were, so it was the only way to get information. So it's just something, you know, to think about.

MS. JOHNSON: Well --

MS. FERRIS: Yeah. After Haiti, I think that's how we learned about what was happening was on Facebook and social media.

MS. BUZARD: But it's also really interesting just in terms of superfast disaster response. We have at the American Red Cross a deck where we actually are monitoring social media, most blogs and Facebook and Twitter around the world. And when the Mexico earthquake happened, which came up on our BlackBerry and in 30

seconds I was running across to the DOC, to the Disaster Operations Center, to look up at the screen because I knew within one minute, there would be a huge number of feeds. And from that -- I could tell before I called the Mexican Red Cross, anything, before CNN, that's where I saw, boy, that was a shake, but I'm okay. Well, the building really moved around, but I'm fine. I mean, within I would say 15 minutes -- don't tell anyone this -- but we had our assessment done at some level. We knew it was probably basically okay.

It's kind of remarkable in that way. I mean, there's -- I mean, we don't want to miss, obviously, things that we need to pay attention to, but it was pretty extraordinary knowing that fast because there was that much information about that particularly was natural disaster fairly straightforward. But I thought it was astonishing.

MS. FERRIS: And I remember seeing that come up on the Twitter feed, the Mexico earthquake, and immediately going to CNN, *New York Times*, BBC, and it took them a long time.

MS. BUZARD: Exactly.

MS. FERRIS: There were, you know, hundreds of Tweets about Mexico before it hit the mainstream media.

MS. BUZARD: But maybe to get back to ethics, economics, rich countries, and violence, I think the resilience question is a great one and I think that it's true that it's being bandied about, it's the word that everyone uses now, including many governments. And I think that's basically a good thing because I think we can push governments to actually -- I mean, yes, it can be abused. I agree, Beth, but I think there's an opportunity. Because even if we don't have a clear definition, if we don't know exactly what it means, and I think we have a lot of work to do there, certainly we do in terms of saying if we're going to do it, how are we measuring it, et cetera? What do we mean by it? But I think that donors are speaking about it, and I think there's an opportunity to

leverage that into a more coherent and consistent funding. I really do believe that. And I think we need to use that iron while it's hot.

This is your -- yep, good. We have time for about two more questions.

MS. MARS: Hello, my name is Diane Mars. I'm a master of public administration candidate at George Washington University. I have two quick questions, primarily maybe for Ms. Ferris, if you could answer them.

The first is, what is being done, if anything, to help prepare cities across the world in case there are cyber attacks that might, you know, shut down grids of entire cities, entire areas, or what would you like to see being done in that area?

And secondly, Ms. Ferris, what would you like to see -- how would you like to see the role of public-private partnerships being played to help alleviate this cost and effectiveness? Would you like to see them moving forward? Would you like to see them more maybe in helping out with like a crisis mapping? Maybe more traditional roles like donor roles perhaps? I don't know what, helping in CBA, program evaluation. So if you could speak to that. Thank you.

MS. BUZARD: Last question. Last two questions. One on the corner.

MR. TIPSON: Thank you. Fred Tipson again. How do you see the future in terms of what we should expect over the next -- let's not go so far in the future that global warming if it's real, kicks in, in a big way, just in the next -- the rest of the decade. What do you think we should anticipate?

MS. BUZARD: I love it when it gets to this level. I think that's probably a good last question. Do you want me to buy you some time or are you ready to go?

MS. FERRIS: I'm okay.

MS. BUZARD: Good.

MS. FERRIS: Sure. I can't answer the question on cyber attacks. I

mean, I think it's a big threat that there are lots of people working on. And as we use not only social media, but as our lives become more dominated by computer technology, I mean, it's a huge issue. But I just don't -- I don't have that expertise.

In terms of public-private partnerships, I think we should be doing it on the humanitarian side. I think we should be engaging much more with the private sector.

I mean, a lot of humanitarian organizations, you know, have real suspicions about profit motivations of companies wanting to respond in disaster situations for their own entrepreneurial reasons. I mean, yet they're there and they're here to stay. And I think working with them to have certain basic standards is kind of like working with the military that you may wish this were just exclusive fear of humanitarian organizations, but it isn't. And then given the reality, I think it's a good pragmatic approach to work with them and to find ways in which their particular talents and skills can be used. Often that's in the area of logistics, (inaudible) work done during Katrina about, you know, Coca-Cola and Walmart and their means of distributing things were better than anything in the government or humanitarian organizations had. Communications technology is another area where I think that private corporations have a lot to contribute to disaster response.

In terms of what we might expect from the future, I'll say a few words and then Susan might want to. I think we're going to see much more urban disasters. I think everybody's worried about Nepal, frankly, about what might happen -- what is likely to happen in the next decade in terms of an earthquake. And what would happen if it occurred in winter, you know, when planes couldn't get in? I mean, I think there's a lot of contingency planning that's already going on, and most people involved in that are pretty terrified. So I think the urban thing is one thing.

I think we're going to see more severe, one-off, high-impact events that we're not very well prepared for, you know, whether it's in terms of increased intensity of

cyclones or hurricanes or longer droughts as a result of climate change. Not in 30 years, but in the next decade. I think those are very real trends.

I think we're going to see more intersection between conflicts. And particularly, there are the rise of these new forms of farmed actors, gangs and mafias and drug traffickers and people traffickers, somehow combining with the fragility of natural disasters.

I think on the more positive side, there's much more awareness about some of the political and human rights dimensions of disasters than there was five years ago. You know, 5 or 10 years ago, but before the tsunami in 2004, I mean, the assumption was that this was kind of a logistical thing. You know, you've got to get them the food and water and that's it and we're done. And then the conflicts are the really complicated things.

And I think we're all beginning to realize that, hey, natural disasters, well, they're not so natural maybe, and they're more complicated than just logistical experience would indicate.

MS. JOHNSON: Well, a couple of things. Just on the public-private partnerships, just to give a couple of examples where the Canadian Red Cross is actually very engaged in public-private partnerships in humanitarian action, if you like. And I'm speaking again about the domestic context, not international. But we have an arrangement with a -- at which we borrowed from the American Red Cross actually, where we have pre-agreements with a number of corporations in Canada where we -- they pre-identify staff who could be -- who are interested in being part of our disaster responder teams. Therefore, they are pre-trained, and, therefore, it's clear that if an XY event happens, they will be seconded the Canadian Red Cross for a period of time. And they could be HR managers, general -- I mean, they could be technicians of all kinds,

whatever else. And that's great because that means you've actually multiplied your workforce, essentially. But you've also got the opportunity to do the pre-training with people.

And these are then -- corporations were saying, you know, we will release a certain number of our people in these circumstances and for this much time. And we've drawn on that and had to, you know -- and we can rotate people through. So that's a fantastic thing we're doing.

And then, I don't know if we're allowed to name names, but Walmart is a corporation that I know the American Red Cross has a relationship with, as does the Mexican Red Cross, as does the Canadian Red Cross. And there, I mean, what you've spoken about a little bit, Beth, is, I mean, obviously the logistics capacity, but not only that. We have a partnership with Walmart where we fundraise on Walmart property every August. The corporation then matches what clients, as in customers, contribute to the Canadian Red Cross, which is a big funder of our domestic disaster response capacity in Canada.

But also it's the whole question of having pre-agreements with Walmart in terms of what we call a comfort kit. I think maybe you might use the same terminology here in the States. You know, so what's the basic kit that you're going to have ready to respond to, you know, the individual house fire or, as I've spoken about, you know, the sort of mass evacuation events? What kind of material do you actually have on hand?

The fantastic thing is, we don't necessarily have to have it on hand at all, because Walmart does -- will hold it, and they've got the tremendous logistics capacity. So as long as you've got the agreements in place in terms of what the norms and the rules and the regulations and all that kind of stuff are, there's certainly room for, I think, good collaboration in terms of getting, you know, practical work done well.

I think what you've described in terms of the future, I absolutely sign on to everything you said. I mean, I think in much of the world where we work in partnership with national societies, it's not a question of if climate change. It's already happening in many, many places and we see it big time. Too much water, not enough water, changing weather patterns of all kinds meaning all kinds of things, including, mass -- you know, more population movement, more people at risk, you know, all kinds of circumstances.

Maybe one thing I would add, though, is that -- and I think this is not only within the world of the Red Cross movement, but we are seeing more regional capacity. So individual countries are gaining strength, and in their neighborly arrangements, also gaining strength. So the whole, kind of, architecture, if you like, at the humanitarian community and who has what roles and responsibilities, I think is shifting.

And I don't think we've figured that out yet exactly, what that will mean, but it's certainly shifting in terms of, you know, what Canada could have expected to be expected of it, and the space that Canada would have to intervene or help in certain circumstances. I think we're going to see that shifting. And there's, in fact, going to be reduced space for some of the traditional Western governments because, you know, -- the South Asia or the Southeast Asia governments are organizing and are saying, you know, we can -- we're going to take care of this.

Now I think one of the questions there is what norms are we all working to? But that's a discussion for another day.

MS. BUZARD: Everybody, thank you so much for coming out. And a big hand to both of you and to our panelists.

* * * * *

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY PUBLIC

I, Carleton J. Anderson, III do hereby certify that the forgoing electronic file when originally transmitted was reduced to text at my direction; that said transcript is a true record of the proceedings therein referenced; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which these proceedings were taken; and, furthermore, that I am neither a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of this action.

Carleton J. Anderson, III

(Signature and Seal on File)

Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of Virginia

Commission No. 351998

Expires: November 30, 2012