



Social Impacts Thematic Group Meeting Report 3-7 September 2007

1. List of participants, agenda, dates, place

Representatives of the Microdis Social Impacts Group attended a thematic group meeting at Northumbria University, Newcastle upon Tyne from Monday 3rd until Friday 7th September 2007. The meeting also included attendance at a two-day international conference – Dealing With Disasters – which was held at Northumbria University. On Friday 7th September the group was joined by Terry Cannon of the Integration Group.

Those present were:

- Terry Cannon, University of Greenwich, UK
- Lou Escandor, CDRC, Philippines
- Maureen Fordham, University of Northumbria, UK (host)
- PC Joshi, Delhi University, Dept of Anthropology, India
- Sharon C Linog, RIMCU, Xavier University, Philippines

Apologies from:

- Alok Mukhopadhyay Chief Executive, Voluntary Health Association of India
- Shisir Ranjan Dash VHAI, New Delhi, India
- Ivan Komproe HealthNet TPO, Amsterdam, The Netherlands
- Meghachandra Singh Mongjam, Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi University, India

A draft agenda (Annex 1) was circulated and then adapted at the start. The agenda largely followed the suggested reporting headings. A summary of discussions of each day is presented in Annex 2)

Goals of the meeting

The meeting aimed to review work so far and to discuss the major issues of producing the conceptual framework and designing the methodology for later field research. Discussion of the integration issue was of top priority.

2. Briefing by participants on activities since Kick-off meeting

- **PC Joshi, Delhi University, Dept of Anthropology, India**

Delhi University had engaged a PhD student for the Microdis project who will focus on the social impact of flood disasters (Uttar Pradesh).

Another PhD student has been enrolled who is working on a gender theme, relevant to but not paid from Microdis.

Delhi University is now starting to work on the tools in collaboration with Meghachandra Singh Mongjam (Maulana Azad Medical College, Delhi University) also works on this

Contributed an initial paper on MIDSAT

Contributed an initial paper on conceptual framework

Attended the CRED training programme

Has completed a draft paper for the Potsdam Conference: SHIFT07: P.C. JOSHI, P. Khattri, M. M. Singh, M. Fordham and, D. Guha-Sapir
“Floods: Trends and social impacts in Indian context”

- **Sharon C Linog, RIMCU, Xavier University, Philippines**

Xavier team now has 3 main researchers (including Sharon Linog)

They have contributed an outline conceptual framework

Also gender and ethical rights concerning disaster

After this meeting, will be organizing a forum on climate change and disaster with an audience from GOs and NGOs plus students in collaboration with National Disaster Coordinating Council

- **Lou E Escandor, CDRC, Philippines**

Conducted national consultation to unite the network Citizens Disaster Response Network (CDRC provides the secretariat). This included scanning of the research capabilities of the network

Contributed to the Midsiat Indicators discussion

Contributed a paper on the conceptual framework

Have 1 researcher financed by Microdis at CDRC

Has a reservoir of 12 researchers from the regional network who are willing to help in the project if required.

Sent one participant to the CRED training

- **Maureen Fordham, University of Northumbria, UK**

Northumbria has been engaged in various coordination efforts for the Social Impacts Group. These have included the stimulation of discussion and sharing of materials and the setting up of a password protected website to store shared documents for easy access.

Contributed to the formation of the Midsiat tool

Contributed to the paper to be delivered at Potsdam

Compiled initial bibliography on social impacts of disaster.

Because of University delays in engaging the Microdis researcher (who will also be registered for a PhD) a decision was made to delay finalizing the conceptual framework so that she will be able to take the lead

Have secured an external partner (the Environment Agency) willing to support an additional Microdis PhD studentship

3. Summary of discussions

3.1 Review of Work Plan and Deliverables

See Excel spreadsheet of latest Workplan (Annex 3).

3.2 Interactions needed with other Groups, e.g. communications, data needs, conceptual ideas

What interactions are needed (and when) with health and economic groups?

- The social impacts group will share our current state of design and thinking with the other groups as soon as this meeting is complete
- We will then share our protocol with the other groups at an early stage (early enough to have time to discuss and modify eg November 2007)

- Thematic coordinators should meet at Potsdam

3.3 Key Issues for Social Thematic Group discussion

What external bodies do we wish to include as partners and supporters in the research process?

In Europe:

- UK Environment Agency (have agreed to partner on a PhD with Northumbria University)
- Defra (was defra minister) Hilary Benn link follow up maybe Terry and I for a meeting
- Germany National Platform
- Link through early warnings people
- UNU-EHS

In Asia:

- India: National Flood Commission, AIDMI, UNDP, Ministry of Home Affairs (2nd Asian Ministerial Conference – MF) etc
- Philippines: NDCC, PHIVOLCS, UNDP

Globally

- Interact with the national committees working for the Hyogo Framework (contribute to the UNISDR Global Framework meetings)

The SI Group requests some ground rules for engagement to come from the Microdis Coordinator.

3.3.1 Discussion of Integration Issues including surveys, how and WHEN to integrate the research and results – two approaches; Summary of discussion of advantages and disadvantages of each approach

The integration issue was considered a top priority of the group. While all were convinced of the need for integration, the timing and process was still unclear at the beginning of the meeting. Concerns were raised about the appropriateness or effectiveness of the social impacts team administering and analyzing e.g. health or economic surveys and data – and vice versa. After lengthy discussions, an acceptable way forward was found at the Friday meeting (see Annex 2).

3.3.2 Literature review – purposes, content, work allocation

SI group had already discussed this and identified tasks and deadlines. Group members have been sending readings since the Kick-Off Meeting and these have been lodged on a Yahoo account and later on a password protected website for easy sharing. The literature review would be ongoing but a draft would be completed by the end of October and a final version by the end of November.

3.3.3 Research questions for Theme

1. What are the social impacts on individual households and communities, and representatives of individual social groups (eg women, children, frail elderly,

widows, etc) within households and communities, of floods, storms and earthquakes? (Each hazard has different social consequences, according to different time frames)

2. What are the social impacts of disasters at larger scales? (eg county/province/state/region/national/international) – NB it is not yet defined whether primary in addition to secondary data collection is necessary at these higher scales
3. What factors make people become vulnerable and how to reduce these? Why are some people more vulnerable than others? (age, gender, education level, urban/rural etc)
4. What are the psychosocial impacts (eg depression, anxiety, etc) of disasters on individuals?
5. What is the role of human rights or rights-based approaches in reducing or increasing vulnerability?
6. What preparedness measures reduce vulnerability? At household, community, etc and institutions (GOs, NGOs, etc) at other levels
7. What are the impacts of natural disasters on social structure? (Eg household structure/dynamics, family size, etc)
8. What are the impacts of natural disasters on social capital (eg social supports, cohesion, community participation, networks)
9. What are the impacts of social capital on vulnerability reduction?
10. What are the impacts of natural disasters on social welfare (vulnerable groups, social services, housing, education [health])?
11. What is the impact of the emergency response system in reducing social impacts?
12. Is there a mechanism for institutional (eg CBOs) learning in disaster preparedness? What are the barriers to the learning?

3.3.4 Conceptual and methodological frameworks relevant to Theme

The SI team are working on a development of the Pressure and Release model (as adapted and presented by Terry Cannon). This would incorporate a greater emphasis on rights based approaches and incorporate recent chaos and complex adaptive systems theories.

What methods do we envisage?

Quantitative and qualitative; individual/group; household/community/expert informants/NGOs/GOs; primary/secondary;...

The importance of an internationally validated tool was underlined – this is what makes Microdis so challenging and important. Particularly, there were no comparable quantitative datasets of the complexity we envisaged. As just one example, sex disaggregated data is frequently missing in other datasets and the Microdis studies could fill this gap. However, the team also emphasized the importance of qualitative and participatory methods. Both quantitative and qualitative methods and techniques were needed.

A case study approach is preferred to incorporate a range of methods for purposes of triangulation

Focus Group Interviews (FGI) – small group, community level, key informants, (eg implementation issues – sensitive)
Focus Group Discussions (FGD) – GOs, NGOs, community
Household surveys (HH/spouse)
Secondary data analysis for national level contextual information

3.3.5 Assessment of data requirements for thematic group to fulfil research questions

Normally:

- Primary data (household and community)
- Secondary data (community and larger scales)
- Household data

Exceptionally:

- we may need primary data at larger scales eg provincial/national plus studies of intra-household dynamics

We would also emphasize the importance of qualitative and participatory approaches
Identify stakeholders – eg officials, govt, NGOs, etc – implementation of policies

The team asked: How do we capture the household? Head of household? Separate interviews with men, women? What about other intra-household power differentials e.g. in many cultures the (resident) mother-in-law can wield considerable power but may not normally be identified for interview. These questions would be raised again at the meeting in Potsdam and subsequently.

3.3.6 Cross-cutting issues

The team consider gender and environment to be important cross-cutting issues but time was too short at this meeting to discuss how to manage these demands. Terry Cannon recommended a paper by Roger Few (Few R 2007 “Health and climatic hazards: framing social research on vulnerability, response and adaptation” *Global Environmental Change* 17 pp 281-295). The team discussed this briefly and await further follow up from Terry Cannon on possible ways to incorporate elements of Few’s model into Microdis conceptualisations.

3.3.7 Surveys: site selection criteria and rationale for time elapsed since disaster to be studied

The meeting agreed that all would identify field research locations that cover appropriate geographical locations, event types and timescales. This would continue through email after the Thematic meeting had ended. An Excel spreadsheet was set up which would allow us to develop a matrix of sites and research parameters (see Annex 4). The next section identifies a summary of the points raised.

It was emphasized that we need to identify both positive and negative social impacts of disasters.

We need a spread of sites/events to cover urban and rural situations. The group then discussed likely sites/events by hazard type, subdivided by region.

Floods

We required sites/events to give us a range of social groups impacted (middle-working class); some areas with frequent and some with infrequent flood experience.

Europe:

- UK: 2007 floods. These hit many parts of the UK and we would prefer to have one site from the south and one from the north which would give us a range of class differences, urban-rural, frequent/rare. The UK floods will be the subject of a PhD studentship in partnership with the Environment Agency (EA) which has responsibility for flood defence in England and Wales.
- Elsewhere in Europe was still uncertain. There had been some notable floods in Europe in recent years and the Team felt feedback from the Hanoi meeting of the Health group and during the Potsdam meeting, might help in this choice.
- In the interim, Maureen Fordham would liaise with her contacts in the Environment Agency for examples of EA EU projects with whom we can collaborate and share materials/data.

Asia:

- India:
 - The Indo-Gangetic plain was strongly preferred. E.g. Uttar Pradesh and Bihar have frequent floods every year. This would give us primarily rural and also could show us cumulative impacts from repetitive flooding.
 - West Indian: Gujarat or Rajasthan – flooding here would be a largely new phenomenon due to building in the floodplain. This would give us urban floods (2007).
- Philippines:
 - North – (Luzon) frequent urban and rural floods. Here we would have access to both organized communities and unorganized
 - South – (Mindanao) flash floods, urban and rural, organized communities and unorganized
- Vietnam:
 - A site in Vietnam was preferred because this would give us a location with very different socio-political organization to the others in our project
 - The Mekong was suggested as it has a body of research associated with it upon which we might draw
- Possibly elsewhere in Asia but the team felt it needed to discuss this with the wider Microdis group.

Storms

Europe:

- European storms in 2007 were widespread and led to around 46 deaths. It was decided to choose precise locations later when the matrix was further populated
- The team also discussed whether we should study storm surges. This should be raised at the Potsdam discussions

Asia:

- The Orissa cyclone 1999 was suggested because it was such a major event and because there were already many studies upon which we could draw. There were clear methodological difficulties because of length of time since it had happened but it was felt valuable to explore long term impacts if the methodological issues could be resolved. It was felt the study would probably be at community level; a comparison of affected and not affected communities (VHAI is still working there and have continuing data)
- Tsunami 2004 – Tamil Nadu; Andaman Nicobar
- Indonesia: Banda Aceh

- Philippines:
- Philippines have 24-26 storms per year and so it was felt likely that a suitable site/sites would be identified. Typhoon Durian 2006 November was suggested as a likely site

Earthquakes

Europe:

- Turkey, Izmit 1999 but this had the same methodological drawbacks as the Orissa cyclone
- Possibly Italy
- It was decided to look at the emdat database and to ask Tuomo and Debby if can we leave it out if a suitable earthquake location cannot be found in Europe. Another way to explore it could be to do a risk assessment and extrapolation from a site known to be at risk but without a recent event

Asia:

- Gujarat, India 2001
- Possibly the Pakistan/Kashmir earthquake of 2005

- Philippines:
- A suitable earthquake site in the Philippines was problematic. Possibly Mindanao
- Indonesia 2004, Jogjakarta

We expect there to be 1 earthquake site in Europe and 2 in Asia

3.3.8 Time table, group deadlines and milestones, interactions with other groups

See workplan

The next major interaction will be at the Potsdam meeting in October 2007

3.3.9 Preparations for Annual Meeting

The feedback from Hanoi, with which the SI team concurred, is that 2 days for an annual conference is too short.

The discussions between the SI team and Mihir Bhatt of DMI (see Annex x) suggest there are opportunities for useful wider engagement and activity

The team had questions about the relationship between the Microdis annual meeting and the conference in Delhi which PC Joshi is organizing. Furthermore, what will be the expectations of our partners? Is it expected that all partners will attend both?

What are the budgetary implications? PC Joshi has some funds for conference including travel and accommodation – more details to follow.

4. Conclusions and Plan of Action

The meeting was an intensive one but had achieved much in clarifying ideas and working towards delivery of required outputs.

The plan of action included working to the workplan as confirmed at this meeting. It also included capitalising on our various contacts and opportunities for disseminating Microdis ideas and outputs.

Annexes

Annex 1: Draft agenda for the Newcastle upon Tyne meeting



Meeting, Newcastle upon Tyne, 3-7 September 2007 MICRODIS Social Impacts Group **Preliminary Draft Agenda**

Monday 3 September 2007

Disaster and Development Centre (DDC) Seminar Room (Press buzzer for DDC outside 6 North Street East and ask for entry)

11.00 – 17.00

I suggest we meet between 11am and 1pm for an initial update meeting. Everyone will report on where they are now with the work and suggest how best to use the next day and prepare for Friday's meeting where Terry Cannon will be present.

At 1pm we will break for lunch (nothing is arranged but there are plenty of places to eat in Newcastle).

At 2pm people can choose to spend the afternoon as tourists; or stay in DDC to do some individual or group work. I will be available all day.

Tuesday 4 September 2007

DDC

10.00 – 17.00

This will be our main working day. We can decide on Monday exactly how we will use this day but I suggest we spend the time discussing in detail and working directly on a computer to map out our conceptual framework and to organize our reports.

Wednesday 5 September 2007

Dealing With Disasters Conference

I assume you have by now registered for the conference at the reduced rate of £150.

You are free to attend as much or as little of this as you choose

Thursday 6 September 2007

Dealing With Disasters Conference

Friday 7 September 2007

Ellison Building, Board Room 2

10.00 – 15.00

Terry Cannon will join us. We can update Terry on our current state of output and discuss the many issues concerning the next stages of the project.

Annex 2: Summary reports for Monday 3rd, Tuesday 4th and Friday 7th September 2007

Microdis Social Impacts Team Thematic Meeting: 3-7 September 2007

On **Monday 3rd September 2007** the team discussed the following:

- The team members met from 11am until 1pm but meetings with fewer numbers had taken place since 9.30am.
 - The team reported back on what they had achieved in the time since the start-up meeting
 - There was lengthy and continuing discussion on the integration issue without yet agreeing a simple way forward. Integration was deemed desirable but the practicalities of doing so raised some challenges
 - The team discussed various methods for fieldwork with the general understanding that a case study approach would be preferable as this allowed a whole community study to be carried out, using a range of techniques (quantitative/qualitative/individual/community/group level).
 - The team discussed the difficulties of making much headway on the project at an early stage when they did/do not yet have their research team in place. However, the team expressed commitment to carrying out the project and all agreed that the team members would produce what was necessary although at some cost to those present.
 - The team discussed all parts of the suggested agenda at a superficial level before deciding on a plan of action for the Tuesday meeting. This would complete discussions under the suggested report headings. The team also made suggestions for how to conduct the Friday meeting when one of the integration team would be present.
-

On **Tuesday 4th September** the Team met from 10am until 5pm. The topics of discussion followed the report headings and all these have now been incorporated under their respective headings.

On **Friday 7th September** the Team met from 10am until 5pm. The meeting began by welcoming Mihir Bhatt of the Disaster Mitigation Institute, India. The report of those discussions follows:

The Microdis team gave a brief presentation on the project and opened the discussion concerning for future collaboration

PC Joshi referred to the conference planned to coincide with the period of the Micodis Annual meeting in Delhi (in February 2008) and offered DMI the opportunity to collaborate. Mihir Bhatt welcomed the offer and agreed to contribute in various ways. He further elaborated other opportunities for working together:

DMI has much data and other material which Microdis researchers could use/analyse. For examples, concerning storms, there is much on the Kandala cyclone (ongoing work) and this would fit well with studies of the long term impact of disasters.

Also there is material on Orissa.

For floods, there is material on the Gujarat floods 2005-6 where DMI carried out an investigation into the government response. This includes materials already written up. Also, DMI are working now on the Bihar rapid response on floods. Additionally, work in Surat/Jamnagar slums (urban floods); the research question is, can you work with slum communities directly? The DMI answer is yes and they have developed processes for livelihood relief with the local people including that the local people decide how the money is to be spent (donors: Oxfam Aus; DMI's own fund). Other foci of research and action include livelihood and shelter support, and satisfying immediate needs.

In terms of economic impacts, DMI had an Australian intern who worked on the impact of livelihood relief which might be useful for the social/economic linkages. A methodological problem usually is that you never have benchmarks but DMI have this for 18000 families across Gujarat. Before the Surat floods they collected data beforehand because they knew these people were vulnerable and it was only a matter of time before a flood occurred. So DMI have this benchmark material.

Other sites and topics discussed included:

Baroda; resurveys of DMI studies; methodologies for disaster impacts and vulnerability reduction at the local level; PUCL People's Union for Civil Liberties; People's commission on floods; who should use the impact data? A Govt of India national commission on flood management is being set up. One suggestion was for a comparative study to show Govt how other countries are dealing with floods; and a suggestion that DMI/Mihir Bhatt put on a half/whole day workshop at the Delhi meeting. This was welcomed and discussion moved to how the Microdis team might fund this; one suggestion (to be discussed further subsequently) was for a contribution from partners proportionate to their budget.

Concerning earthquakes, DMI have been involved in a large EU project – and all their data on livelihood relief and recovery and school safety could be made available to Microdis researchers.

They have other material on cash transfer – the first in India. This was in Bhuj and Bhachao with 12000 families. They carried out a needs assessment for each family. These were likely to get compensation/relief from govt and ngos but this takes time. Meanwhile the project asked the question, what do you need to get going to start your business? E.g. 3k rupees for sewing machine; handcart; stock; etc. So they gave a cash transfer (they got quotes for the sewing machine). They did it for 12000 families. One comment on this was that the process would be time/labour intensive and therefore expensive. The response was that as you expand up then there were only marginally greater costs.

A research project could examine 3 levels of impact:

- Individual (social)
- Business (economic)
- Community

In:

- ?Srinagar
- Kutch
- B?/Pattan

The research could also examine those who were left out of all compensations etc. What was the impact of that project on many more people – beyond the community?

It could be done in a multidisciplinary way. DMI have some fieldworkers in the region already.

The process for this might be:

1 dmi provide an update on this to the microdis India team who could put the data into a benchmark study

2 resample some sites

3 Refine the tools

Analysis

Joint writing (includes the fieldworkers used by Mihir Bhatt) translate from Gujarat to English

The team thanked Mihir Bhatt for attending the meeting and looked forward to further opportunities for collaboration in the future.

The **Friday** meeting then heard a report from Terry Cannon on the meeting in Hanoi with the Health Impacts Group.

Hanoi school of Public Health hosted it and it was very well organized. They spent 2 ½ days, very productively.

Key issues to emerge were:

- Research questions
- Literature review - how to be done and how will it relate to others?
- Methodology in general and integration in particular
- Criteria for selection of sites and time periods
- European case studies (to be discussed in Potsdam)
- The importance of Europe learning from Asia which is much better at
 - Preparedness
 - Community involvement and livelihood
 - Gender

The Microdis team then discussed matters arising from the Hanoi Meeting before returning to the Agenda which was organized around the suggested reporting headings.

Methodology

The problem for the surveys of households and communities is that people won't see it in discrete boxes so we should integrate from the start. How to do this?

Suggestions included to use an interrupted method – return over time to same household

After lengthy discussion, this is the suggested model research methodology using a concrete (although hypothetical) example:

Location: a Bihar village hit by floods

3 thematic groups with special interests carry out the research they wish to see

Engage enough survey people to do 3 separate thematic investigations BUT they should be trained to listen for the other 2 themes

They should come together after work in the field

Half day workshop to see what they learned and what still needs to be done – e.g. resurveyed/extended/additional focus groups
Maybe a health person goes to a household where a social study has been carried out and cross checks
90 houses (30 for each theme)

This model would be discussed further at the Potsdam meeting in October 2007.

