

ISSN 2580 6378
E-ISSN 2580 7048



JURNAL
ASIA
PACIFIC
STUDIES

Journal of International Relations Study Program
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
Universitas Kristen Indonesia

Volume 5 | Number 2 | July - December 2021

HOW ASEAN PERCEIVE NATURAL DISASTER AS PART OF SECURITY COMMUNITY AGENDA?

¹Alifia Putri Rahmadewi, ²Arfin Sudirman

¹International Relations Study Program, Faculty of Social Sciences and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jln. Ir. Soekarno km. 21, Sumedang, 45363, Indonesia

²International Relations Department, Faculty of Social Sciences and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran, Jln. Ir. Soekarno km. 21, Sumedang, 45363, Indonesia

alifia17002@mail.unpad.ac.id, arfin.sudirman@unpad.ac.id

Abstract

As a disaster-prone area, ASEAN had a set of disaster management mechanisms. In 2011 ASEAN established an institution that focuses on regional disaster management, namely the AHA Centre. However, the AHA Centre did not show its significant role in some disasters. This article aimed to determine the obstacles faced by the AHA Centre in 4 phases of international disaster management, namely mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery, and to use the concept of the security community to analyse ASEAN norms, institutions, and collective identity and relation to disaster management through the AHA Centre. The method used is a qualitative research method. The data collection technique collaborated several techniques derived from interviews with Indonesia's Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the AHA Centre, and BNPB RI, document-based research, and internet-based research. This research showed how the AHA Centre had played a role in the four phases of disaster management. However, there were still shortcomings such as its limited role, lack of resource management, and mechanisms that only focused on government-to-government. In addition, this shortcoming can also be found stemming from the collective identity of ASEAN, which is applied in its regional disaster management. Thus, this study suggested that the ASEAN policymakers increase the role of the AHA Centre in regional disaster management, improve mechanisms and resource management, and establish cross-pillar mechanisms of the ASEAN community.

Keywords: Disaster Management, Security Community, ASEAN, AHA Centre, ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, Challenges

Abstrak

Sebagai kawasan yang rawan bencana ASEAN memiliki seperangkat mekanisme penanggulangan bencana. Pada tahun 2011 ASEAN membentuk lembaga yang berfokus pada manajemen bencana regional, yaitu AHA Centre. Namun dalam beberapa bencana, AHA Centre masih belum menunjukkan perannya yang signifikan. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui kendala yang dihadapi AHA Centre pada 4 fase manajemen bencana internasional, yakni mitigasi, kesiapan, respons, dan pemulihan serta menggunakan konsep komunitas keamanan untuk menganalisis norma, institusi, dan identitas kolektif ASEAN. Metode yang digunakan dalam artikel ini adalah metode penelitian kualitatif. Teknik pengumpulan datanya mengkolaborasi beberapa teknik yang berasal dari wawancara dengan Kementerian Luar Negeri RI, AHA Centre, dan BNPB RI, document-based research, serta internet-based research. Artikel ini menunjukkan bagaimana AHA Centre telah berperan dalam empat fase manajemen bencana, tetapi masih ada kekurangan seperti perannya yang masih terbatas, manajemen sumber daya yang kurang, dan mekanisme yang fokusnya masih government-to-government saja. Kekurangan ini juga dapat ditemukan berasal dari identitas kolektif ASEAN yang diterapkan dalam manajemen bencana regionalnya. Untuk itu, penelitian ini menyarankan bagi pengampu kebijakan ASEAN untuk menambah peran AHA Centre, meningkatkan mekanisme dan manajemen sumber daya, serta membentuk mekanisme lintas pilar komunitas ASEAN.

Kata Kunci: Manajemen bencana alam, Komunitas keamanan, ASEAN, AHA Centre, Pilar Komunitas Sosial-Budaya ASEAN, Tantangan

1. Introduction

Natural disaster is a non-military threat classified as a non-traditional security issue in International Relations studies. Naturally, disasters are an unavoidable phenomenon. However, efforts to anticipate, control, and mitigate natural disasters are possible and appropriate for the state and related institutions. Southeast Asia is a region prone to natural disasters. From 2004 to 2014, more than 50 percent of deaths caused by natural disasters occurred in the area, or 354,000 of the 700,000 deaths worldwide recorded as deaths caused by natural disasters (ASEAN 2013).

Various kinds of destructive natural disasters and claimed many lives had hit countries in Southeast Asia, such as the tsunami caused by a 9.3 Richter scale earthquake in Aceh in 2004 and was recorded as the second-largest earthquake in history. However, this natural disaster did not only happen to Indonesia. The quake, centered 250 km southwest of Banda Aceh, triggered a tsunami that hit countries from east Africa to Thailand, killing more than 230,000 people in fourteen countries (BNPB-National Agency for Disaster Management 2009). In addition, the natural disaster of Typhoon Nargis that hit Myanmar in May 2008 also claimed a large number of lives, around 138,000 people were declared victims. (APEC Climate Center 2017). A deadly natural disaster has also hit the Philippines in November 2013, which was Typhoon Haiyan. This hurricane was recorded as one of the strongest hurricanes, with wind speeds reaching 270 km / h and causing more than 5,000 casualties (BBC News 2013).

Natural disaster management efforts have been developed, both by individual countries and under the auspices of ASEAN. All ASEAN member countries have their respective disaster response bodies. Meanwhile, ASEAN, through its shared vision in the ASEAN Community, especially the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, which was formed in 2003, has paved the way for disaster management in the region. The effort was later strengthened by ratifying the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER), operating in 2009 (ASEAN Secretariat 2009).

In the early AADMER period, namely the 2010-2015 period, the AADMER work program focused on improving effective mechanisms to achieve loss reduction due to natural disasters in the social, economic, and natural disaster risk reduction fields regional level. During this period, AADMER also issued an agreement regarding forming the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre), which later became the regional operational coordination center for disasters in ASEAN. The agreement for the establishment of the AHA Centre was signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of ASEAN countries and witnessed by the heads of state/government of ASEAN member countries on 17 November 2011 (ASEAN 2011). As the overseer of AADMER, the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) acts as the Governing board of the AHA Centre and guides the institution (ASEAN 2016).

As an ASEAN disaster management institution, the AHA Centre has several advantages. By its objectives, the AHA Centre can be utilised as a platform to facilitate ASEAN member countries to cooperate, especially concerning natural disaster management (AHA Centre 2020a). The AHA Centre may also accelerate the dissemination of information on recent disasters from disaster-affected countries to other ASEAN member countries through its disaster monitoring function (AHA Centre 2020c).

However, as has happened in several catastrophic events, the AHA Centre still has its weaknesses and has yet to demonstrate its significant role in centralised disaster management. For example, in the tsunami in Palu, Central Sulawesi, Indonesia, on 28 September 2018, the AHA Centre has carried out its duties to monitor natural disasters,

provide situation reports, and provide information to ASEAN countries regarding the incident. Nevertheless, the role of the AHA Centre was less pronounced in terms of emergency response and significant engagement. In the Situation Update Reports issued regularly by the AHA Centre during the disaster, it can be seen that in the case of the tsunami in Palu, most of the actions, resources, and operations were carried out by the Indonesian government and the Indonesian National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB). In the Situation Update Report no.9, which was issued ten days after a natural disaster, there was a report on the involvement of ASEAN countries (AHA Centre 2018). Meanwhile, the participation of the AHA Centre is being limited as a branch of support and accommodating cooperation between countries affected by natural disasters and ASEAN member countries.

On another occurrence, like the mount eruption in Mount Sinabung and Mount Agung in Indonesia, the Indonesian government did not include the AHA Centre or ASEAN in general. So, why is the AHA Centre's involvement limited on several emergency responses? Furthermore, why is it on several other occasions, the AHA Centre is not present? Based on these findings, this article raises the central question of "why is disaster management in the ASEAN region is still not centrally coordinated through the AHA Centre?".

This article is based on several previous studies, which serve as a basis and reference for a deeper understanding of the phenomenon. They have been divided into several clusters. The first cluster is a cluster that focuses on discussing natural disaster management in the Southeast Asia region. It refers to the existence of AADMER, AHA Centre, and ARF as natural disaster management phenomena in the Southeast Asia region where researchers refer to 7 previous studies, namely (Sudirman and Putra 2018); (Syaban 2014); (Simm 2018); (Emmers and Tan 2011); (Rum 2016); (Wibowo 2014); (Sawada and Zen 2014). The second cluster is an earlier study that describes the role of the Indonesian State in regional disaster management, namely (Herningtyas 2014); (Herningtyas and Surwandono 2014). The last cluster is the security community cluster, particularly those discussing ASEAN as a security community, namely (Zulkarnain 2014); (Maf'ul 2011); (Rosyidin 2013).

These previous studies have provided the basis and reference for this research. However, they focused more on discussing natural disaster management in ASEAN through regulations or regional agreements, namely AADMER. In addition, the discussion of disaster management from a regional perspective and the AHA Centre as a disaster management organisation in ASEAN is still limited. Therefore, this article will discuss disaster management in ASEAN through the AHA Centre. This article also employs the security community concept and international disaster management as its theoretical approach.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Security Community

The analysis and discussion of this article follow the concept developed by Karl Deutsch in 1957 and its three main factors. Concisely, this concept describes a group of countries that has developed a long-term habit of interacting peacefully and overriding force in resolving disputes with other group members. In other words, security communities are groups that have 'become integrated' in which integration is defined as the attainment of a sense of community accompanied by formal and informal institutions (Acharya 2014). In a further step, if the definition of threat has become the same between its member countries, it indicates the quality of a security community that can distinguish it from other types of security cooperation frameworks (Adler et al. 1998, 56).

Moreover, establishing a security community requires developing an understanding of peaceful interaction between its members. Three main factors build a security community and become important keywords, namely institutions, norms, and collective identity. These three factors are interrelated, and the development of one element can encourage other factors to develop as well.

The first factor, the institution, refers to the existence of formal and informal institutions that may provide a framework for the development of the security community. An institution may enact conditions that can help develop a security community, such as cultural homogeneity, belief in a shared destiny, and unilateral control norms. Institutions can encourage creating a regional “culture” based on common attributes, such as democracy, developmentalism, and human rights. An institution can also instill trust and promote control norms and practices, such as using a mediation approach in regional conflict resolution (Adler et al. 1998, 43).

The second factor, the norms, help to distinguish between normal and abnormal behavior, as well as to influence decision making and legitimise actions taken. In the international order, norms are used to prohibit activities that deviate from a common goal by providing a framework for conflict resolution and creating the basis for cooperation schemes. These norms can be in the form of formal and written agreements or unwritten rules. The existence of norms in a security community will also encourage the formation of a collective identity. (Acharya 2014, 24).

Moreover, last but not least, the collective identity, which, just like norms, collective identities may redefine the interests of the state beyond the political logic of power (Acharya 2014, 26-29). Several factors can drive the development of a collective identity, and the first is a commitment to multilateralism, prevailing norms, the emergence of “symbols”, and regional autonomy. (Adler et al. 1998, 207 - 213).

Based on these three critical factors in a security community, this article implemented the security concept to analyse ASEAN and its handling of issues within the region, especially those related to security, such as disaster. This concept will serve as a framework for this article to help answer the question mentioned beforehand.

2.2 International Disaster Management

This article employs the international disaster management concept as a supportive approach to help a deeper understanding of its definition and to identify the key actors that play significant roles in disaster management.

First and foremost, the unique concept of international disaster is based on the problems faced by countries in several disaster events where the disaster response needs of a country or several countries exceed the capabilities and capacities of the country. Conceptually, in this scenario, the affected country’s government would request resources from the international community. Thus, this global response can be defined as international disaster management (Coppola 2011, 10).

Furthermore, Coppola mentioned four phases of disaster management, i.e.:

1. Mitigation. This phase focuses on reducing or eliminating the likelihood or consequences of a disaster.
2. Readiness. In this phase, people who may be affected by the disaster or assist those affected are provided with equipment, either with the tools or knowledge, to increase their chances of survival and minimise other losses.
3. Response. This phase involves reducing or eliminating the impact of a disaster occurring or has already happened. Assisting is one of the terms commonly used in international disaster management at this phase.

4. Recovery. This phase involves post-disaster efforts to return the lives of the affected victims to normal. (Coppola 2011)

Although the objectives and actions taken in international disaster management are similar to national-level disaster management, the actors participating in such direction are more varied. At the national level, countries generally have disaster management systems that involve military components, fire departments, law enforcement agencies, emergency management agencies for civilian protection, and emergency medical services. This component is a component of traditional disaster management. Apart from these components, the state also involves specific ministries and disaster management agencies formed by the country (Coppola 2011, 425-446).

State involvement in international disaster management can be seen through several national agencies, i.e., the national disaster management agency, the diplomatic missions abroad through embassies and consulates, international development agencies, and other government agencies with specific expertise for disaster management.

Moreover, the states may also contribute through the United Nations and its agencies for international disaster management. In a regional organization such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, European Union, Organization of American States, and ASEAN, the states may contribute through its respective agencies

3. Research Methods

The sole research methods used in this article are qualitative and mainly refer to Christopher K. Lamont's book the "Research Methods in International Relations. Qualitative research methods can be used to understand better social phenomena that occur. Therefore, qualitative research methods encourage the researchers to focus on the meanings and processes that shape international politics. In addition, qualitative methods are generally carried out through in-depth studies of certain phenomena, events, countries, regions, organizations, and individuals (Lamont 2015).

Furthermore, this article collects data from websites and official documents, mainly from asean.org and ahacentre.org and their archives. Interviews are also conducted with sources from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs Indonesia, the AHA Centre, and Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana Indonesia (BNPB). This article uses discourse analysis for its data analysis and to ensure validity. Data obtained from interviews are reevaluated using the triangulation technique by comparing them with results from other interview results, news, journals, and reports.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Disaster Prone Situation in ASEAN Region

The ASEAN region is no stranger to almost all kinds of natural disasters, from flood to drought, tropical storms to earthquakes, volcanic eruptions to tsunamis the region has experienced. The reason why the area is so prone to disaster is that it has several natural disaster hotspots. The first hotspot is located around a transboundary river that crosses South Asia and several Southeast Asian countries such as Myanmar, Laos, and Vietnam. These areas are prone to natural disasters, floods and droughts. The second hotspot is along the ring of fire which puts countries such as Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines at high risk of natural disasters from earthquakes and volcanoes. The last hotspots are archipelagic regions such as the Philippines, prone to tropical storms and cyclones (United Nations Economic

and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific 2019). The table below exhibits the number of disasters that had hit the region from 1970 to 2009.

Figure. 1 Numbers of Natural Disaster Data since 1970-2009 in ASEAN

Disaster Type	Number of Disasters per Year	Total Deaths	Deaths per Year
Flood	10.85	17,800	445.0
Storm	9.65	184,063	4,601.6
Epidemic	2.28	7,294	182.4
Landslide	2.05	5,058	126.5
Forest Fire	0.45	310	7.8
Drought	0.98	1,337	33.4
Tsunami	0.15	92,021	2,300.5
Volcano	1.33	1,380	34.5
Earthquake	2.58	105,735	2,643.4

Source: (ASEAN Disaster Risk Management Initiative 2010)

The ASEAN region has also experienced three major natural disasters: the Indian Ocean Tsunami in 2004, Typhoon Nargis in 2008, and Typhoon Haiyan in 2013. These three natural disasters have claimed more than 373,000 lives (APEC Climate Centre, 2017). In addition, during the period 2012 to 2020, as many as 2,302 natural disasters have hit ASEAN, with the most cases of natural disasters in the territory of Indonesia, namely 1,433 instances of natural disasters (AHA Centre 2020b).

These conditions have encouraged ASEAN to coordinate and develop a regional framework covering aspects of natural disaster management such as instruments, platforms, mechanisms, and joint initiatives. One of ASEAN’s initial steps is to include the urgency of natural disaster management in the ASEAN Community, namely the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. In Chapter D, entitled “Resilience”, at point D1, there is a vision of ASEAN related to natural disasters, namely a disaster-resilient ASEAN that can anticipate, respond to, overcome, adapt, and rebuild better, smarter, and faster (The ASEAN Secretariat 2016b).

4.2 Disaster Management in ASEAN

Aside from the Socio-cultural Community Pillar Blueprint, ASEAN is also guided by several regional natural disaster management frameworks in ASEAN to establish common goals, legal bases and develop regional natural disaster management initiatives. There are three main frameworks in regional natural disaster management in ASEAN, namely the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER), ASEAN Vision 2025, and the One ASEAN One Response Declaration.

The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) is a regional agreement signed by all ASEAN member states in 2005 and ratified on 24 December 2009. AADMER aims to overcome problems related to natural disasters that occur in the ASEAN region. AADMER is also a guide for regional cooperation, coordination, resource mobilization, and technical assistance in disaster management and response (ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management, 2020). Later, AADMER, along with the Agreement on the Establishment of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management, became the foundations for establishing The AHA Centre.

Next is the ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management, a policy document that maps strategic objectives and provides policy guidance on AADMER implementation until

2025. This policy was approved at the 23rd ACDM Meeting and adopted at the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management (AMMDM) in 2015. ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management aims to achieve a community-centered, people-oriented, financially sustainable, networked approach to natural disaster management in ASEAN by 2025 (ASEAN 2013). Three main areas in regional disaster management are set to improve by 2025. The first is institutionalization and communications, the second is partnership and innovations, and the last is finance and resource mobilization.

Furthermore, the One ASEAN One Response declaration also re-emphasizes the AHA Centre's role as the ASEAN regional disaster management institution. This declaration also aims to develop a faster response to disasters, mobilize considerable resources, and establish a robust coordination mechanism so that ASEAN has a collective response in terms of disaster management (AHA Centre 2018). Three points become the focus of One ASEAN One Response, namely, Speed which encourages response to natural disasters to be carried out quickly; Scale, which enables reactions to natural disasters to be given on a scale that suits the need; and Solidarity, which promotes an increase in the impact of the answer that is provided by ASEAN so that ASEAN's presence can be more felt by the affected country (AHA Centre 2018).

The AHA Centre is the leading institution for ASEAN regional coordination in disaster management and emergency response. The fact has also been confirmed in the One ASEAN One Response Declaration signed by the ASEAN Leaders. However, natural disaster management in ASEAN does not only involve the AHA Centre, but other ASEAN bodies, platforms, and units collaborate and are liable for disaster management in the ASEAN region. This article differentiates these institutions into the different institutions aside from the AHA Centre and The AHA Centre itself.

These other institutions consist of the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Council (ASCC Council), the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management (AMMDM), The Conference of The Parties (COP) of AADMER, and the ACDM. The ASCC Council is the second-highest position in the ASEAN disaster management structure, just below the ASEAN Leaders. Under the ASCC Council is the AMMDM, an annual meeting held to encourage cooperation in disaster management and strengthen coordination among the ASEAN Member States. AMMDM will be held in conjunction with COP of AADMER. Of course, the ASCC Council, AMMDM, and COP of AADMER also coordinate with the Secretary-General of ASEAN (The ASEAN Secretariat 2016a).

Under those three units are the ACDM and the Government Board of AHA Centre. The ACDM or ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management has an essential task in disaster management in the region because they act as the main driving force in implementing AADMER. In addition, ACDM also provides strategic guidance in the implementation, establishment, monitoring, and evaluation of the AADMER Work Program. ACDM members consist of the National Disaster Management Organizations (NDMOs) of all ASEAN member countries.

Lastly, the main subject of this article, the AHA Centre itself, was established in 2011. This ASEAN government institution which has a secretariat office in Jakarta, Indonesia, has been running as the operational engine of AADMER. The AHA Centre has its primary function, namely to facilitate regional cooperation related to disaster management. However, the AHA Centre also has several other functions, such as operating regional coordination mechanisms for disaster emergency preparedness and response and facilitating joint emergency preparedness and response (AHA Centre 2020c).

Besides referring to AADMER and the AADMER Work Program, in carrying out its duties, the AHA Centre is guided by procedures as outlined in the Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and

Emergency Response Operations (SASOP) documents. This led to the development of an emergency response mechanism by the AHA Centre, which became the procedure for the disaster strike.

When a disaster strikes the Southeast Asia region, the AHA Centre will receive notification of the disaster from the Disaster Monitoring & Response System or DMRS, which is the AHA Centre's disaster monitoring tool. After that, the AHA Centre will analyze the disaster report, which will be reported to the parties concerned. Then, the AHA Centre will ask for assistance from other parties before offering their contribution to the affected country. Within 24 to 48 hours from the arrival of the aid to the party in need, the AHA Centre will continue to update the disaster situation report (AHA Centre 2019).

The AHA Centre may facilitate the mobilization of ERAT (Emergency Response and Assessment Team), a disaster response team to assist ASEAN member countries affected by the disasters. The AHA Centre may also facilitate the mobilization of the assets and capacities of the AHA Centre. After the tragedy begins to subside or two weeks after departure from the affected area, the AHA Centre will provide a final report and update the situation (AHA Centre 2020b).

Since its establishment, the AHA Centre has been involved in various natural disaster relief operations in ASEAN member countries. In 2017, the AHA Centre's most obvious involvement was in the two disasters in Vietnam. A hurricane called Hurricane Damrey in November 2017 and the flood in August 2017 (AHA Centre 2017). Then, in 2018, Myanmar experienced a catastrophic fire Center on a landfill in western Yangon. AHA Centre sent the ASEAN-ERAT, which helps deal with environmental and public health issues in the affected areas (Kurniawan 2018c). Still, Indonesia also experienced natural disasters in the same year, namely, earthquakes that hit Lombok in August and Palu in September. The AHA Centre then deployed the ASEAN-ERAT to assist the affected areas and relief items worth approximately USD 154,438 (Kurniawan 2018b).

4.3 The Role of the AHA Centre in Four Phases of Disaster Management

Referring to Coppola's explanation of the four phases of natural disaster management, namely mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery, it is appropriate for the AHA Centre as a regional disaster management institution to play a role in these four phases.

The first phase is mitigation which refers to efforts to reduce the likelihood or consequences of a disaster. Here, the role of the AHA Centre can be seen from the institution's monitoring function. To support this, the AHA Centre has a monitoring system called the Disaster Monitoring and Response System (DMRS) and an interactive data platform. They provide an overview of daily regional disaster monitoring called the ASEAN Disaster Information Network (ADInet) (AHA Centre 2020b).

The AHA Centre's disaster monitoring system helps the AHA Centre monitor regional disasters. When a natural disaster occurs, the AHA Centre can prepare the assistance it can offer to the affected country before it requests. The effort can reduce the preparation time needed by the AHA Centre to send relief responses in a disaster.

However, there are two types of disasters, namely sudden-onset disasters and slow-onset disasters. The system currently used by the AHA Centre is more supportive of sudden-onset disasters, which occur unexpectedly, such as earthquakes and volcanic eruptions. From the AHA Centre monitoring system to its standard operation for emergency response, the AHA Centre is appropriate for this type of disaster. In contrast, for slow-onset disasters, the AHA Centre still does not have the proper SOP.

Examples of slow-onset disasters are droughts, rising sea levels, and epidemics. Mitigation for this type of disaster can have a significant impact. The challenges and

complexities of drought monitoring have amplified the threat because the effects are cascade, broad, repetitive, and can last for months or even years. However, for this reason, anticipatory actions are needed, which are currently still a challenge for the AHA Centre.

The next phase in disaster management is preparedness which refers to the preparation given to people who may be affected by a disaster or who may assist those affected. The AHA Centre itself has one of its functions, namely for capacity building and training and a knowledge management system. Here the AHA Centre and NDMOs of ASEAN member countries and ASEAN-ERAT conduct training related to disaster management so that the parties concerned can be better prepared (Widagdo 2021).

In addition, to support the readiness of the AHA Centre for emergency response, the AHA Centre has also prepared a regional stockpile called DELSA, which functions as a storage area for goods that are usually needed when a natural disaster occurs so that when required, logistical assistance can be mobilized immediately. However, the logistical readiness is still limited to the AHA Centre's resources; the AHA Centre here still does not reach resources from the private or community sector (Faisal 2021).

The third phase in disaster management is a response which refers to taking action when a disaster occurs to reduce the impact of the disaster. The AHA Centre has preparedness in terms of disaster response which can be seen from the assets owned by the AHA Centre and the AHA Centre's SOP for emergency response. However, there is a challenge to the AHA Centre's emergency response.

The researcher found that the AHA Centre experienced force majeure problems during an emergency response during a disaster event. This is an obstacle for the AHA Centre in achieving centralized regional disaster management as it should be.

Based on experiences during major natural disasters such as the earthquake and tsunami in Palu in 2018, BNPB RI acknowledged that the AHA Centre needed a few days after the disaster occurred to come to the field because, at that time, the communication network and command system in the field had not yet been established (Herlianto 2021). Considering that the AHA Centre requires approval from the relevant countries to send aid, this communication barrier becomes a challenge for the AHA Centre to implement its One ASEAN One Response which requires speed in disaster response following one of the points in the OAOR, namely speed.

In addition, during a disaster, the facilities needed to receive assistance from outside, including from the AHA Centre, such as the airport, were also damaged, which further slowed the movement of the AHA Centre (Herlianto 2021). The AHA Centre needs to consider also unexpected things like this that prevent it from achieving centralized disaster management through the AHA Centre.

The final phase in natural disaster management is the recovery phase. This phase involves post-disaster efforts. The role of the AHA Centre does not only stop at the emergency response phase, but the AHA Centre also concerns itself in this recovery phase. This has not been done too much by the AHA Centre, but the AHA Centre implemented recovery efforts for the Palu tsunami disaster in 2018.

The Indonesian government asked the AHA Centre to continue its support after previously participating in the emergency response in Palu. The several ASEAN Member States wishing to support Indonesia's recovery efforts then asked the AHA Centre to facilitate the provision of their assistance. Based on the identification of needs by the local government, the support provided is the provision of permanent housing for the affected communities, and the place is called the ASEAN Village (Rachmawati 2020).

From the four phases of natural disaster management, it can be seen that the AHA Centre already has its role in each stage. However, the AHA Centre is still experiencing problems, especially in managing and mobilizing resources. However, the AHA Centre in

carrying out regional disaster management is also influenced by the factors of the ASEAN security community, especially those related to the collective identity of ASEAN.

4.4 The ASEAN Way of Regional Disaster Management

Collective identity is a critical concept in the security community initiated by Karl Deutsch. ASEAN as a security community also has it, manifested in a symbolism known as the “ASEAN Way”. The ASEAN Way refers to a set of norms shared by ASEAN (Katsumata 2003). Also, it refers to a decision-making process that focuses on consensus and discussion lines that emphasize equality between members and the importance of collaborating despite the time it takes to hold discussions to achieve agreement (Tekunan 2014).

These norms are embedded throughout the ASEAN Charter and the Treaty of Amity and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC). Then the core of these ASEAN norms is summarized as the ASEAN Way into four main points, which shape the ASEAN as a security community. The first point is the non-interference principle which is by what is written in the ASEAN Charter articles 2 (a) and 2 (b) that states that all ASEAN members must respect the independence of each country and not interfere in domestic affairs of other countries. In addition, this principle is also one of the TAC principles (The ASEAN Secretariat 2008).

Concerning disaster management, this article found that the implementation of the non-interference principal disaster management in ASEAN can be seen in the mechanism of the AHA Centre, which is contained in the Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP) document. This is reflected in the way the AHA Centre works, which requires the approval of the affected country to distribute its assistance in the event of a natural disaster.

Nevertheless, this non-interference may cause interference to the performance of the AHA Centre, which cannot mobilize its assistance until approval has been obtained from the relevant country so that in several disaster occurrences that have hit ASEAN member countries, the involvement of the AHA Centre in the field will only be recorded in a situation report a few days after a catastrophic event. This became an obstacle for the AHA Centre to respond to disasters quickly or within 72 hours.

In addition, this principle has also led to a situation in which the affected ASEAN member countries chose to reject the involvement of the AHA Centre in a disaster occurrence. Because ASEAN countries are multicultural and diverse, this principle of non-intervention is upheld to avoid suspicion of interfering in the country’s internal affairs. Therefore, the AHA Centre cannot force to assist (Mulyanto 2021).

The AHA Centre itself is trying to overcome this with the help of the One ASEAN One Response (OAOR) declaration, which aims to recall the AHA Centre’s role as the leading regional coordinating institution for natural disaster management in ASEAN. OAOR Declaration also seeks to accelerate the response to disasters carried out by the AHA Centre. Each ASEAN member country has its internal procedures concerning receiving foreign assistance and its natural disaster management mechanisms. This OAOR is expected to streamline these internal procedures. Furthermore, regarding the declaration, the AHA Centre has also prepared a regional stockpile containing logistical assistance, initially located in Subang, Malaysia, and in 2019 expanded to 2 additional locations, in Thailand and the Philippines. This regional stockpile is an effort to speed up response when a disaster occurs so that logistical assistance can be sent directly from one of the closest regional stockpiles (Widagdo 2021).

This was also confirmed by Mr. Said Faisal, who stated that the AHA Centre had also worked and prepared things needed by the affected country before the country gave permission. In some disaster events, the AHA Centre response could be faster. The existence of non-intervention is not an obstacle for the AHA Centre because the AHA Centre has been working even before the affected country gives the green light (Faisal 2021).

Then, the implementation of the second principle of the ASEAN Way, the quiet diplomacy in disaster management in ASEAN, is also related to the point of non-intervention. This article found that quiet diplomacy is manifested in one of the OAOR points, namely solidarity, referring back to the One ASEAN One Response declaration, the purpose of this solidarity point is to encourage an increase in the impact of the responses given by fellow ASEAN Members State so that their presence can be more felt by the state and communities in the country, they are affected. In this disaster response in ASEAN, there are indeed many ASEAN member countries capable of handling disasters, however here, the presence of fellow ASEAN member states is not to 'help', but to show solidarity as ASEAN. Thus, countries that are 'assisted' also feel comfortable because ASEAN member countries, through the AHA Centre, are based on solidarity and have no hidden intentions (Faisal 2021).

Furthermore, the response sent by the AHA Centre during a disaster was a form of solidarity with ASEAN member countries so that the assistance was not on behalf of only a few countries, but all ASEAN member countries represented by the AHA Centre. This can also be seen from official publications during the disaster in Lombok, Indonesia (Kurniawan 2018b), Yangon, Myanmar (Kurniawan 2018c), and Tropical Storms in Laos and Myanmar (Kurniawan 2018a), these state that the AHA Centre sent the ASEAN-ERAT team as a response to the disaster. The ASEAN-ERAT team consists of experts from 10 ASEAN countries, but they still work as a team and on behalf of the AHA Centre.

Next is the principle of the non-use of force, or peaceful settlement of disputes. This article highlights that their implementation in natural disaster management can be seen from the forums on disasters contained in the ASEAN natural disaster mechanism, such as the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management (AMMDM), a yearly meeting promoting disaster management cooperation and strengthening coordination. In addition, there is also the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) which is the governing council of the AHA Centre which contains a combination of the national countermeasures bodies (NDMO) of each ASEAN country.

The issue of disaster management is also not sensitive, so in disaster forums, conflict and different opinions in discussion and decision-making are minima (Mulyanto 2021). This is also related to the perception of ASEAN member countries that are already in line with the issue of disasters. Furthermore, the focal points of ASEAN member countries in terms of regional natural disaster management are incorporated in ACDM, which contains representatives from each of the NDMOs of ASEAN member countries. Perceptions of disasters among the NDMOs of ASEAN countries members of ACDM are also the same, even though in terms of risks, mechanisms, and the basis for their formation can be different (Faisal 2021).

However, of course, in disaster forums that have been held, it does not mean that it runs without debate or differences of opinion. Here the final element in the ASEAN Way is that consensus decision-making plays a role. This affects the perceptions of ASEAN member countries towards disasters and how the output of decision-making by ASEAN member countries then creates a regional disaster mechanism like the one that exists today.

All decisions regarding natural disasters that exist have gone through the agreement of all ASEAN member countries because all decisions must be through consensus so that if one

country does not agree, the decision is not implemented or adjusted so that all parties can feel comfortable and reach a consensus (Faisal 2021).

4.5 ASEAN Member Countries' Perception on Disaster and the AHA Centre

The common perception towards a threat is an essential point in the concept of a security community and can determine the maturity phase of a security community. To some extent, ASEAN member countries' perceptions of regional natural disasters are relatively the same.

For example, ASEAN has agreed to include natural disaster management and its mechanisms in the Pillar of the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. The placement of the issue of natural disasters on this pillar has been carried out since the formation of the ASEAN community in 2003 (Mulyanto 2021). Furthermore, the ASEAN Member States have obeyed the AADMER by having a national policy on disaster management and establishing a focal point for disaster management, as shown in the table below:

Table. 1 The Adherence of ASEAN Member States to the AADMER

ASEAN Member States	Integrating disaster management into national policies, planning, and programs at all levels (Article 3 AADMER)	Establishment of disaster management focal point (Article 22 AADMER)
Brunei Darussalam	<i>Disaster Management Order 2006</i>	National Disaster Management Centre
Cambodia	Law on Disaster Management (DM Law) 2015	National Committee for Disaster Management (NCDM)
Lao PDR	Prime Minister Decree No.158	National Disaster Management Office, under the ministry of social welfare
Malaysia	Civil Defence Force Act 195, Prevention and Control of Infectious Diseases Act 1998, Emergency (Essential Powers) Act 1979	National Disaster Management Agency
Myanmar	National Disaster Management Law (2013)	<i>Relief and Resettlement Department</i> , under the ministry of social welfare
The Philippines	The Philippine National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Act 2010	National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council (NDRRMC)
Singapore	Civil Defence Act with three support: Fire Safety Act, the Civil Defence Shelter Act, and the Infectious Disease Act	Singapore Civil Defense Force
Thailand	Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Act 2007	Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation
Vietnam	Law on Natural Disaster Prevention and Control 2013	<i>Vietnam Disaster Management Authority (VDMA)</i>
Indonesia	Disaster Management Act 24/2007 and Presidential Regulation Number 8 of 2008 (BNPB Establishment)	Badan Nasional Penanggulangan Bencana (BNPB)

In addition, referring back to one of the points of the ASEAN Way, namely decision-making by consensus, means that all decisions regarding natural disasters that exist have

been approved by all ASEAN member countries (Faisal, 2021). By agreeing to establish the AHA Centre through the agreement on the establishment of the AHA Centre, ASEAN member countries have recognized. They are aware of the applicable AHA Centre mechanism. In addition, referring to the solidarity points of the One ASEAN One Response declaration further strengthens the perception of ASEAN member countries towards regional disaster management (Widagdo 2021).

This article also found that the perceptions of ASEAN member states are in line with the definition of international disaster management written by Damon P. Coppola, which defines global disaster management as “International responses to problems faced by a country in the event of a disaster where the need for disaster response exceeds the capability and capacity of the country” (Coppola 2011).

The capability of ASEAN Member States in disaster management is sufficient. All states have their NDMOs and disaster management mechanism, and most have experience dealing with natural disasters because of the high level of disaster risk. However, this led to the notion that the ASEAN member states are more likely to handle them alone rather than ask for assistance from other countries or even the AHA Centre in most disaster events.

Moreover, ASEAN still does not have qualification standards for its disaster management professionals (ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management 2019). Without qualification standards, assistance in the deployment of personnel will be complex for the receiving country to accept. There is no indicator to help the country know if the person is eligible or not. So, the affected country tends to accept assistance in relief items.

Therefore, AHA Centre is currently developing a project to establish a common set of standard skills and competencies and its validation process, called The ASEAN Standards and Certification for Experts in Disaster Management (ASCEND). The ASCEND project is still developing and will finish its piloting phase in 2023 (ASCEND PMT 2020). The project will need to be legally recognized and implemented in all ten ASEAN Member States to work fully, and it is still a long way to go. Nevertheless, the initiative is a viable solution to increase the States’ willingness to accept aid from AHA Centre.

4.6 The Future of ASEAN Regional Disaster Management

Based on the analysis, the AHA Centre still has limitations, challenges, and obstacles in implementing regional natural disaster management in the ASEAN region, both due to ASEAN’s collective identity as a security community that affects the AHA Centre mechanism, as well as obstacles that are beyond its control. However, the AHA Centre has a long way to go. The AHA Centre has also designed and developed a mechanism to overcome its limitations, especially to achieve a shared vision in the ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management.

Referring to the contents of the ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management, three strategic points are the goals and guidelines for the AADMER Work Program and the AHA Centre as we advance. The first is institutional and communication points that refer to a multi-layered and cross-sectoral governance approach that encourages the integration of the 3 Pillars of the ASEAN Community in disaster management and emergency response. This was also confirmed by Mulyanto, who stated that at regular meeting forums (such as the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management), mechanisms or frameworks for carrying out disaster management that is cross-sectoral and cross-pillar are being discussed (Mulyanto 2021).

Furthermore, the second point in the ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management is financial and resource mobilization that combines the increased contribution of ASEAN member countries with traditional and non-traditional sources of funding. This also refers to

the funding constraints that the researchers described in the previous section. In addition, this second point is also related to the scale points in the One ASEAN One Response declaration. Mobilizing the resources and potential of ASEAN, which has a community of more than 600 million people, is still a challenge for the AHA Centre. It was stated that to manage Business to Business (B2B) and People to People (P2P) connections, it was still not as strong as the Government to Government (G2G) connection. The aim of expanding the coverage of the AHA Centre to B2B and P2P is to mobilize resources more centrally (Faisal 2021).

The third point in ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management is a partnership and innovation that emphasizes cooperation between the AHA Centre and non-traditional partners for disaster management and disaster emergency response. Currently, ACDM has formed several platforms for the AADMER Partnership Conference, The ASEAN-United Nations Joint Strategic Plan of Action on Disaster Management (ASEAN-UN JSPADM), The ASEAN-International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) Coalition on Resilience, and the ASEAN-International Red Cross (ICRC) Joint Platform (ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Department 2020). The purpose of establishing these platforms is to increase cooperation with various partners. This article also analyzed that this point relates to the point *scale* on the OAOR where it is necessary to cooperate with multiple partners to enable resource mobilization and potential assistance in significant natural disaster response in the ASEAN region.

5. Conclusions

In the context of disaster threat, ASEAN has demonstrated its role in the four phases of international disaster management through the AHA Centre, namely mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery. However, the study still found some shortcomings that caused regional natural disaster management not to be centralized through the AHA Centre.

Even though the AHA Centre has played a role in the four phases of international disaster management, the AHA Centre is too focused on emergency response, which should be recognized as having good preparedness. However, in this emergency response, the AHA Centre is not always involved when a disaster occurs for reasons related to the collective identity of ASEAN in the ASEAN Way and the capabilities of ASEAN member countries that are already good in disaster management at the national level. The role of the AHA Centre can be expanded so that it not only focuses on disaster response that is a sudden-onset disaster but can also grow on anticipatory slow-onset disasters so that the involvement of the AHA Centre in disaster management can be added.

In addition, the AHA Centre's focus is still on government-to-government. It has not yet expanded to non-traditional connections such as business-to-business or people-to-people. The potential resources that can be managed and deployed for disaster management are still limited. This is also projected on the lack of funding for the AHA Centre, especially for emergency response.

As a security community full of the factors that make up a security community, namely norms, institutions, and collective identity, ASEAN has also applied these factors in its regional disaster management. First, this research finds that in terms of the norms of the security community, in terms of disaster, ASEAN already has it, and here it is manifested in the form of instruments that regulate regional disaster management in ASEAN. However,

these existing norms are only a reminder, especially regarding centralized regional disaster management through the AHA Centre. ASEAN member countries are not bound to involve the AHA Centre when a natural disaster occurs, also based on the principle of non-intervention. In most natural disaster events, ASEAN member countries prefer to handle it at the national level.

Then, in the collective identity, it was also found that the perception of ASEAN member countries towards natural disasters is already one perception because it is reinforced by norms, the existence of the AHA Centre, and the principles in the ASEAN Way. This common perception of threats is an ideal condition in a security community. In addition, the capability of ASEAN member countries in natural disaster management is also a form of commitment to shared perceptions of the threat of natural disasters and is demonstrated by the existence of national disaster management agencies (NDMOs) and national mechanisms of each country. Thus, the researcher found that all ASEAN member countries have been aware of and committed to natural disaster management individually, but collectively in regional disaster management has not been seen. This is also based on the finding that because countries already have high capabilities in national disaster management, the involvement of the AHA Centre is still limited.

The AHA Centre has been established as the leading ASEAN regional disaster management institution for a decade. However, in some aspects, it is still not perfect. The AHA Centre continues to grow and learn from its experiences. In addition, through the shared vision of ASEAN, namely ASEAN Vision 2025, the AHA Centre has also begun to develop a more coherent and coordinated emergency response mechanism. By improving disaster risk assessment and early warning systems and building the capacity of ASEAN member countries, the AHA Centre can assist ASEAN to achieve its goal by 2025 in terms of disaster management.

REFERENCES

Books & Journals

- Acharya, Amitav. 2014. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia. Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315796673>.
- Adler, Emanuel, Michael Barnett, and Et al. 1998. "Security Communities." In *A Framework for the Study of Security Communities*, edited by Emanuel Adler and Michael Barnett. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446288344.n36>.
- AHA Center. 2018. "Operationalising One ASEAN One Response: Speed, Scale, Solidarity." *The AHA Centre*, 1–56. <http://doi.org/10.3386/w22921>.
- AHA Centre. 2017. "AHA Centre Annual Report 2017." Jakarta.
- . 2018. "Situation Update No. 9 M 7.4 Earthquake & Tsunami Sulawesi, Indonesia." Jakarta.
- APEC Climate Center. 2017. "Disaster Management Research Roadmap for the ASEAN Region Disaster," 142. https://ahacentre.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/ASEAN-Region_Disaster-Management_0228_optimize.pdf.
- ASCEND PMT. 2020. "ASCEND Brochure." *AHA Centre*, 2020.
- ASEAN. 2011. "Agreement On The Establishment Of The Asean Co-Ordinating Centre For Humanitarian Assistance On Disaster Management." 2011. <https://asean.org/asean-socio-cultural/asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response-cop-to-aadmer/aadmer-work-programme/>.
- . 2013. *ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management*.
- ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management. 2020. *AADMER Work Programme 2021-2025*. Jakarta: the ASEAN Secretariat.
- ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management. 2019. "The ASEAN Standardization and Certification for Experts in Disaster Management (ASCEND) Framework."
- ASEAN Disaster Risk Management Initiative. 2010. "Synthesis Report on Ten ASEAN Countries Disaster Risks Assessment," no. December: 149.
- ASEAN Secretariat. 2009. *ASEAN Political-Security Community Blueprint*. Jakarta: ASEAN Secretariat.
- ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Department. 2020. "The ASEAN: Before Disaster Strikes - Building Resilience." *Asean*, 2020.
- BNPB-National Agency for Disaster Management. 2009. "Indonesia National Disaster Management Plan 2010-2014," no. 24.
- Coppola, Damon P. 2011. *Introduction to International Disaster Management*. Burlington: Elsevier.
- Emmers, Ralf, and See Seng Tan. 2011. "The ASEAN Regional Forum and Preventive Diplomacy: Built to Fail?" *Asian Security* 7 (1): 44–60. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14799855.2011.548211>.
- Herningtyas, Ratih. 2014. "Penanggulangan Bencana Sebagai Soft Power Dalam Diplomasi Indonesia." *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* 3 (1): 85–92. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.2014.0050.85-92>.
- Herningtyas, Ratih, and Surwandono Surwandono. 2014. "Diplomasi Bencana Alam Sebagai Saran Meningkatkan Kerjasama Internasional." *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* 3 (2): 181–88. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.2014.0060.181-188>.
- Katsumata, Hiro. 2003. "Reconstruction of Diplomatic Norms in Southeast Asia: The Case for Strict Adherence to the 'ASEAN Way.'" *Contemporary Southeast Asia* 25 (1): 104–21.

- <https://doi.org/10.1355/cs25-1f>.
- Lamont, C. 2015. *Research Methods in International Relations*. Sage.
- Maf'ul, Muh. Arsyad. 2011. "Peran Komunitas Keamanan ASEAN Dalam Menghadapi Masalah Terorisme." *Jurnal Humanis* XII.
- Rosyidin, Mohamad. 2013. "Membangun Komunitas Yang Kredibel: Komitmen Terhadap Institusi Sebagai Prasyarat Menuju Komunitas Keamanan ASEAN 2015." *Jurnal Universitas Paramadina*.
- Rum, Muhammad. 2016. "The Case of Regional Disaster Management Cooperation in ASEAN: A Constructivist Approach to Understanding How International Norms Travel." *Southeast Asian Studies*. https://doi.org/10.20495/seas.5.3_491.
- Sawada, Yasuyuki, and Fauziah Zen. 2014. "Disaster Management in ASEAN." *ERIA Discussion Paper Series*. <http://www.eria.org/ERIA-DP-2014-03.pdf>.
- Simm, Gabrielle. 2018. "Disaster Response in Southeast Asia: The ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Response and Emergency Management." *Asian Journal of International Law* 8 (1): 116–42. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S2044251316000205>.
- Sudirman, Arfin, and Animbyo Cahya Putra. 2018. "Disaster Diplomacy as an Alternative Approach for Indonesia's Instrument of Foreign Policy in ASEAN." *Jurnal Ilmiah Hubungan Internasional* 14 (1): 1. <https://doi.org/10.26593/jihi.v14i1.2772.1-12>.
- Syaban, Mohammad. 2014. "Kepemerintahan Bencana (Disaster Governance) Asia Tenggara." *Andalas Journal of International Studies* 3 (1).
- Tekunan, Susy. 2014. "The Asean Way: The Way To Regional Peace?" *Jurnal Hubungan Internasional* 3 (2): 142–47. <https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.2014.0056.142-147>.
- The ASEAN Secretariat. 2008. *The ASEAN Charter. The ASEAN Secretariat*. Jakarta: the ASEAN Secretariat. https://doi.org/10.1142/9789813221147_0005.
- . 2016a. *AADMER Work Programme 2016-2020. Annual Report 2007-2008*. Jakarta: the ASEAN Secretariat. <papers3://publication/uuid/D2E7FCA1-ACB2-4706-9A5F-EC3443E9746E>.
- . 2016b. *ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025*. Jakarta: the ASEAN Secretariat.
- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. 2019. "Economic and Social Council." *International Organization*. Bangkok. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020818300031131>.
- Wibowo, Agung. 2014. "Program Penanggulangan Bencana ASEAN: Analisis Kepentingan Dan Kemampuan Indonesia Menuju Komunitas ASEAN 2015." *Jurnal Diplomasi* 06.
- Zulkarnain. 2014. "Komunitas Keamanan Asean ; Identitas Baru Kerjasama Regional Asia Tenggara." *ILMU Dan BUDAYA*. <http://repository.unas.ac.id/71/1/7>. ZULKARNAIN SIP.%2C M.Si..pdf.

Online Articles & Websites

- AHA Centre. 2019. "ASEAN Regional Mechanism on Disaster Management The ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on Disaster Management (AHA Centre)." https://www.preventionweb.net/files/56219_01ts01ahacentrespptforamcdr2ndrevi.pdf.
- ASEAN. 2020a. "About Us - AHA Centre." 2020. <https://ahacentre.org/about-us/>.
- . 2020b. "Frequently Asked Questions AHA Centre." Jakarta: AHA Centre.
- . 2020c. "What We Do - AHA Centre." 2020. <https://ahacentre.org/what-we-do/>.
- . 2016. "AADMER Work Programme 2016 - 2020." 2016. <https://asean.org/asean-socio-cultural/asean-agreement-on-disaster-management-and-emergency-response-cop->

- to-aadmer/aadmer-work-programme/.
- BBC News. 2013. "Typhoon Haiyan Death Toll Rises over 5,000." 2013. <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-25051606>.
- Kurniawan, Shintya. 2018a. "Vol 41-Response to Tropical Storm 11 – AHA Centre – The Column." 2018. <https://thecolumn.ahacentre.org/posts/highlight/vol-41-response-to-tropical-storm-11/>.
- . 2018b. "Vol 42-ONE ASEAN ONE RESPONSE for Lombok – AHA Centre – The Column." AHA Centre. 2018. <https://thecolumn.ahacentre.org/posts/highlight/vol-42-one-asean-one-response-for-lombok/>.
- . 2018c. "Vol 39-The 23RD ASEAN-ERAT Mission in Yangon Myanmar – AHA Centre – The Column." AHA Centre. April 2018. <https://thecolumn.ahacentre.org/posts/highlight/vol-39-the-23rd-asean-erat-mission-in-yangon-myanmar/>.
- Rachmawati, Ina. 2020. "PRESS RELEASE: ASEAN Helping ASEAN Beyond Emergency Response - Handover of 75 Units of Permanent Houses as Part of the ASEAN Village to the Local Government of Palu City - AHA Centre." 2020. <https://ahacentre.org/press-release/press-release-asean-helping-asean-beyond-emergency-response-handover-of-75-units-of-permanent-houses-as-part-of-the-asean-village-to-the-local-government-of-palu-city/>.

Interview

- Faisal, Said. Interview by Alifia Rahmadewi. Personal Interview. Jakarta, April 27, 2021.
- Herlianto, Medi. Interview by Alifia Rahmadewi. Personal Interview. Jakarta, April 16, 2021.
- Mulyanto. Interview by Alifia Rahmadewi. Personal Interview. Jakarta, April 16, 2021.
- Widagdo, Caroline. Interview by Alifia Rahmadewi. Personal Interview. Jakarta, April 22, 2021.