AN OPERATIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR MAINSTREAMING DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

Thomas Mitchell[1]

Benfield Hazard Research Centre
Disaster Studies Working Paper 8

November 2003

Abstract

This working paper introduces an operational *Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Mainstreaming Framework* for application at a national level. The paper argues a disaster risk reduction framework must be flexible enough to be modified through a participatory process and specific benchmarks or grades should be locally derived. Both the framework and the participatory process will help to generate political will and a sense of ownership, which are seen as vital to achieving disaster risk reduction gains. The paper also places the framework in the context of other similar initiatives and

from five continents is that political leaders respond to popular demands and only to demands – not studies, recommendations, rankings or to be honest frameworks'. Contradicting Wisner, it is possible to design a framework that empowers communities, is also a tool to organise efforts around and is a method by which popular demands can be articulated to respective authorities.

One clear advantage of using a framework with benchmarks or 'incremental' achievement levels is that targets are much more accessible. So for politicians and legislators, the pill is partially sugared. Moving up the incremental scale provides political mileage and thus a stimulus for action, as progress can be clearly demonstrated and the next 'level' can be reached much more easily. Alternatively, because the framework is transparent, failure to jump to the next level could be politically more damaging. For communities, incremental targets allow for much greater familiarity with the process and interest is generated by the government's wish to publicise its successes. The key to this incremental performance target setting is to clearly set out and agree on what is needed for achieving each grade at the beginning of the process, and to realise that everyone must work to make disaster risk reduction targets a reality.

Secondly, the framework must be flexible, so that a 'relevant starting point can be created for particular development and hazard scenarios' (Padmanabhan 28/03/03). This flexibility must be 'carried into a range of cultural and social situations so that it can be refined for a particular region or country' (Van Niekerk 1/9/03). Basaen (29/8/03) also suggests that 'the framework must be able to adapt or be contextualised within the socio-economic and political conditions of the country'. It must also be flexible enough to incorporate new expert and local knowledge on risk and vulnerability. With this in mind, the key challenge for maintaining the relevance of a risk reduction framework will be to create flexibility over an extended period of time. As Abrahams (25/09/03) puts it, 'the framework may be seen as a living framework, like coral in a sea of risk, which can be modified and added to, as issues emerge, knowledge expands and capacities change'. Other commentators focus on the flexibility of how the framework is authored. 'Emphasis should be placed on using vernacular languages to communicate with majority of the population' (Mulikita 1/9/03), with Murty (26/08/03) cautioning 'the challenge will be getting various inter-disciplinary groups to talk the same language, i.e. to be on the same wavelength, rather than getting bogged down in their own little corners'. The framework I suggest has been intentionally designed to minimise technical or scientific language, with the focus placed on accessible statements that apply to any disaster prone area. However, methods of introducing the framework into a society will vary widely, being dependent on how sensitised and willing the authorities and communities are to engage with a disaster reduction process.

Lastly, a number of commentators in the UN-ISDR online discussion voiced their concern over ownership, with comments placing emphasis on the need to promote the framework through education and by involving communities. 'Whatever fra3(r)-t-8.4(a)-18c.7(6(co)-4(W)e(a)-18 .4(W)2.W)2.u44

6

the government first and then the population' (Benouiar 28/08/03). Lee-Huu (29/08/03) summarises how vital a collaborative process is to the success of the framework for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction: 'To be effective, the framework would need to be accepted and owned by all stakeholders, especially key stakeholders. Political commitments need involvement of leaders and decision makers. Technical feasibility requires participation of professional groups. Implementation needs ownership of implementers at all levels and awareness of the public'. Wisner (26/08/03)

be measured, or in the field of risk assessment biased towards the tangible data from the physical sciences and biased against the less tangible data that is needed from the social sciences'. However,

be pulled apart and reconfigured. It is important not to get lost in detail though. The crucial reason for employing such a tool is to mobilise support for a concerted multi-stakeholder effort to internalise the mantra of disaster risk reduction.

D. Participation

The *DRR Mainstreaming Framework* is a starting point for a participatory process with the key objective being to mainstream disaster risk reduction measures into development policy. The

5. The DRR Mainstreaming Framework

20 Indicators for Disaster Risk Reduction

1. Politics and Legislation

1.1 Political Commitment

To what extent has a national strategy for mainstreaming 'disaster risk reduction' (DRR) been implemented?

Super goal:

A lead agency has <u>driven</u> a process of DRR, which has been adopted by <u>all</u> key institutions. <u>Clear</u> evidence of this is identifiable in policy, practice and institutional mentality.

Criteria:

A. A national strategy for DRR exists with successful implementation in <u>some</u> areas. However, adoption <u>disjointed</u> in others because of lack of ownership, capacity or political will.

B. Key figures <u>supportive</u> of DRR and a national strategy in planning phase. Institutions <u>moving towards</u> proactive disaster planning.

C. <u>No</u> national strategy for DRR, institutions reactive in disaster planning, <u>little</u> political will to change policies.

Evidence for Discussion:

Legislation, Policy documents, Government press releases, Newspaper articles, Interviews with key actors.

1.2 Regional Linkages

What is the nature of the relationship with regional disaster institutions? Have regional and international disaster reduction initiatives been successfully adopted at national and local levels?

Super goal:

<u>Full involvement</u> in all regional and international disaster reduction initiatives with <u>good</u> relations with the relevant institutions. <u>Clear</u> evidence of progress as a result e.g. policy, practice, capacity improvements.

Criteria

Super goal:

History of <u>extensive</u> collaboration with 'publics' for development of policy. The authoring of disaster and development plans achieved through <u>thorough</u> engagement with <u>wide</u> range of stakeholders, especially community interests.

Criteria:

A. History of <u>limited</u> collaboration with 'publics' for development of policy. The authoring of disaster and development plans achieved through <u>limited</u> consultation with <u>wide</u> range of stakeholders, especially community interests.

B. <u>Very piecemeal</u> collaboration with 'publics' for development of policy. The authoring of disaster and development plans achieved through <u>very minimal</u> engagement with narrow range of stakeholders, <u>largely excluding</u> community interests.

C. <u>No history</u> of collaboration with 'publics' for development of policy. The authoring of disaster and development plans <u>completed in isolation</u> with no engagement with stakeholders, or community interests.

Evidence for Discussion:

Interviews with key actors, previous policy development processes. Experience of local community groups.

2.3 Development Plans

Do the following development plans and sectoral policies integrate risk reduction programmes: Poverty eradication, social protection, sustainable development, climate change adaptation, natural resource management, transportation, housing and energy?

Super goal:

<u>All</u> of the listed policies incorporate thorough risk reduction measures <u>significantly</u> improving the mitigation of natural disasters.

Criteria:

A. <u>The majority</u> of the listed policies incorporate thorough risk reduction measures improving the mitigation of natural disasters.

B. <u>Some</u> of the listed policies incorporate risk reduction measures, though they are rather piecemeal. There have been <u>limited</u> benefits for the mitigation of natural disasters.

C. Policies <u>do not</u> include risk reduction measures, and there has been <u>no</u> improvement to the mitigation of natural disasters.

15

Evidence for Discussion:

16

2.5 National Disaster Planning

How comprehensive are the national disaster mitigation and response plans? Have there been both desktop and community-based exercises to test to their effectiveness? How successful are forecast and early warning systems in predicting danger and disseminating warnings?

Super goal:

<u>Very comprehensive</u>

Criteria:

A. <u>Completed full and comprehensive</u> study and mapping of all natural hazards, their previous impacts and people's vulnerability to them (full vulnerability analysis). This data is <u>often</u> used to inform policy, but is <u>not always</u> readily available to all interest parties. There is either no plan to review and update the figures or period >3 years.

B. Study and mapping of all natural hazards, their previous impacts and people's vulnerability to them <u>planned/under way</u>. As yet <u>no use</u> of data for policy development, and <u>no plans</u> to review/update the studies at this stage.
Or
Mapping is <u>not comprehensive</u>. Use of data for policy development <u>hampered by incomplete data.</u>

C. <u>No study</u> of natural hazards, their impacts or people's vulnerability. Policy decisions are made <u>without</u> knowledge of the potential threats of hazards.

Evidence for Discussion:

Data files, use of maps and figures in policy documents, vulnerability reports, minutes of policy development meetings. Number of times figures updated, number of review exercises, policy documents, interviews with key actors.

3.2 Education

Is 'disaster mitigation' taught as a compulsory component of the curriculum at all stages of the national education hierarchy (pre-school, primary, secondary and higher-education) and are there vocational courses for disaster managers? Is there a co-ordinating body for disaster education?

Sub-Indicators:

Number of students educated/people trained in disaster management. Is disaster management treated as a professional qualification? To what extent is a framework for disaster reduction introduced into

within 18 months. Co-ordination of disaster mitigation education handled by national disaster organisation which plays an <u>active role</u> in promoting and diversifying interest in the subject.

B. Disaster mitigation <u>not formally</u> part of the syllabus <u>but</u> taught in certain classes <u>throughout</u> educational hierarchy because of particular relevance at a local level. <u>No opportunities</u> for professional disaster management qualifications. National disaster organisation promotes disaster reduction education through leaflets and radio programmes.

C. Disaster mitigation is <u>not part</u> of the syllabus and <u>not addressed</u>

B. Print and broadcast generally <u>ambivalent</u> of efforts to reduce impact of disasters. <u>Irregular</u> (3 monthly – once yearly) articles on disaster reduction initiatives, with little attempt to educate. <u>No</u> efforts to translate difficult scientific/technical aspects of risk and hazard into easy to understand programmes or articles for the lay population. Media personnel <u>not involved</u> in translating disaster warnings into layman's language. Disaster reduction day/weeks <u>have not often</u> involved the media in past beyond basic advertising.

C. Print and broadcast <u>ambivalent</u> of efforts to reduce impact of disasters. Articles on disaster reduction initiatives almost never appear. <u>No</u> efforts to translate difficult scientific/technical aspects of risk and hazard into easy to understand programmes or articles for the lay population. Media personnel <u>not involved</u> in translating disaster warnings into layman's language. Disaster reduction day/weeks <u>have never</u>

B. <u>Some</u> disaster info. on website/in library but <u>poor access</u> for community. <u>No</u> disaster societies. <u>Some limited</u> educational outreach in a few selected localities. <u>No</u> technical information database, and <u>minimal attempt</u> to improvni

industrial waste etc) has not been used to inform policy at the local level. <u>Informal</u> network to exchange ideas with academic community both locally, regionally and internationally. <u>Some</u> disaster reduction research occurring locally into specific topics but not across all sectors with <u>some</u> of the results informing decision-making.

C. Key actors <u>never</u> attend regional and international conferences. Learning from outside of national institutions ignored (e.g. research into Oil Spill dynamics, disposal of industrial waste etc) and <u>not</u> used to inform policy at the local level. <u>No</u> network to exchange ideas with academic community. <u>No</u> research into disaster reduction occurring locally.

Evidence for Discussion:

Research groups, documents, papers. Interviews with key actors, attend research meetings. Obtain records of conferences attended, examine policy documents for linkages.

3.6 Skills, Capacity and Motivation

What do the key actors in development/disaster planning see as the priorities for planning policy? To what extent do they believe a culture of safety is infused within society and is there a week/days dedicated to safety issues? With whom do they share ideas, sympathies, both locally and regionally?

Super goal:

Language used by <u>all</u> key actors indicates a desire to move from reactive to proactive disaster planning solutions. Words such or phrases such as 'mainstreaming disaster reduction, vulnerability, livelihood, sustainability, mitigation etc. <u>basis of all</u> policy discussions and professional conversations. Safety issues <u>pervade</u> society, from health to traffic management to disaster planning to resource management.

Criteria:

A. Language used by the <u>majority</u> of key actors indicates desire to move from reactive to proactive disaster planning solutions. Words such or phrases such as 'mainstreaming disaster reduction, vulnerability, livelihood, sustainability, mitigation etc. basis for <u>majority</u> of policy discussions and professional conversations. Safety issues are <u>regularly</u> highlighted in society, but <u>more could be done</u> to encourage an all-pervasive 'safety culture'.

B. Language used by <u>some</u> key actors indicates a desire to move from reactive to proactive disaster planning solutions. Words such or phrases such as 'mainstreaming disaster reduction, vulnerability, livelihood, sustainability, mitigation etc. <u>rarely</u> appear in policy discussions and professional conversations. Safety issues are <u>sometimes</u> highlighted in society, but <u>much more</u>

An Operational Framework for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction

Super goal:

Insurance companies offer <u>sizeable</u> discounts to those who have taken mitigation measures. Companies give <u>extensive</u> guidance, technical support on how to achieve premium reductions. Government lending institutions, businesses and micro-credit schemes to support homeowners and small businesses to take mitigation measures. Government, businesses etc. <u>waive or reduce costs</u> of disaster rebuild materials etc. NGOs, credit-unions, churches etc. support funds designed to help vulnerable people in post-disaster situation.

Criteria:

A. Insurance companies offer <u>limited</u> discount to those who have taken mitigation measures. They give <u>some</u> formal guidance on how to obtain discount (e.g. technical leaflet). <u>No extra</u> financial support to take mitigation measures, either for individuals or businesses. <u>Some</u> reduction of prices, reduced loans etc. in post-disaster rebuild phase. Support funds for vulnerable people post-disaster <u>planned</u>, but not yet operational.

B. Insurance companies are <u>preparing to phase in reduced</u> premiums for better protected buildings within next 18 months. They are preparing documents detailing what measures are needed to obtain the reductions. <u>No extra</u> financial support to take mitigation measures, either for individuals or businesses. <u>No</u> preferential pricing in post-disaster phase. <u>No</u> support funds for vulnerable people post-disaster.

C. <u>No</u> reduction on premiums for those with stronger homes. <u>No</u> technical help from companies encouraging mitigation measures. <u>No extra</u> financial support to take mitigation measures, either for individuals or businesses. <u>No</u> preferential pricing in post-disaster phase. <u>No</u> support funds for vulnerable people post-disaster.

Evidence for Discussion:

Interview members of finance sector, church groups, NGOs. Obtain guidelines of mitigation/premium reductions. Interview business owners and those who rebuilt following previous disasters.

Criteria:

An Operational Framework for Mainstreaming Disaster Risk Reduction

Disaster Studies Working Paper 8

Annual Hazards Workshop, University of Colorado, Boulder. Available online at online.northumbria.ac.uk/geography_research/radix

Harrington, L. (1992) 'Measuring sustainability: Issues and Alternatives', *Journal of Farming Systems Research-Extension,* vol. 3 (1) pp 1-20.

Instituto de Estudios Ambientales, IDEA (2003) 'Information and Indicators for Disaster Risk Management' coordinated by the of the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, in Manizales, with the financial support of the Inter-American Development Bank, IADB. Papers available online at http://idea.unalmzl.edu.co, accessed 25/9/03.

Inter-Agency Task Force (2001) 'Disaster Reduction and Sustainable Development –April 2001'. Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction Presentation 3-4th May 2001 UN-ISDR. Revised version of Focus Paper No. 1 Prepared for the 2nd Meeting 10-11th October 2000 of UN-ISDR.

Kent, G. (2001) 'The human right to disaster mitigation and relief' in *Global Environmental Change Part B: Environmental Hazards*. Volume 3, Issues 3-4 , September-December 2001, Pages 137-138

Lavell, A. (2003) 'I. International Agency Concepts and Guidelines for Disaster Risk Management, II. The Transition from Risk Concepts for Risk Indicators', presented as part of the

and Monitor Disaster Risk Reduction, www.unisdr.org, 25/9/03.

Van Niekerk, D. (2003) Contribution to the UN-ISDR's online discussion on the *Draft Framework to Guide and Monitor Disaster Risk Reduction,* www.unisdr.org, 1/9/03.

Warner, J. (2003) 'Participatory Water Resource Management in Peru and South Africa'. Address to the RGS-IBG International Annual Conference 2003, 3-5 September. Abstract available online at www.rgs.org.

Wisner, B. (2002) 'Disasters: What the United Nations and its World Can Do'. Available online at online.northumbria.ac.uk/geography_research/radix. Accessed 01/09/03.

Wisner, B. (2003) Contribution to the UN-ISDR's online discussion on the *Draft Framework to Guide and Monitor Disaster Risk Reduction* www.unisdr.org, 26/8/03.

UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR) (2002) *Living With Risk – A global review of disaster reduction initiatives.* Preliminary version, July 2002. Prepared as an inter-agency effort coordinated by the ISDR Secretariat with special support from the Government of Japan, the World Meteorological Organization and the Asian Disaster Reduction Center (Kobe, Japan). Available online at http://www.unisdr.org/unisdr/Globalreport.htm, accessed 26/9/03.

UN International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (2003) 'A Draft Framework to Guide and Monitor Disaster Risk Reduction'. Available online at www.unisdr.org/dialogue/basicdocument.htm, accessed 21/08/03.

UK Government Sustainable Development (2003) *Indicators of Sustainable Development.* Available online at http://www.sustainable-development.gov.uk/indicators/index.htm, accessed 22/9/03