

# Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) Policy Implementation Guide for States

## Expanded Outline<sup>1</sup>

14 November 2005

---

### PREFACE

---

To be added

[An abridged version of the summary of the Guide. This gives the reader the shortest version of the Guide, to provide a high level overview of its purpose and content.]

---

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

To be added

## I

### INTRODUCTION

---

#### 1. Preface

The 2005 World Conference on Disaster Reduction sanctioned the commitment of States to disaster risk reduction through the endorsement of the ***Hyogo Framework for Action 2005 – 2015: Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters (HFA)***. States have primary responsibility for the implementation of the HFA. This ***Policy Implementation Guide*** (hereafter The Guide) has been developed by the ISDR Secretariat to assist States in implementing the five priority action items of the HFA with the aim of developing a “***national platform for disaster risk reduction***” (NPDRR).

This Guide is not meant to be an exhaustive treatment of the HFA concepts and recommendations, but rather a succinct “how-to” manual suggesting practical strategies and implementation procedures for disaster risk reduction (DRR), and illustrating them with worldwide examples and references to case studies. The Guide does not attempt to cover all hazards, DRR elements, issues, and approaches; rather it focuses on selected areas where there is demonstrated experience and practice. The Guide does not prescribe a “one-size-fit-all” approach; users should individualize the suggested guidelines based on their own reality and existing policies and systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> Authors: Fouad Bendimerad, Shirley Mattingly, Amal Bendimerad – Contact: [fouadmail@sbcglobal.net](mailto:fouadmail@sbcglobal.net)

## **2. Purpose**

The purpose of the Guide is to assist States in establishing a sound and rational framework for DRR upon which they can further improve with time and with their own accumulated experience. The Guide aims to share concepts, methods, and case studies to aid users in identifying and undertaking appropriate disaster risk reduction (DRR) actions.

## **3. The Guide's Approach to DRR Policy Implementation**

States have a responsibility for looking after the welfare and safety of their people. Increasing the safety and security of lives, livelihoods, and property from disaster risk, therefore, is an *a priori* element in the stated or unstated mission of the government. It rests with the State to establish the authorities, policies, and legal and institutional framework for sharing this responsibility for disaster risk protection with local governments, academic institutions, professional groups, and other societal entities. It is up to the State to create and support a mechanism for dialogue and consensus building among these various stakeholders on the policies and action plans that determine the NPDRR or national framework for disaster risk reduction (DRR).

The State should show leadership in regarding DRR as a national and cross-cutting priority around which policies are developed within and among different sectors, professions, and interest groups throughout civil society and government.

The State should also ensure that DRR policies are debated in the context of its other policies and programs, including urban and rural economic development, poverty reduction, recovery and reconstruction from past disasters, and emergency preparedness for future disasters.

The discussion needs to be high profile, generating awareness and interest throughout society. Stakeholders must participate in the debate, understand the trade-offs at stake, and work out how to consolidate and strategically integrate DRR policies with other sectoral policies in order to accomplish multiple objectives, meet the interests of different groups, and mainstream DRR in governmental and societal processes.

States should be aware that making gains in DRR may prove difficult to implement because of resistance to change away from customary processes and lack of pre-existing models. This requires a willingness to put in place new and innovative cross-sectoral and inter-institutional communication and information sharing mechanisms and bureaucratic management protocols. Also, DRR cannot be accomplished without a dedicated and sustained investment in human and financial resources. Existing State resources may not be sufficient, and additional resources are likely to be needed. Hence, DRR should be approached both strategically (i.e., based on a clear, common vision), and tactically (i.e., backed by plans of action). Most of all, the success of DRR hinges on conviction, commitment, leadership and sustained action.

The Guide's underlying premise, therefore, is that the user understands that the development of a NPDRR requires unprecedented collaboration across institutional, sectoral, and socio-cultural lines, generating new challenges to responsible individuals and organizations.

---

## II

### USING THE GUIDE

---

#### 1. Intended Users

The Guide is written specifically for the following users:

- (1) State ministers and officials, in particular those responsible for disaster risk management and national platforms for HFA implementation, particularly in the tsunami-affected countries.
- (2) State and local officials and other stakeholders involved in the development and implementation of national platforms and other recommended actions of HFA.
- (3) Disaster risk reduction advocates and professionals.

#### 2. Guide Design and Organization

The Guide is aimed to be a functional and straightforward document, and its structure keeps in line with this concept. There are twenty (20) sections of the Guide, each one highlighting one main area of implementation. Each section provides step-by-step how-to guidance, illustrated through examples, visuals, and case studies. The content is structured for ease of access and facility of navigation by organizing the text in boxes and templates, and supporting it with color-coded sections and topics.

This structure is also aimed at supporting “implementers” in their advocacy and in their awareness and capacity enhancement duties. Specific sections and examples can be quickly pulled out and shared with others; and illustrations can demonstrate the value of a particular action and its practicality. Therefore, the Guide will also help facilitate communication and help develop and strengthen inter-institutional discussion and cooperation necessary to establish a pragmatic and inherently robust national disaster risk management strategy and agenda. The structure of the Guide is intended to also facilitate the integration with other ISDR supplementary documentation.

#### 3. Scope and Content

The HFA presents a very ambitious agenda comprising three strategic goals, around which five broad priorities and numerous key activities are defined. The Guide is meant to be short on discussing concepts and repeating the terms of the HFA’s Strategic Goals. It will not reproduce what is in the HFA or in other related ISDR documentation such as the *Strategic Directions for the ISDR System to Assist in the Implementation of the HFA*, nor will it analyze or discuss the issues and concepts raised in the HFA.

Instead, it focuses on providing guidance for implementation of the HFA’s five Priorities for Actions, and more particularly on elements where knowledge and practice exist. In the Guide, four elements are elaborated for each of the five priorities, for a total of 20

implementation elements. In focusing on these 20 actions, the Guide incorporates illustrative experiences and examples from various countries, including providing references for case studies and additional sources of experience. The attached table lists the elements developed in the Guide and their relationship to the five Priorities for Action.

---

# BOX INSERT

## The Five HFA Priority for Action and the 20 Selected Implementation Elements

HFA Priority for Action	Priority Action Number	Priority Action Element
1. Ensure that Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation	1.1	Evaluate existing legal and institutional mechanisms and policies
	1.2	Engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue to establish the foundations of a national platform
	1.3	Establish a national risk management vision, policies, strategy and implementation plan, including benchmarks
	1.4	Institutionalize DRR and establish mainstreaming mechanisms
2. Identify, Assess and Monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning	2.1	Collect, review and synthesize existing knowledge, including sound practices and lessons learned; publish and disseminate
	2.2	Check validity and assess trends, gaps and areas of concern
	2.3	Build the national knowledge base on risk and disaster risk management
	2.4	Establish a hazard monitoring program including an early warning and alert system
3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels	3.1	Develop a public awareness system, including educational campaigns, community and neighborhood drills, simulation games, media arrangements, and business agreements;
	3.2	Incorporate disaster risk and disaster risk management in education programs at all levels;
	3.3	Establish strategies to involve stakeholders in risk assessment and risk communication
	3.4	Enhance access to information and understanding of risk and risk management to build constituencies for DRR advocacy. Establish monitoring programs as basis for DRR advocacy
4. Reduce the underlying risk factors	4.1	Establish DRR mechanisms related to land use planning and construction standards
	4.2	Establish mechanisms for protecting the poor and the more vulnerable
	4.3	Establish financial risk transfer mechanisms
	4.4	Establish programs for vulnerability reduction of critical facilities and infrastructure
5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels	5.1	Assess disaster response and recovery capability
	5.2	Develop evacuation plans
	5.3	Develop response and recovery plans, undertake drills
	5.4	Develop and test mechanisms for organizing and coordinating emergency operations

### III

## IMPLEMENTING DRR

---

### 1. Concepts and Principles

The Guide is based on the premise that States share key fundamental concepts and principles in their understanding and their commitment to the HFA. These include:

- (1) ***The principle of correlation*** that recognizes that the source of vulnerability of society lies in its underlying development practices and, thus dictates coherency of developmental, environmental and social policies for achieving disaster risk reduction. A NPDRR stands valid only in its integration with the country's socio-economic policies and systems; in particular, in the country's (sustainable) development policies and practices, its agenda for poverty reduction and its public safety protection plans.
- (2) ***The principle of participation*** that recognizes that the development of NPDRR is largely a process of engagement of and collaboration between stakeholders, and that DRR is the concern and responsibility of the whole nation. Disasters affect everyone and everything in and beyond the directly impacted area, and it is not possible for any one agency or institution, or even the government as a whole, to manage all aspects of risk. At the heart of good governance is the commitment to sharing decision-making power among the stakeholders, giving them a voice, and keeping them informed and involved in the process.
- (3) ***The principle of safeguarding the public*** that obligates States, governmental and non-governmental organizations, businesses and families to accept some degree of responsibility for prudence regarding risk and reducing causes of vulnerability even in the case of lack of scientific or empirical certitude regarding the risk. In particular, the State's emergency, crisis management, and recovery plans should incorporate actions for DRR.
- (4) ***The principle of sustainability*** that indicates that policy without identification, mobilization and allocation of resources and responsibilities, and a commitment to installing and supporting the mechanisms for mainstreaming is bound to have little positive socio-economic benefit on society in the long term.

### 2. Elements of the Process

- (1) ***Adopting flexibility and long term goals***  
To be added
- (2) ***Setting priorities through a participatory process***

To be added

- (3) ***Mainstreaming as a mechanism for institutionalization***

To be added

- (4) ***Decentralization and strengthening local capacity***

To be added

- (5) ***Enhancing governance and inter-governmental linkages at all levels***

To be added

- (6) ***Establishing and sustaining partnerships***

To be added

### **3. Benchmarking, Evaluating and Measuring Progress**

To be added



## SAMPLE--DRAFT

# Priority Action 1.2: MultiStakeholder Dialogue

**Aim:** To bring together a country's current disaster management system and stakeholders, social-economic-environmental agencies (sustainable development), relevant technical/scientific groups, the private sector, NGO's and other representatives of civil society to engage in a dialogue through which a common agenda for DRR is developed.

### Significance

A forum and process where the diverse systems, agencies and actors can meet and reach a common understanding, which must be developed, promoted, and nurtured, in order to create the environment conducive to the emergence of an effective overall national system for DRR. This dialogue will enhance societal awareness of hazards, risk and risk reduction, so that DRR emerges as a societal value and is integrated with other social, economic, and physical development priorities and actions.

### Key Action

Engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue to establish the foundations of a **national platform** and effective disaster risk reduction.

### Other Key Actions

- Establish dedicated funding mechanisms for DRR, especially for pre-disaster programs.
- Encourage participation of key vulnerable stakeholder groups including women and the socially and economically disadvantaged.
- Build inter-institutional mechanisms armed with ongoing action agendas and supported by the institutions.
- Empower local governments, private entities, NGOs and CBOs.
- Sponsor inter-institutional dialogue about risk and risk management actions at regional and local levels.
- Clearly define and legally establish DRR responsibilities and authorities throughout governmental entities and civil society.
- Create and strengthen linkages between national initiatives and inter-institutional committees and those at other levels.
- Build capacity of key institutions for coordinating and encouraging integration of risk reduction into ongoing operations.
- Learn from experiences in other countries.

### additional info

"Unless the most senior government officials commit to implementing mitigation practices, as an investment in protecting assets and conserving resources, disaster reduction will be of low priority. History shows that without such leadership, short-term crises will overshadow the long-term consideration and *absorb the resources needed for effective loss reduction measures.*" In addition, leadership from the community is equally important, as "*Governments cannot sustain mitigation measures without broad public support.*" (R. Hamilton, 1999)<sup>1</sup>

## Getting started

- Develop a proposed “game plan” and determine who will be responsible for initiating, managing and overseeing the process.
- Secure the support of the chief executive (prime minister, mayor, CEO, etc.).
- Identify key stakeholders: Stakeholders, by definition, have a stake or interest in disaster risk reduction, and they should play a role in both: (1) identifying and selecting the risk reduction strategies and programs and (2) implementing programs and projects.
- Identify one or more “champions:” that is, persons with some influence or power who are very interested in DRR and who are willing to take action and assume some risk to make certain that DRR becomes a public priority. A champion is an activist-leader. A champion may be anyone with conviction, determination and persistence—a top-level government official, a professional in one of many fields, or a community activist.
- Convene interested and affected parties.
- Decide on goals, objectives, scope, agenda, working arrangements and “ground rules.”
- Consider establishing multi-disciplinary working groups or committees to work on specific issues or elements.
- Provide a mechanism for overall coordination of the work effort, setting and monitoring of milestones, and integration of outputs.
- Set up a system for disseminating and publicizing discussion results to key officials, participating organizations, and the public, and for receiving and acting on input from those outside the process.

## Resources and support needed

- Participants’ time, open-mindedness, and commitment to the process
- Information resources (e.g. risk assessments, laws, regulations, policies, strategies, plans, resources, and institutional arrangements that relate to disaster risk management, land use and urban planning, economic and physical development, and the environment)
- Expert communication facilitator

*Also see lessons learned*

## SAMPLE--DRAFT

### Case Study: Morocco

The Kingdom of Morocco started an expanded national dialogue by holding the First National Workshop on Catastrophe Risks on 26-27 February 2004. This workshop brought together representatives from the relevant ministerial departments, local and provincial governmental institutions, the private sector, NGOs, professional associations and civil society organizations, academia, media, and international organizations. This workshop took stock of the existing situation in terms of disaster risk management, identified several weaknesses across sectors and in the legal, institutional and organizational systems, as well as in the areas of knowledge development, education, and awareness raising. Following this workshop, several dialogue platforms were activated and a National Coordination Committee was established. The secretarial responsibility was given to the Division of the Environment at the Ministry of Land Use Planning, Water and Environment. In particular, several thematic workshops took place over the following 12 months, including:

- Integration of risk factors in economic development planning, land use planning, urban planning and industrial facilities planning
- Prevention of technological and man-made risks
- Flood prevention
- Earthquake response and prevention (lessons learned from past earthquakes)
- Disaster and risk management
- Housing and urban planning
- Development of a National Strategy for Disaster Risk Management
- Preparation of the World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction

Several round tables and discussions took also place with selected stakeholders. Further, concerned ministries and agencies were requested to report on their programs and plans for disaster risk management, and to develop specific priorities and budget requirements for their proposed action plans.

This dialogue generated and energized a broad discussion and improved the inter-communication and exchange of ideas and issues between a wide representation of stakeholders. The proceedings from each workshop and seminar were published and distributed among the participants for comments. Several reports and documents related to particular issues and topics were generated. The dialogue culminated with the development of a comprehensive report on disaster risk management and a proposal for a national strategy for disaster risk reduction and a national plan for emergency response. The report was submitted to the ISDR as part of the Kingdom of Morocco's contribution to the WCDR. In view of the country's very limited financial resources, further action and implementation has been on a slow path until additional funding is secured. Nevertheless, the outlook is positive because there is high awareness, leadership, and the person in charge of this matter is quite resolved and resourceful.

For more information, contact *Direction de la Surveillance et Prevention des Riques, Departement de l'Environnement, Ministere de L'Amenagement du Territoire, de l'Eau et de l'Environnement, Kingdom of Morocco*; <http://www.minenv.gov.ma>

# **SAMPLE--DRAFT**

## **Obstacles and impediments**

- Difficulty in maintaining information-sharing and communication networks within and between groups and organizations (government, NGOs, civil society); some organizations and individuals must take the lead.
- Different groups have different interests, agendas, and missions which are difficult to integrate.
- Difficulty in maintaining interest, involvement, and commitment of busy people with other responsibilities and higher priorities, particularly in the case where a strong sense of purpose and an action agenda to rally around are lacking.
- Misrepresentation of issues and inaccurate reporting of information.

## **Keys to success**

- Take into account public perceptions of risk and differing local economic and other realities. For instance, stakeholders who occupy different roles in connection with risk (e.g. builders versus building owners versus renters) have very different perceptions of the situation and different ideas about risk and the costs and benefits of taking implementation actions.
- Be willing to negotiate tradeoffs in order to reach consensus and agreement on multi-disciplinary approaches to DRR.
- Usually it takes a combination of both “top-down” and “bottom-up” approaches to effectively manage risk. National government resources, guidance, leadership, commitment, and technical assistance are needed, while local governments and communities must contribute the political will to focus attention and scarce resources on DRR activities.

## **Intangibles**

- Leadership plays a vital and essential role in DRR implementation; in fact, without leadership within the government and community, implementation is unlikely to take place. DRR activities have the best chance of success if they have a local “champion.”

## **Key Points**

- Open and sustained dialogue offers the opportunity for learning, mutual understanding, trust, and decision-making based on combined wisdom.
- The role of civil society stakeholders in DRR should not be underestimated. Unless the interests of the various stakeholder groups are accommodated at some minimally acceptable level, it is likely that DRR policies and programs will be subject to delays, challenges, and lack of implementation.

## SAMPLE--DRAFT

### Key Actors

Stakeholders can be individuals or organizations. Six types of stakeholder organizations have been identified as having a role in implementing DRR<sup>1</sup>:

1. Policy making organizations, including legislative and executive entities such as key ministries and concerned national agencies
2. Front line implementing organizations (usually public agencies charged with implementation including public safety)
3. Indirect implementing organizations (other public agencies responsible for overseeing implementation e.g. of building codes, regulating, sanctioning or providing incentives; key humanitarian and social services organizations)
4. Primary target organizations (land use planners, architects, engineers, developers, builders, etc.)
5. Market intermediary organizations (those that provide mortgage loans or insurance)
6. Non-governmental policy-making participants, such as professional associations

Not all of these types of organization always play a role. And it should be noted that organizations typically are not internally consistent in their thinking. Internal bureaucratic politics can strongly influence how an organization approaches its role and responsibilities.

### If you need help ?

Consult United Nations and World Bank country offices and representatives.

Contact U.N. ISDR office for documentation and guidance.

Consult websites of capacity-building U.N. institutions and NGO's.

## Lessons Learned

- Engaging in dialogue, when it is accompanied by joint decision-making, provides empowerment, which leads to a sense of ownership.
- Successful inter-institutional mechanisms or models usually have:
  - top-level support from the government's chief executive and the chief executives of the institutions
  - an indisputable mandate
  - proactive leadership
  - a strong core group and secretariat
  - incentives for action.
- It may be necessary to overcome a perception or misperception that national focal organizations responsible for disaster response are already building adequate systems to reduce disaster risk.

(Footnotes)

<sup>1</sup> Alesch and Petak, 2001.

# SAMPLE--DRAFT

## Definitions

**National platform:** A national mechanism for coordination and policy guidance on DRR that need to be multi-sectoral and inter-disciplinary in nature, with public, private and civil society participation involving all concerned entities within a country.

**Stakeholders:** Individuals, groups or organizations that have an interest or investment in the actions that will be taken to reduce disaster risks.

**Sustainable development:** Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

## References

1. Hamilton, Robert, "Natural Disaster Reduction in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century," *Natural Disaster Management*, Jon Ingleton, ed., Tudor Rose, 1999, pp. 304-6.
2. Alesch, Daniel J. and William J. Petak, *Overcoming Obstacles to Implementing Earthquake Hazard Mitigation Policies: Stage 1 Report*, Technical Report MCEER-01-0004, Multidisciplinary Center for Earthquake Engineering Research, 2001.

## Notes

HFA Priority for Action	Priority Action Number	Priority Action Element
1. Ensure that Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation	1.1	Evaluate existing legal and institutional mechanisms and
	1.2	Engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue to establish the foundations of a national platform
	1.3	Establish a national risk management vision, policies, strategy and implementation plan, including benchmarks
	1.4	Institutionalize DRR and establish mainstreaming mechanisms
2. Identify, Assess and Monitor disaster risks and enhance early warning	2.1	Collect, review and synthesize existing knowledge, including sound practices and lessons learned; publish and disseminate
	2.2	Check validity and assess trends, gaps and areas of concern
	2.3	Build the national knowledge base on risk and disaster risk management
	2.4	Establish a hazard monitoring program including an early warning and alert system
3. Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels	3.1	Develop a public awareness system, including educational campaigns; community and neighborhood drills, simulation games, media arrangements, and business agreements;
	3.2	Incorporate disaster risk and disaster risk management in education programs at all levels;
	3.3	Establish strategies to involve stakeholders in risk assessment and risk communication
	3.4	Enhance access to information and understanding of risk and risk management to build constituencies for DRR advocacy. Establish monitoring programs as basis for DRR
4. Reduce the underlying risk factors	4.1	Establish DRR mechanisms related to land use planning and construction standards.
	4.2	Establish mechanisms for protecting the poor and the more
	4.3	Establish financial risk transfer mechanisms
	4.4	Establish programs for vulnerability reduction of critical facilities and infrastructure
5. Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels	5.1	Assess disaster response and recovery capability
	5.2	Develop evacuation plans
	5.3	Develop response and recovery plans, undertake drills
	5.4	Develop and test mechanisms for organizing and coordinating emergency operations





HFA Priority for Action	P.A. No.	Priority Action Element	Aim, Significance and Selected Undertakings
1. Ensure that Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) is a national and local priority with strong institutional basis for implementation	1.1	Evaluate existing legal and institutional mechanisms and policies	<p><b>Aim:</b> To raise awareness and understanding of how the existing legal and institutional system and public policies in a broad range of subject areas cause intended or unintended impacts on hazards, risk, and the environment.</p> <p><b>Significance:</b> A country's constitution, laws, and governmental system provide the framework for its approach to DRR. Governments have responsibility and obligation to provide leadership in safeguarding lives, institutions, jobs, the infrastructure, and the environment from disaster, yet few countries have seriously and systematically evaluated how they might do a better job.</p> <p>a. Strengthen governance through application of principles of good management, e.g. clear mandates and roles</p> <p>b. Develop and strengthen coordination mechanisms between national and local level institutions</p>
			<p>c. Ensure there is a sound legal basis for DRR policies, plans, and institutional arrangements</p> <p>d. Strengthen mechanisms for compliance with laws and regulations</p> <p>e. Evaluate the degree of devolution of powers and authorities to provincial and local governments and entities</p> <p>f. Identify and evaluate risk reduction initiatives which are already underway</p> <p>g.</p> <p>h.</p>
	1.2	Engage in multi-stakeholder dialogue to establish the foundations of a national platform	<p><b>Aim:</b> To bring together a country's current disaster management system and actors, social-economic-environmental systems (sustainable development), relevant technical/scientific groups, and NGOs to work together to develop a common agenda for DRR.</p> <p><b>Significance:</b> A venue or forum (platform) where these diverse systems and actors can meet and reach a common understanding must be created, promoted, and nurtured, in order to develop the environment conducive to the emergence of an effective overall national system for DRR.</p> <p>a. Establish dedicated funding mechanisms for DRR, especially for pre-disaster programs</p> <p>b. Encourage participation of key vulnerable stakeholder groups including women and the disadvantaged</p> <p>c. Build inter-institutional mechanisms armed with ongoing action agendas and supported by the institutions</p> <p>d. Empowerment of local governments, private entities, NGOs and CBOs</p> <p>e. Create and strengthen linkages between national initiatives and inter-institutional committees and those at other levels</p> <p>f.</p> <p>g.</p> <p>h.</p>

1.3	Establish a national risk management vision, policies, strategy and implementation plan, including benchmarks	<p><b>Aim:</b> To establish a clear national commitment and approach to DRR which is fully supported by government and stakeholders; to focus attention and efforts on risk reduction to achieve safety, security, and sustainability; to affect decision making; and to help people visualize the outcome and keep in mind the reason for DRM, i.e. to create a safer society in the face of risk, to protect and respond effectively when a disaster threatens or occurs.</p> <p><b>Significance:</b> Policies and plans are useful for defining intentions but must actually impact behavior and decision-making. For DRR to emerge as a national priority and influence daily actions and decisions, DRR strategies, plans, and responsibilities must be clear, precise, widely disseminated, and supported throughout governmental levels and civil society.</p> <p>b. Assess governmental and civil society's resources and capabilities for DRR (see HFA 1.1 and 5.1)</p> <p>c. Develop institutional capacity for DRR through training and education</p> <p>d. Establish a systematic process of evaluating alternative actions and setting and reassessing priorities</p> <p>e. Provide guidance to local governments for engaging in a complementary process of establishing DRR policies, strategies, plans</p> <p>f. Address issues of employment, social equity, alleviation of poverty</p> <p>g. Establish framework for monitoring systems to verify performance and policy application</p> <p>h.</p>
1.4	Institutionalize DRR and establish mainstreaming mechanisms	<p><b>Aim:</b> To ensure that DRR is integrated in functions and operations of governmental and non governmental institutions at all levels, and that the population is aware and supports the institutional process</p> <p><b>Significance:</b> Economic and physical development, poverty reduction, governance, and education all present opportunities for mainstreaming DRR at the national level. When risk is considered in development investment decisions, risk reduction can be incorporated into projects as they are designed, at low cost.</p> <p>a. Promote institutional ownership</p> <p>b. Decentralize authority, responsibilities, and resources to local level</p> <p>c. Develop mechanisms for compliance, control and reporting</p> <p>d. Strengthen capacity of institutions for implementing DRR</p> <p>e. Generate community ownership and action, initiate and support programs that foster local sustainability</p> <p>f. Establish and promote role of professional organizations</p> <p>g. Mobilize human and financial resources and institutionalize funding for DRR; institute incentives for DRR initiatives</p> <p>h. Develop sustainability through partnerships with NGOs, CBOs, other States and localities, etc.</p>

P.A. No.	Case Study Description & Lessons Learned	Resources/ Impediments/ Keys to Success
1.1	<p><b>Case Study:</b> Application of the Indicators of Disaster Risk and Risk Management Program for Latin America and the Caribbean. The InterAmerican Development Bank engaged a group of experts, coordinated through the Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Manizales, to develop and apply a system of Indicators of Risk and Risk Management (see <a href="http://idea.unalmz.edu.co">http://idea.unalmz.edu.co</a> for a collection of project reports). The program objective is to facilitate access to relevant information on disaster risk and management by national decision-makers, thus making possible the identification and proposal of effective policies and actions. It helps move toward a more analytically rigorous approach to risk management decision making. The system identifies risk factors and risk management factors (indicators), providing a useful tool and systematic approach to evaluating legal and institutional mechanisms and policies (as well as factors affecting risk). The system has been applied in a range of countries and also at the provincial and local level.</p>	<p><b>R:</b> Executive and organizational support for the review; interdisciplinary and interinstitutional team; understanding of the socio-political environment; access to documentary sources—laws, executive orders, regulations, policies, plans, resources, institutional arrangements, past disaster experiences, lessons learned; relevant experiences from other States; key questions to ask as a basis for the evaluation.</p>
	<p><b>Lessons Learned:</b> Understanding the legal, institutional, and policy context is essential for developing effective strategies and plans and successful DRR implementation. Look for weaknesses in both vertical and horizontal linkages between governmental levels, entities, and jurisdictions. Inter-organizational cooperation and collaboration often do not come naturally. And institutions and policies are dynamic, not static; the evaluation needs to be ongoing. Such reviews often result in identifying resources and linkages which are underutilized or untapped in regard to DRR.</p>	<p><b>I:</b> May need to overcome some initial reluctance toward perceived criticism or self-criticism that is implicit in an assessment or evaluation</p> <p><b>S:</b> Honesty, simplicity, and transparency of the process</p> <p>Multi-disciplinary, multi-organizational team approach</p> <p>Utilize a self-assessment approach rather than outsiders' evaluation</p>
1.2	<p><b>Case Study:</b> One possibility is the Bangladesh Risk Reduction Framework and how it was developed.</p> <p><b>Lessons Learned:</b> Engaging in dialogue, when it is accompanied by joint decision-making, provides empowerment, which leads to a sense of ownership. Successful inter-institutional models usually have: top-level support from the government's chief executive and the chief executives of the institutions; an indisputable mandate; proactive leadership; a strong core group and secretariat; and incentives for action. It may be necessary to overcome a (mis)perception that national focal organizations responsible for disaster response are already building adequate systems to reduce disaster risk.</p>	<p><b>R:</b> Participants' time, open-mindedness, and commitment to the process; information resources. (Also see lessons learned)</p> <p><b>I:</b> Difficulty in maintaining information-sharing and communication networks within and between groups and organizations (government, NGOs, civil society)</p> <p>Different groups have different interests, agendas, and missions which are difficult to integrate</p> <p>Difficulty in maintaining interest, involvement, and commitment</p> <p><b>S:</b> Take into account public perceptions of risk and differing local economic and other realities</p> <p>Combine top-down and bottom-up approaches, engaging national to community-level actors</p>

1.3	<p><b>Case Study:</b> One possibility is the Government of India's process for developing DRR mission and vision statements, draft national policy, and plans.</p> <p><b>Lessons Learned:</b> Focus first on reaching broad consensus on clearly articulated vision, goals and policies, which serve as the foundation for specific strategies and implementation actions. This process is a continuous cycle of collaborative planning, familiarization and socialization, monitoring and review of activities, and updating and correcting. Clearly identify authorities, responsibilities, necessary resources, timelines and benchmarks for monitoring progress.</p>	<p>R: Resources needed for planning include executive commitment, authority to plan, involvement of all affected entities and organizations.</p> <p>I: Perception that nothing concrete will come of the planning process</p> <p>Other priorities and lack of time (process is time-consuming)</p> <p>S: Use an inclusive, participatory, multi-stakeholder process</p> <p>Fully integrate the process and products with other national strategies, plans and programs</p> <p>Include mechanisms for ensuring accountability and tracking results</p>
1.4	<p><b>Case Study:</b> One possibility is Vietnam's policy, legal and institutional response to the challenges presented by flooding (outlined in ADPC's <i>Primer on Disaster Risk Management in Asia</i>, 2005).</p> <p><b>Lessons Learned:</b> Other interests and priorities make it difficult to ensure that DRR actions are explicitly integrated into a country's multi-year development plans and annual budget allocations. Existing institutions charged with response and relief are generally ill-equipped for broader DRR responsibilities, but they often resist assignments to others or new mechanisms. Leadership is key: identify "champions" who will promote DRR with their contacts and in their organizations. Regarding mainstreaming, DRR measures are more likely to be implemented if they are an integral part of development projects and included in the original project formulation and design.</p>	<p>R: Leadership; willingness to speak out and to take on tasks and responsibilities; capacity and mechanisms for awareness-raising and education; political will to dedicate resources to DRR; resources to be dedicated to DRR; initiative and ingenuity.</p> <p>I: Lack of trust</p> <p>Different groups have different interests, agendas, and missions which are difficult to integrate</p> <p>Difficulty in keeping decisions during disaster time on track with sustainable policies</p> <p>S: Tie DRR to economic and developmental objectives</p> <p>Ensure that the components of sustainable hazard mitigation (e.g. environmental quality, local resiliency) are factored into "sustainable development"</p>