1.0 Introduction

RedR UK conducted a Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Learning Needs Assessment (LNA) from 1 March-3 May 2012. The objectives of the LNA were to map existing DRR resources and tools and to establish the essential components of a 5-day training workshop for humanitarian workers.

The LNA methodology included a mapping exercise to identify existing DRR resources, an internet survey which was completed by 146 respondents and 20 semi-structured interviews. Survey respondents were broken down thusly:

The LNA was designed to offer an overview of commonly held views and experiences related to DRR in humanitarian work. However it does not necessarily reflect the diverse views of the humanitarian community as a whole.

The filtered data received from the surveys is included in annex 2 – there is a wealth of information in this annex, which will actively inform course development. Those people with an interest in DRR are encouraged to read it for the wealth of experience contained within it.

RedR would like to thank all of those who took the time to complete the online survey and those who took part in semi-structured interviews.
2.0 Findings

2.1 Existing courses, resources and tools
There are a plethora of existing materials on DRR. The key resources to inform the development of the course are listed in Annex 1.

2.2 Essential Training Content

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DRR Cycle Overview including timing and funding mechanisms</th>
<th>Assessing national/local capacity for DRR</th>
<th>Using participatory methods for DRR activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment and management of risk</td>
<td>Analysing and selecting appropriate DRR approaches to enhance humanitarian response</td>
<td>Building collaborative partnerships for DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context assessment to include stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>Community-based DRR</td>
<td>Monitoring and Impact Evaluation of DRR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of key literature</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Case studies
- Three case studies which identify good practice and lessons learned in DRR were identified from the learning needs assessment along with examples of incorporating DRR into different sectors in humanitarian responses. These can be found in Annex 2.

3.0 Summary conclusions
- DRR training should be kept simple and assist participants to navigate existing resources available
- Participants should leave DRR training with the ability to assess risks in the humanitarian context in which they are working.
## Annex 1 key materials

### Some key DRR Reference Materials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)/Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A framework for community safety and resilience</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benchmarks and Standards and Indicators for Emergency Preparedness and Response</td>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNISDR Terminology on Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>UNISDR</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Some DRR Toolkits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)/Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tools for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction</td>
<td>Charlotte Benson and John Twigg/IFRC</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVCA handbook</td>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCVA – Participatory Capacities and Vulnerabilities Assessment</td>
<td>OXFAM</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Corps Disaster Risk Reduction tool</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A practical step-by-step VCA Guide for Red Cross and Red Crescent filed practitioners and volunteers</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Some DRR Guidelines / briefings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Author(s)/Agency</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disaster Management Team Good Practice Guidelines for Disaster Risk Reduction</td>
<td>Bob Hansford, Sarah Dellor &amp; Shone MacPherson/Tearfund</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disaster risk management for insecure contexts</td>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: Comprehensive Guidance</td>
<td>Global WASH Cluster</td>
<td>2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Warning-Early Action: A Regional Guideline for Effective Engagement</td>
<td>IFRC</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Practitioners Guide to Disaster Risk Reduction (To be released this year)</td>
<td>Emergency Capacity Building Project (Multiple Agencies)</td>
<td>2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7. Have you received training that has included information on how to incorporate DRR into humanitarian response?

Note the majority of respondents had not attended any DRR trainings. Of the trainings mentioned, many had some DRR components and were not specifically targeted at DRR post disaster

UN / interagency

- Austrian Red Cross and RedR UK, Training of Trainers (Prepare to Respond), 5 days training in Orahovica.
- FAO, Centre for Public Policy Training Latin-American and Caribbean; Disaster Risk Management applied to Food Security in Crisis Contexts and Food Security and Nutrition;
- FAO DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT (DRM) IN AGRICULTURE AND FOOD SECURITY, in collaboration with National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA), Islamabad (Pakistan), 7-8 February 2012
- United Nations (UN) Security Awareness & advanced security awareness certification; 2008
- UNDP: DRR training organized by UNDP Myanmar and Malteser and MRCS
- UMCOR Internal DRR Training, June 2012
- UNMIS Sudan - Do Not Harm humanitarian principles, 2010
- UNHCR - emergency management workshops between 2001 and 2006.
- UNHABITAT - internal habitat reviews on Myanmar, Mozambique and Pakistan
- UNICEF, PATH (a Principled Approach to Humanitarian Action)
- UNISDR working groups since 2001
- UN OCHA Online Induction Programme by UN OCHA 07/2011
- UN Basic and Advanced Security in the Field by UN-DSS 07/2011
- UN OCHA Civil Military Coordination (UN CMCoord) course in 2011.
- OCHA - Emergency Field Coordination in 2006
- WFP emergency management workshop in Sweden in 2005

NGO / Red Cross

- ACF Network, DRR basics - Jakarta 2007
- ADPC Disaster Preparedness
- Arbeiter-Samariter-Bund Deutschland e.V. (ASB) ASB’s own educational centre, as well as via ADH (German NGO network):
- Asian Disaster Preparedness centre, 20th REGIONAL LEARNING WORKSHOP ON COMMUNITY-BASED DISASTER RISK REDUCTION by AISAN DISASTER PREPAREDNESS CENTER in Bangkok, 2011.
• CARE USA Regional training on Contextual Analysis of Underlying Causes of poverty and vulnerability. Held at Mororogo Oasis Hotel, Tanzania from 17th May-4th June 2010
• Conflict Management Training
• CARE Academy (online and workshops) Emergency preparedness Plan, Emergency Preparedness Planning.
• Concern Worldwide, Humanitarian Workshop, Malawi, 2007
• ECB - Emergency Capacity Building Project has a DRR component (ERIP emergency Risk Informed Programming)
• Habitat for Humanity - DRR 2011- online course
• humedica international, Coordination and implementation of humanitarian aid projects by 10/2009
• Red Cross, Beginning course for cleaning water (XH2O ISTRA) – intervention team in Istrian region (Red Cross) November 14th -15th 2008
• Red Cross, Course for instructor of first aid
• Red Cross, "safe shelter awareness training"
• Inter SOS - DRR -Harare - 2009
• KDSC/Dtalk, CD-based, Disaster Preparedness –development training programme;
• KDSC/Dtalk , Logistics & Security aspects in Humanitarian Programmes –development training programme; Dublin
• Red Cross IHAT course
• ICRC, 2009, Training in team management and leadership, Amman, Jordan
• IFRC - global early recovery surge capacity training - training has been run three times in Nepal, Uganda and Malaysia, and includes emphasis on DRR aspects.
• IFRC – Code of Conduct;
• IFRC, DRR and RC movement - IFRC - Geneva - 2008
• IFRC, International Disaster Response Laws, Rules and Principles (IDRL) and Gender Equality in Programme Planning
• IFRC - VCA see the VCA assessment handbook
• IIIRR regional Training, 2011, Community Managed Disaster Risk Reduction and Climate Change Adaption, Held in Dire Dawa, Ethiopia
• International Institute for Rural Reconstruction (IIRR), CBDRR, Cavite, Philippines, July 2010
• InterAction DRR working group – various case studies presented
• Merlin, Public Health in Conflict and Transitional Contexts, Merlin Learning and Development Center, Monrovia, Liberia
• MSF, Logistic in Precary Situation - Merignac, France, June 1995 (3-weeks)
• OXFAM internal: CBDRM, integration of DRR/CCA into Social - Economic Development, Mainstreaming gender into humanitarian/DRR/CCA programmes mainly in Vietnam and in East Asia region.
• Oxfam GB, CaLP, British Red Cross, Emergency Market Mapping Exercise,
• RedR emergencies course +/- 2001
• RedR India course son community based disaster reduction
• RedR Sri Lanka, Community Based Disaster Risk Reduction, 2008
• Save the Children UK - some sessions on DDR during Induction
• Shelter Centre - CORE Training - has a module
• Tearfund internal - no official course names
• WWF, Green Recovery and Reconstruction Toolkit, A 3-day course on Green Recovery and Reconstruction after disaster and conflict.

Sphere / projects
• DRM, CBDRM and Sphere Standards (1990'2)
• INEE training
• IASC Gender Training 11/2011
ANNEX 2 – Q.7 TRAINING

- SPHERE training - Pakistan 2001, June 2010:
- SPHERE MS INEE MS CERT Disaster Management Course

Governments / Donors

- Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) which includes integrating DRR into Emergency Response at a Whole of Government level
- Austria Civil protection Team Leaders training and XH2O Wat-San, Austria
- ECHO DRR training in E.Africa
- EU, Advanced Course for Senior Political Advisers working in the wider context of EU's CSDP. The Course took place in European Security and Defence College in Sweden (Folke Bernadotte Academy)
- ECHO FPA Training
- ONTARIO: EOC IMS BEM ER planning and response Emergency Management Ontario
- USAID sponsored course in Joint Humanitarian Operations in 2012.
- United States Federal Emergency Management Agency - Various courses in disaster mitigation, response, and recovery
- AusAID, Australian Civilian Corps Foundation Courses, Canberra 2011
- Viking11 Civil/Military CAX military/civilian simulation exercise in 5 countries; Curragh Military Base, Kildare; 2011 - (http://www.forsvarsmakten.se/en/About-the-Armed-Forces/Exercises/VIKING-11/)
- Swiss Rapid Response Team Training, SDC, Switzerland, 2009
- Irish Rapid Response Training, Limerick, Ireland, 2009

World bank

- World Bank Institute, Approaches to Achieve Transformational Change for Sustainable and Climate Resilient Cities

Universities

- Master in Africa University (SUDAN)
- MSc in Disaster Management and Sustainable Development at Northumbria University
- MSc in Risk, Crisis and Disaster Management. University of Leicester, 2010-12
- Fordham University, International Diploma in Humanitarian Assistance, Center for Health and International Cooperation, USA
- MSc - Hazard & Disaster Management - Kingston University
- Barcelona Autonomous University; EC Rural Development;
- Mcgill University, Humanitarian Studies Initiative, 2011, Montreal Canada
- University of Wisconsin (Madison) – Disaster Management Program
- Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine, Diploma in Humanitarian Assistance (DHA)
- CIHC-Fordham University, Postgraduate Diploma in Humanitarian Action, N.Y.
- Southern Cross University, Australia, Masters of Community Development/Disaster Management, 2011
Q8. What experience do you have with regards to incorporating DRR into humanitarian response programmes?

*Overall responses indicated a very broad range of experience in both emergency response and longer term programming. From responses, participants saw many programmes as having DRR components – even if they were not explicitly DRR programmes.*

*This section provided interesting background as to the types of roles that there are relating to DRR in emergencies and what participants need to be trained in to be relevant to the jobs required.*

1989
- Nepal, 1989-91, promotion earthquake resistant school building designs

1990
- Papua New Guinea Government 1990 in relation to volcanic eruption risk

1992

1995
- Rwanda 1995-2008 through a variety of relief, WASH and Shelter projects always integrating activities and designing projects that encouraged tribal groups to work together to reduce the potential for future conflict. Always endeavouring to include tree-planting in WASH projects to reduce soil erosion and reinforce soil stability.

1997
- Mauritania 1997-2004, promotion drought mitigation activities agriculture sector
- Mozambique, OGB from 1997 - 2000, I transitioned a post-emergency rehabilitation programme into a long term development programme and then also lead a high profile response to floods in 2000. Not exactly DRR back in those days...

1999
- Nicaragua 1999, post Hurricane Mitch, proposal preparation concerning locations for housing away from areas prone to mudslides and involving planting to reduce likelihood of mudslides occurring.
- DIPECHO program for Andean countries in 1999-2000. Thus, the program was on DRR and humanitarian response.

2001
- Turkey, 2001-2, integrated DRR programme including capacity building, training, earthquake-proofing/retrofitting emergency contingency stock warehouse.
- In 2001-2002 in Gujarat earthquake as well as part of DRR we identified watsan structures like check dams, bunds for farming lands, ponds which were broken and needed quite a bit of renovation, gabion structures etc. which were then implemented together by watsan and livelihoods team for OXFAM GB.

2002
- Based in Paris, France (MSF) 2001-2006, Logistics Supervisor. My experience is mostly linked to conflict situation, malnutrition, health programs and IDPs.
- Proposal writing for IRC in 2002 for rebuilding of housing post Goma volcano eruption. Ensuring that houses would be less prone to collapse due to seismic events.
- Zimbabwe, food insecurity, 2002-2005, strengthening agricultural production in rural and urban areas to reduce vulnerability to price changes etc

2003
- Bam earthquake in Iran (2003)
- Sudan - Northern Nile - 2003 till 2006 - DRR (mapping - prevention - community enhancement

2005 -2009
- Darfur with Care International as Safety and Security officer.

2004 - Tsunami
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- Asian Tsunami Recovery Programme of the British Red Cross in Indonesia (Banda Aceh), the Maldives and Sri Lanka from 2005 to 2008. Bringing disaster preparedness and disaster risk reduction perspective into livelihoods recovery activities. These include training in DRM, CBDRM for the Red Cross staff and community members.

- Sri Lanka; 2005-2008 DRR integrated with livelihoods programming and capacity building; community based approaches with tsunami-affected communities including community based contingency planning, first aid training, swimming lessons - ties with activities to diversify and strengthen livelihoods.

- Sri Lanka; 2005; Health; Construction/Equipping/Capacity-building of primary/secondary health facilities in Batticaloa district.

- Within the Tsunami response we tried to integrate DRR into our livelihoods work. 2006-2007 In Sri Lanka where as part of DRR we decided to build community structures but doing it as part of livelihoods. 2007-2008 In Aceh we also decided to work on projects which were identified by our DRR team which were more of community projects and implemented through the livelihoods work.

2005

- Worked extensively on DRR in Afghanistan, from 2005 - 2008. Tearfund had a large programme on DRR focussed on natural disasters such as floods and earthquakes. We used the in house method of ‘Participatory Assessment of Disaster Risk’ which is an assessment tool helping beneficiaries to take their own action in reducing the impact of disasters. We also had a radio programme and radio listener groups, and set up a DRR network in the country to advocate with donors and government.


- Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Kazakhstan (from 2005-2007), response to various natural disasters (landslides, earthquakes, etc) as a part of ERU (emergency response and cooperation unit together with the local national Red Crescent Societies).

- Pakistan 2006 to 2008 - all programs (Livelihoods, WASH, reconstruction has DRR elements as mapping, risk reduction, community enhancement)

- 2005 Sri Lanka: Evaluation Tsunami program

2006

- Australia, 2006-7, community recovery Activities: focus groups and needs assessments; working with community leaders to identify priorities and strategies; community information through radio, letterbox drop, service providers, community leaders

- Community Development projects alongside permanent shelter programme, Aceh, Indonesia, 2006-7. Activities included PRA type discussions to identify community priorities for projects, often incorporating DRR elements. Other roles have often included managing or working on projects containing DRR elements, but these were generally smaller parts of programmes.

- 2006 onward The Philippines: The shelter programme included sensitisation (booklet and model shelter in every community) on proper construction techniques, including guidance to improve the resilience of simple structures using bracing.

- Sudan Blue Nile State from 2006 to 2011

2007

- Peru, 2007: seismic adobe construction (local University-developed design) training during construction post earthquake

- Chad, 2007: WASH, Livelihoods: Rainwater harvesting, soil erosion control

- UNDP ER adviser to Suriname for floods in the interior 2007/8 - actually a DRR project by another name

- 2007/08; Protection; Equipping and capacity-building Social Centres in south Lebanon ;

- Uganda 2007 - 2011 - Food security - livelihood diversification and resilience building

- 2007/2008 Floods and cyclone emergency response Bangladesh. WASH, Food Sec. Incorporating DRR in recovery programming.

2008

- Myanmar 2008-2011 Health especially RH Mobile services, gender, MISP

- Bangladesh, 2008, Livelihoods, Household adaptation (DFID funded multi country pilot programme)

- 2008: Bangladesh SiDR operation: “safe shelter awareness training” addressing hazards, risks and vulnerabilities and how to increase the resilience of simple structures using bracing

- Bangladesh, 2008, Research on Disaster Risk Reduction: Needs assessment and preliminary study to design a programme for development of disaster risk reduction provisions for children affected by floods in Bangladesh: Conducted field assessment and direct interviews, focus group discussions and workshops involving children,
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local community leaders, ministries, schools, local and International NGOs (141 informants in total) to establish a baseline on DRR knowledge, attitudes and practices

- Support for China after Sichuan Earthquake (2008)
- Indonesia - 2008 - relief operation post Pangandaran earthquake (West Java) Activities: Initiating child safe plan/system and spaces in responding any emergency situation
- I have written many disaster/security plans and provided consultation for private clients over the past twenty years. Served as consulting member of NBC security team at the 2008 Olympic Games in Beijing.
- Indonesia: 2008/2009: Emergency Preparedness for primary school students, teachers, government officials and local institutions (school based preparedness programme with special focus on children with disabilities as well as strengthening of institutional linkages); funded by German Foreign Ministry
- 2008/2009: Disaster Risk Reduction for Disabled Children (integration of DRR within inclusive schools; strengthening of institutional linkages - building a framework for inclusion); funded by DIPECHO
- 2008 Myanmar, cyclone NARGIS: The shelter programme included sensitisation (booklet and model shelter in every community) on proper construction techniques, including guidance to improve the resilience of simple structures using bracing

2009

- Part of UNICEF emergency response division. Incorporated a methodology to assimilate all contingency planning into one package. That way linked into humanitarian response and DRR. 2009-2010
- Kyrgyzstan, 2009, Coordination, seconded to OCHA we were trying to hand over from humanitarian to development stage while retaining emergency response capacity
- In Djibouti, we run an educational and Livelihoods project. From a global point of view, I can say our livelihood project is part of our DRR measure to counter risks of girl child trafficking/abuse and also to secure means of livelihood for parents who ‘sell’ out their girls in order to satisfy basic needs. This we have done since 2009 when we launched the Djibouti project.
- Zimbabwe 2009 to 2010 - disease surveillance and reporting system
- Ecuador; Sept 2009-May 2011 ; working as Head of Delegation with Spanish Red Cross, design and supervision of several projects about DRR ( Echo, AECID, etc)
- Training of international staff and partners on gender and DRR: Thailand and Myanmar 2009
- 2009 Padang earthquake Indonesia: The shelter programme included sensitisation (booklet and model shelter in every community) on proper construction techniques, including guidance to improve the resilience of simple structures using bracing
- Myanmar 2009 -2011, DRR in coastal areas
- 2009 Indonesia, India: Evaluation Tsunami program

2010

- Ensuring DRR was integrated into the UNDAF in Namibia in 2010.
- 2010-2009 – EPTISA Project Evaluation: Agriculture production systems, sustainability and economic diversification for the indigenous families of the Ayllu of Salinas Garci Mendoza, Llica and Tahua; Sustainable Agricultural Development (DAS) for Local Economic Development (DEL) in Lowland Bolivia; Forest Development and Conservation of Dry Forest Eco-region Chiquitano (Bolivia and Paraguay); Environmental Management for Land Recovery in desert areas of the Municipality of Villazón - Department of Potosí; Shared governance in the forest Xingu river Headwaters region; and Building consensus on access to natural resources in the Brazilian Amazon.
- 2010: Samoa; Shelter kit training for volunteers, including a session on "hazards, risks and vulnerabilities". The training also addressed increasing the resilience of simple structures using bracing
- Working in a CBDRR Project from 2010 to present at Maldivian Red Crescent
- Pakistan - 2010 till now; all regions; DRR as part of vulnerability reduction
- 2010/2011: Building resilience for children with disabilities (strengthening DRR information delivery for disabled children out of school); DIPECHO
- Haiti (2010 and 2011), Sector Shelter, Activities - informal training and workshops as part of Shelter Cluster meetings and workshops. Field exposure on how to incorporate DRR into shelter programs.
• "Haiti, 2011, Disaster Risk Reduction Programme, funded by DIPECHO: - Création, formation, équipement d’Equipes d’intervention communautaires - Mapping de risque et mise en place d’un système d’alerte précoce - Sensibilisation adultes et enfants ; sensibilisation et exercices de simulation dans 5 écoles; réalisation de plans familiaux d’urgence et sensibilisation porte à porte - Construction de 3 maisons pilotes construites en techniques locales et para-sismiques et para-cycloniques; mise en place de microprojets permettant de diminuer les vulnérabilités des populations face aux catastrophes naturelles - Renforcement de 3 abris d’évacuation communautaires

• Haiti: 2011/2012: School-based Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR education for all primary school students in Petit Goave/Grand Goave school district; strengthening of institutional linkages); funded by DIPECHO

• Haiti, 2010: Shelter sector; incorporating training on hazard-resilient construction

• 2011 Earthquake emergency response Haiti. WASH, Food Sec, Nutrition, Mental Health. Incorporating DRR in recovery programming. Implementing DIPECHO DRR/DRM program (WASH).

2011

• USAID in Nepal in 2011 when we did a DRR assessment to develop our 5 year strategic plan to mainstream DRR into our current programs and develop our DRR strategy.

• Worked with Water Missions International (INGO) building DRR WASH solutions into Kenya, Uganda, Malawi, Honduras, Haiti, Peru and Belize. Worked with partnering and direct project installations on mobile state treatment systems that can run solely on solar. These systems then remain as community development structures after the response thus reducing further disasters.

• 2011 Pakistan: Beneficiaries for the 2010 monsoon flooding receive a "safe shelter awareness training" addressing vulnerabilities of common (in proper) applied techniques, hazards and risks, and how to deal with them. The communities are informed about proper construction techniques, receive technical advise during the owner driven construction and receive brochures

• 2011; Shelter; Transitional Shelter/Permanent Housing for Somali Refugees in Dollo Ado

• Somaliland, 2011. Livelihoods. Through a lot of discussions with Local population, authorities and other traditional elders we implemented Series of Cash for Work projects where people get income and build big infrastructures like water catchments, water channels (canals), Rubbish collection, Rehabilitating and Building Berk ads or Bore holes.


• Malawi 2011, Proposal development BRCS with MRCS to build flood and ‘quake resistant housing and build pit latrines using least cement possible.

• Supervisor of the WASH project in which DRR component was included. That was in South Sudan 2010-2011. We were trying to prepare contingency plan for few counties of the one of S.Sudan states.

• UNICEF, 2011, Developed DRR Toolkit for Education in Emergencies / cluster, and gap analysis

• IFRC, 2011 Public Education and Public Awareness for DRR guidelines international

• Pakistan, 2011, Shelter, guidelines poster for safer building practices in reconstruction after the flood

• Horn of Africa, 2011: Rainwater harvesting Ethiopia, ongoing; PSNP: Using food for work as part of safety net program for soil erosion control, rainwater harvesting, reforestation, etc.

• 2011 Design of an M&E framework and Ethiopia, Lesotho, Brazil, Nicaragua: baseline surveys of mainstreaming DRR in all programs of one of the largest INGO's

• India 2011 - the present, WASH related DRR activities in flood prone areas in Uttar Pradesh and drought prone areas in Rajasthan

• 2011, Uganda, Drought Preparedness in karamoja- Uganda and Pokot-Kenya through developing Early Warning Systems and Building Community's Resilience-Seed bank, microfinance, pasture management, and Livestock disease surveillance

2012

• Contributed to developing proposals and assessments of DRR work with various Oxfam teams, mostly in Asia. Assessments of DRR work for a gender perspective in Myanmar in 2012

• Nicaragua: 2012/2013: Community based Disaster Preparedness (Training of DRR committees and institutional stakeholders on community, municipal and regional level; equipping of DRR response structures; Livelihoods and economic assets protection); Proposal submitted to DIPECHO
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General / global guidance

- IFRC Early Recovery Surge Team Training - development and delivery
- Development of outline DRR syllabus for Asia Dev Bank (project stalled)
- Development of urban DRR programme for ADRA for USAID, Managua, Nicaragua
- We incorporate DRR in all our projects and programmes as much as possible. A current project is to collect country specific information about Building Codes, Planning Policies, DRR Preparation Documents to be hosted in an open source library. Many lessons learnt from Haiti and other disasters.
- DRR is generally considered 'development' work and not incorporated in the humanitarian programmes I have been involved in except at a superficial level e.g. engaging local staff, authorities and stakeholders in informal discussions and advocacy aimed at getting others to engage. That said, a lot depends on what is meant by DRR - a vaccination campaign (a component of perhaps 90% of the missions I've experienced) or general food distribution in famine at-risk regions can be considered disaster risk reduction but don't (as I understand) usually get considered as part of Disaster Risk Reduction...
- Our integrated program for community resilience is aimed at incorporating DRR in to disaster preparedness programs and post conflict response programs in the country. These programmes are continuously going on in the country of Sri Lanka covering all post conflict areas and disaster prone districts.
- Nigeria, Ongoing, Local Rights, Building Community Resilience. My role is working with local communities in building their resilience to when disaster strikes with focus on strengthening their coping mechanism.
- Worked with ISDR to integrate gender into work of Global Clusters (Geneva).
- Development of training material on gender and DRR.
- DRR is one of the four main fields of action of ASB’s foreign aid department. Therefore I was involved in our DRR programming during my time as Programme Manager Admin/Finance/Programme Development in our Country Office in Indonesia, as well as currently as a Project Coordinator for Central America and the Caribbean (responsible for Country Offices in Nicaragua and Haiti). Nevertheless, most of the conceptual work was undertaken by the respective project managers in the field. Examples for DRR projects / programmes implemented by ASB are the following:
  - 2010: the IFRC launched pilot projects for participatory community driven programming based on the PHAST methodology. The new program is called PASSA (Participatory Approach for Safe Shelter Awareness). Pilots launched in Uganda and Bangladesh. The Bangladesh Red Crescent has adopted the programme tool in the Community Development Initiative
  - Organising Sphere trainings for Plan colleagues in which we added a couple of modules about DRR within response. A related assignment was working with both Sphere and INEE to introduce DRR into their respective standards.
  - Working with the global education cluster to produce guidelines and tools for integrating DRR into education in emergencies responses.
  - Working with ECB project to develop DRR guidelines (work is underway on this).
  - From HQ in the Netherlands, development and revision of DRR/WASH emergency response guide.
  - DRR centred training for the past two years. Previous to that, have helped develop DRR training modules.
  - Experience with Handicap International, Action Contre la Faim, Oxfam GB and UNISDR
Q9. What lessons have you or your organisation learnt with regards to incorporating DRR into humanitarian programmes that others could benefit from?

There were many reported lessons and some were contradictory. However, all comments are copied below and grouped in no specific order.

Conflict vs. natural disaster / complex disasters
- DRR - relates to natural disasters - but humanitarian workers do not generally distinguish between natural disasters and conflict.
- In conflict situations activities such as community-based risk mapping made the army suspicious of agency.
- In conflict situations, we have successfully provided shelter kits to enable people to move quickly if needed.
- The natural disasters can be handled only when there is peace and understanding among the population.
- The political conditions have to meet the needs of the population groups. The threat of civil war has to be eliminated at very early stage.
- Studies show that only focusing on natural disasters is bad. Conflict is also an important factor. RR must also look at the risks of conflict. Resilience must also be approached in terms of understanding conflict.
- Multi hazard - Natural Hazards, unnatural disasters. There are always many factors which increase the affect of any disaster. For example look at Fukushima, it was not just an earthquake it was also a nuclear crisis (World Bank paper).

Complexity of DRR / use of Materials
- Majority of DRR materials are in western / HQ generated and most are in English. Difficult to access for majority of implementers - e.g. local government.
- DRR is often made out to be more complicated than it is.
- Majority of documentation is on policy, less is on detailed implementation.
- Much of DRR is really best implemented as "good programming".
- Much of DRR is developed by a small group of people and consultants - most are less operational - leads to lack of integration into programming and strategy.
- Community mobilisers have most impact with DRR if they have the trust of the community.
- Implementation has always proven tricky - there has been a lot of talk about concepts - but how to apply - especially at scale has been challenging. There is a lot of interest (and funding) in DRR just after a disaster happens. It is an opportunity for agencies to get resources for longer-term strategies.
- Humanitarian workers need to understand that there is a growing body of research, guidance, and good practice, and they need to be familiarised with this, as well as strategies for doing their own reading and exploration. They don't need to make it all up as they go along.
- Lack of understanding of what is DRR.
- Practical application of DRR in the programme.
- Produce as much literature required and condense it into a useful handbook.
- It requires a significant change of paradigm for operators, but constant exposure and reinforcement is winning the day.
- I have learned to always expect the unexpected in terms of disaster risk reduction. Going beyond standards and templates by thinking outside the box and being creative in terms of program development and practice should always be encouraged.
- It is important to develop common guidelines for DRR procedures.
- Importance of content dissemination instead of creation of new content (in most countries a huge variety on DRR education materials is available but effective means for spreading the core messages are lacking).
- Capitalisation / Guideline production.

Effective use of resources / programme management
- Project planning.
- Promote simple actions that are easy to replicate with minimum resources (for instance, raised platforms initiated by communities in flood situations for shelter and WASH facilities).
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- Do not waste resources in the relief phases - wherever possible use emergency resources to have longer term impacts - in some cases the focus must remain on saving lives - but there is a need to think in the longer term earlier in responses
- Pre-positioning allows for carefully considered and good quality responses early on. If you wait until the disaster, you often compromise on these because of time pressure.
- Contextualised shelter kits decided before a disaster have worked well so the kits consider DRR as a cross-cutting issue
- How do we implement at scale - it is better to make a 10% change for 90% rather than a 30% change for 5% of the affected population?
- Once programme staff are clear about the necessity of incorporating DRR into humanitarian programme, they will be willing to apply user - friendly tools for integration of DRR into humanitarian programme should be provided
- Good Management during the Disaster.
- There is very little integration of DRR in humanitarian and development programs in practice; a lot of intentions especially in funding requests and proposals but very little substantial activities on the ground.
- Needs to be incorporated at every stage of project cycle
- Planned DRR activities should be carried out, rather than remaining a well-written segment of a project proposal, only paying lip-service to donor requirements - historical risks and coping mechanisms are to be taken into account at the project/programme design stage and as much as possible incorporated into design
- Planning where possible if the environment and urgency allows
- Be able to adapt - so where possible have the correct team make-up
- The importance of assessment preparedness as part of DRR, to ensure that the response is targeted in the best possible way, using the best possible evidence base.
- DRR must be operationalized with the requisite institutional development and resources to implement it.
- Planning is key.
- Make it simple. Humanitarian response colleagues are always fully stretched and have very little time to absorb and act on new ideas during a response. But they are always enthusiastic to receive succinct briefing materials.
- Continuing to critically evaluate what is already in place is critical to the growth and maturation of effective disaster risk reduction. Seeking outside opinion and drawing upon the experience of others (What you are doing with this survey) is extremely helpful. Practical exercises should be held more often and should be designed to be as realistic as possible (Not just going through the motions).
- Get out of the office - see things for yourself Carry out painstaking needs assessment
- Trust no-one until they have proved themselves to you
- Need for basic tools and training on how to carry out a disaster risk analysis as part of the needs assessments;
- The development of sound strategies
- Technical assessments are important. Must always have technical expertise in incorporating DRR into any humanitarian response.

Transparency / accountability and community / government engagement

- Beneficiary aims do not necessarily link to aims of NGOs (donors)
- Be transparent from early stages to avoid problems
- Need to ensure that although both groups may have different goals, ensure that projects meet differing needs
- Shelter and concrete programming with physical construction provides an opportunity for discourse with the community
- Using local implementers is the key to the success of DRR programmes. However there is no time to send people to training courses or do capacity building in the first 2 months
- Have some cynicism re: CBDRM - lack of evidence that it works and impact is hard to prove. There are questions as to how long it actually lasts after the project ends. e.g. Jogjakarta - 8000 dasuns - 200-300 families each - how does CBDRR reach them all? There is a lot of interest (and funding) in DRR just after a disaster happens.
- Coordination (clusters) and shared standards (Sphere) must be pragmatically practical within the context of the crisis.
- Use existing community structures. Try to capitalise on community ideas and priorities for activities/projects, rather than imposing them. That is to say, that when communities arrive at suitable ideas for DRR activities, or ideas that have a DRR element, these should be encouraged and resources made available to them, rather than specific ideas from the agency being implemented.
- No DRR without commitment and involvement of governments
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- DRR should be participative
- DRR training of communities is not sufficient to ensure uptake of practices, tangible, practical application is needed
- Grassroots capacity building is essential (community resilience).
- Community awareness is important in getting their support and involvement in the project.
- Community-led approach was also linked with success. Alignment with civil society and local actors.
- Community Consultations work best
- Local governance need to understand key DRR concepts and the relevance of DRR in their current context. Local governance and local stakeholder support is important for the success and sustainability of the project.
- Community mobilization is difficult when we talk about long term hazards like sea level rise but easier by focusing on more current issues like erosion.
- Social Mobilization and community services are the key factors to the success of Integrated Community Resilience Program.
- refresher courses needed at community level
- Beneficiaries are aware of the risks involved in not considering DRR in any construction
- There is a need to shift disaster risk management away from the paradigm of preparedness towards the concept of community resilience, in which prevention and mitigation activities are equally important.
- Community people know what to do and require support in building their coping mechanisms which is required in developing countries where government is slow at the onset of a complex emergency.
- Inclusivity that is to say, it becomes more productive to involve beneficiaries at the decision-making level so that any DRR measure under-taken are also owned by the beneficiaries.
- DRR should be introduced from the beginning with the communities participating in it
- Let the beneficiary coping strategies inform any interventions
- There is emergency even as we delve into development activities and also there should be capacity among all actors including the state to deal with emergencies.
- Having exit strategy before commencing any operation.
- DRR helps communities to plan better especially agrarian communities where the onset of disasters, e.g., floods, can wipe off acres of farms leading to food insecurity.
- It supports in the development on contingency plans which increases the chances of lives and livelihoods recovering quickly with emphasis on developing strengths of vulnerable groups.
- In emergencies: restoration of basic needs is priority - trying to introduce DRR in that context can be counter-productive. But the flip-side, e.g. in Haiti, you still have to factor in the short and medium terms risk; such as hurricane risk. The importance is to understand the risk cycles that are in play even before intervention and to balance that in the response. It’s about proportionality. Stabilisation and protection of life and then later you look into restoration of life and that’s when you can incorporate DRR into that more. Are you increasing natural resource usage (could that have been an underlining causal factor in the initial crisis).
- Direct engagement with communities to understand the different needs and capacities within these. This will enable practitioners to monitor and understand changes in the environment and respond in relevant ways, and eventually to hand over control of initiatives to them.
- prepare and train countries in DRR so that they are more prepared in case of emergencies
- Bottom up information collection and empowerment of local staff
- Local good practices as the first go-to resource
- Institutional capacity
- Policy dialogue need with government
- Promote awareness on possible DRR related actions with local authorities so that they plan to include this in their humanitarian responses, and not merely limit themselves to providing relief only.
- Importance of NGO Network
- Without local communities and stakeholders active participation and support for this and other activities, it will not work and will put non-national/expatriate staff at risk.
- DRR need a thorough and holistic situational analysis and stakeholder mapping there is a need to recognise community coping mechanism and indigenous early warning system Successful DRR needs multi-stakeholder engagement (partnerships, networks and liaising with government institutions and mandated agencies)
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Coordination

- Good coordinating between the involved partners.
- Good coordination and communication between actors is essential
- Good information management and sharing of information is essential
- The cluster system, if well managed, can ensure better preparation for responses.
- Needs to be systematised (e.g. through NDMA or as part of the syllabus for schools) for it to work effectively
- Sharing responsibility among other humanitarian agencies in the field
- Coordinated approach is very difficult - too many actors with different approaches
- Lessons learned and gaps in preparedness and response must be understood, agreed, shared and implemented locally to build capacity and accountability.
- Disaster is location specific, so how does an organisation coordinate with other actors to ensure that all populations are supported in disaster risk reduction & mitigation actions (including linking government policy capacity to local-level resilience capacity)
- The classification of NGOs is worth considering as there are often too many players on the ground
- Importance of involvement of institutional stakeholders on all levels (in most countries there is a large number of stakeholders involved in DRR, but they often act independently, not even knowing what the others are doing. Therefore it is of utmost importance to interlink these actors and contribute to the establishment of efficient response structures).
- Integrate DRR concepts and principles into institutional humanitarian strategy and policy - thus making it obligatory for colleagues to prioritise this.

Resources

- It is an opportunity for agencies to get resources for longer-term strategies
- Donors like DRR but are reluctant to fund coherent programs
- Cost comparison between with or without DRR during an emergency
- Dialogue with donors
- Simply too little funding available for a too short period to do more as he obvious on DRR
- humanitarian programs (have to, to obtain funding) promise much more as is feasible and many objectives (regarding gender, accountability, DRR) are not really implemented. Missing are a strong strategic focus and clear choices accepted by desk officers that assess proposal. And that is perhaps too much to hope for.

Basic tools / off the shelf

- As with other mainstreaming agendas; many generic problems, like everyone is focused with day-to-day problems when deployed, so it’s too much to ask them to acquire a DRR attitude at incorporate this into their work as part of an immediate response. The time to do this is thus during quiet times and not during emergencies. It should be programmed beforehand so that staff are able to adapt “off-the-shelf” solutions and training as part of a response.
- Need for basic tools and training on how to carry out a disaster risk analysis as part of the needs assessments;

Cross cutting issues / integrated approach

- Consider gender sensitivity at any stage of planning
- The gender dimensions are often neglected;
- For slow onset disasters, like drought in the horn of Africa, DRR and livelihood strengthening and resilience building are interwoven and it may not be useful to separate them into different sectors but apply an integrated approach.
- Focus on interventions in key basic needs related sectors (food, shelter, WASH, health...)
- DRR approaches in all sectors should also incorporate solutions focusing on water and sanitation
- Consider gender and age when working out the vulnerabilities and capacities.
- As I have learnt the DRR and humanitarian response is current issue of the Asian countries. It will stand for the next three to four decades. We will have to be better prepared for the response in following manners. 1) Strengthening capacity of civil society organizations 2) equipping CSOs with knowledge and information 3) incorporating gender mainstreaming in humanitarian response.
- The stable conditions exist only when the role of women in society are recognized. My experiences of Election Observation Missions have proved that women are very effective as election managers at polling stations.
- DRR strategies are to be a holistic part of communities’ lives, they should be integrated into different sectors, including health, education, environment, anthropology, ...
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- As with other mainstreaming agendas; many generic problems, like everyone is focused with day-to-day problems when deployed, so it’s too much to ask them to acquire a DRR attitude at incorporate this into their work as part of an immediate response.
- The gender dimensions are often neglected;
- Project approach is best - sector-based approach wasn’t successful. More successful were multisectoral project approach. But this does challenge the organisational structure of many humanitarian agencies, which traditionally subdivide DRR according to sectors.
- Success was often achieved accidentally or in unexpected ways. Success was often linked with coordinating with pre-existing state-led initiatives.
- Beneficiaries especially women were keen in adopting DRR in construction of WASH facilities.
- Gender - the consideration of the distinct needs, vulnerabilities and capacities of women and men - is still not being integrated efficiently or next nor near comprehensively.
- How are programmes linked together for a holistic approach to risk reduction & mitigation (e.g. how are nutrition programmes linked to food security programmes; and how are these linked to livelihoods to ensure that the there is continuity & consistency in the approach to risk reduction)?
- The importance (and complexity) of incorporating DRR in all other sectors (livelihood, education etc.) in a way that clearly shows that DRR is different from and more than adaptation, especially in situations of chronic vulnerability
- The importance of explicitly and robustly considering political, social and economic situations (including gender considerations at all levels), i.e. the determining factors that tip a difficult situation into catastrophe. Sex disaggregation of data gathering and analysis is a crucial aspect of this.
- As with other mainstreaming agendas; many generic problems, like everyone is focused with day-to-day problems when deployed, so it’s too much to ask them to acquire a DRR attitude at incorporate this into their work as part of an immediate response.
- The gender dimensions are often neglected;

Risk / analysis

- Properly integrated responses reduce vulnerability and risk, and need only a modest community-based DRR component to complete the package
- Proper analysis of risks remains crucial, also in emergency context.
- Don’t create new risks with your ER or rehabilitation activities.
- Need for basic tools and training on how to carry out a disaster risk analysis as part of the needs assessments;
- If management doesn’t make it mandatory to do some basic risk analysis then DRR is last thing people think of during a humanitarian programme
- Risk analysis should include also a vulnerability assessment of the population at risk
- Respect and understand that many communities have been incorporating disaster risk reduction strategies into their way of living for a long time without naming it - sometimes the DRR strategies people want to pursue are not what NGOs or funding regimes want to fund
- DRR lens - the course should always be focused on risk.
- It increases the awareness / understanding of the beneficiaries / communities of hazards, vulnerabilities and risk.
- What are the appropriate points of access/entry (e.g. partners; government departments; social movements; direct access) to ensure that the programme targets the correct actors to implement disaster readiness & risk reduction
- If management doesn’t make it mandatory to do some basic risk analysis then DRR is last thing people think of during a humanitarian programme
- The need to understand how people coped with risk before you arrived. The think how their risk management skills are strengthened and what can we learn about local risks from listening to them. But again this has to be proportionate to their own needs. Bottom line is there is no "one size fits all" solution. It’s all context specific.
- Incorporate DRR and Risk Management in school programmes
- If management doesn’t make it mandatory to do some basic risk analysis then DRR is last thing people think of during a humanitarian programme

Preparedness/Relief/development

- Good preparedness before the time of Disaster and Crisis.
- What is done for the response should be as closely aligned to what the future sustainable community development program should have.
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- Do NOT sacrifice DRR for quick fixes or technical solutions, or government decree, unless absolutely unavoidable.
- Be realistic about when to include and DRR component to be implemented when an emergency is actually happening. I saw organization talking about DRR when local people and authorities still facing casualty and emergency response, which I consider not sensitive enough.
- Bridging the divisions: Between ‘development’ and ‘humanitarian’; between govt ministries; between aid agencies; between tribal factions; etc. DRR can be seen simply as part of the overall continuum of improving quality of life (as can humanitarian response, livelihood projects, good trade policies, etc) - artificial barriers at best decrease effectiveness and at worst contradict and nullify the work of other projects.
- In emergencies: restoration of basic needs is priority - trying to introduce DRR in that context can be counter-productive. But the flip-side, e.g. in Haiti, you still have to factor in the short and medium terms risk; such as hurricane risk. The importance is to understand the risk cycles that are in play even before intervention and to balance that in the response. It’s about proportionality. Stabilisation and protection of life and then later you look into restoration of life and that’s when you can incorporate DRR into that more. Are you increasing natural resource usage (could that have been an underlining causal factor in the initial crisis).
- Good preparation and lessons learned from the mission worked are essential for the future action.
- Giving hope for the future (people who are focused on surviving present realities have little interest in insuring against future possibilities).
- Not linking relief to long term development is costlier in the long run;
- DRR workshops, meetings, trainings are important part of a recovery response (Please note, these are my learning more than the organisation, but of course as part of the organisation’s work)
- Prevention is more cost-effective than responding to emergencies;
- The cheap quick fix DR solution is usually not sustainable for long term community development. e.g.: using clay pots to strain dirty water, produces clear water but not healthy water. The pots will clog up with dirt they will break and crack over time. Issuing a community of 3000 with pots in each house hold is more expensive than installing a full pump and filtration system that runs on solar and can produce WHO standards for drinking water for an anticipated 10 years!
- DRR is crucially important to save lives, evacuation will be successful and on time after alert. Community will have a plan to compromise life loss.
- DRR should first be part of any development program/intervention
- Early Recovery and DRR are almost the same thing. Same themes, approaches, intent.
- Main Issue: how to link emergency response and DRR, when, funding, strategy...linkage with development...mandate...how to deal with chronic vulnerability/structural...
- DRR/DRM must be incorporated from beginning of emergency response
- DRR/DRM, in particular in urban contexts, becomes one main strategic pillar for the organization
- DRR requires a longer view than traditional “relieve suffering” type perspective.
- We were responding to all disasters as opposed to anticipating them
- DRR and development projects
- DRR is difficult challenges the basic paradigm of humanitarian actions. Our orgs are optimised for humanitarian actions and not optimised for DRR.
- What to do: haven’t formulated DRR into humanitarian response; it’s at its birth.
- DRR agenda is too ambitious for a humanitarian.
- DRR cannot be a programme unto itself, nor can it be implemented in the context of short-term humanitarian response. It must be a truly integrated element of longer-term (3-5 year) early recovery and development programmes.
- A DRR approach, embedded through long-term development strategy programming, should incorporate local knowledge by recognising communities’ capacities to empower themselves.
- Preparation  -  Event Survival  -  Event Debrief
- Should DRR really be part of humanitarian activities? Maybe I just don’t get the question but for example any kind of reconstruction should of course take DRR into account though that’s strictly speaking an activity that follows humanitarian programmes such as food/NFI distributions etc and is thus not technicially part of humanitarian programming. If it’s a definition question it might help if ‘humanitarian programmes’ is defined at the beginning of the survey.
- long term development capacity to include resilience and preparedness to respond
- linking relief recovery and development
importance of response to protect resilience

Often there are many possible humanitarian interventions that will worsen the situation in regards to DRR, but seem to be legitimate solutions in terms of a currently existing humanitarian need - e.g. shelter locations that are not appropriate, or water interventions that rapidly and seriously deplete the water table, worsening the situation in the long term, but provide water for agriculture or drinking in the short term.

There are only a limited number of DRR activities you can develop in an emergency context. You have to be realistic on this and set realistic objectives. Specialization of humanitarian aid and humanitarian worker is inhibiting a real LRRD approach. DRR mainstreaming also suffer from this situation as humanitarian agencies and donors look more at contingency planning and emergency operation then at the real need and capacities of affected population and their participation in operational planning and monitoring.

Most of DRR work differs substantially from emergency work (timing, processes, methodologies, general approaches, etc.). If donors and agencies do not take a real commitment on DRR mainstreaming in emergency contexts by promoting long term strategies to support the development of the capacities of most vulnerable communities, there will be no space to address root causes of crisis and no substantial reduction of disasters risk.

The cost of DRR is offset by the benefits. The humanitarian appeal mechanism is not flexible enough to comprehensively include DRR.

Funding for DRR both pre and post disaster is hard to obtain.

It is also clear to us that involving the other partners including the government, helps a lot in achieving a greater acceptance and impact.

It has also been a lesson to us that operations run transparently with high levels of accountability have better productivity. Accountability to beneficiaries and to donors and implementing partners ensures better understanding of our intervention measures and therefore provides a greater support and wider acceptance.

In the rehabilitation stage focus on long term development strategies to reduce vulnerability.

The humanitarian time-scale does not encourage DRR.

As a general rule investment in DRR can save lives and reconstruction cost - it is essentially a developmental activity and not a humanitarian one.

DRR is integral part of our emergency and recovery response.

Monitoring the software component and behaviour change is very important. All monitoring tools and plans should be developed before the commencement of the program. Both qualitative and quantitative tools should be employed.

This can be very politically incorrect to say in the aid world today...but...sometimes the communities don’t know exactly what intervention is best for them, because they have not been exposed to the possibilities of what can be done to reduce risk. A good facilitator can introduce options to them.

Always refer to DRR in humanitarian funding applications. And budget for this work within response plans, even though many donors won’t currently accept this, they do need to know that we think it is important. ALNAP conducted an internal review of 1500 evaluations (based on 74 member NGOs) going back to the 1990s. The review was specific to the lessons on DRR.

Building back better

Ideally the emphasis has always been on prevention (development) but if it cannot be prevented then the aim is to ensure that the impact of a similar disaster of a similar size in the same area should be lower due to a good transition from humanitarian crisis to stabilisation and then development.

Real impact of DRR when the disaster struck

need to link relief, rehabilitation and development

need to always pursue participatory approaches to ensure sustainability.

Other

DRR integration into humanitarian programme should be strategy of the organisation.

DRR solutions must be realistic and cost-effective to the local context and understandable to the local population not based on donor requirements; however, conducting a needs assessment should be carried out by a central organization (UN-OCHA) and results shared among humanitarian organizations to prevent a survey-weary population.

too difficult for NGO’s

Specific approaches / technologies

We have also provided concrete foundations as part of relief to promote early recovery and the path for more disaster-resistant shelter.
• In emergencies: restoration of basic needs is priority - trying to introduce DRR in that context can be counter-productive. But the flip-side, e.g. in Haiti, you still have to factor in the short and medium terms risk; such as hurricane risk. The importance is to understand the risk cycles that are in play even before intervention and to balance that in the response. It’s about proportionality. Stabilisation and protection of life and then later you look into restoration of life and that’s when you can incorporate DRR into that more. Are you increasing natural resource usage (could that have been an underlining causal factor in the initial crisis).

• Early warning systems based in community (not only in technology)

• During my appointment in Geneva with the Emergency Section I worked on an early warning system for emergency preparedness which was incorporated into an on-line system with very limited success. Lessons learned include:
  o There is a limit to which humanitarian Agencies can prepare for a humanitarian conflict induced emergency as determined by the political climate and donor willingness to support preparedness. Thus expectations of such a system must be set against the political background.
  o Ultimately emergency preparedness stops at the identification of additional resources. Again the willingness of donors to support preparedness measures is paramount to success.

• Over concentration on preparedness can lead to wasted resources if emergencies do not occur as predicted.

• employing new technologies for DRR integrating DRR into national policies retrofitting social infrastructure in earthquake prone zones

• Those sessions should follow after the sensitisation of the shelter program in a community. Posters and brochures (IEC) material should complement the participatory sessions. Building model shelters with proper connections for timber and bamboo, benefits a larger audience than the beneficiaries. Other community members have adopted the proper construction techniques it is preferable to use artists to develop the IEC materials, who seem to have better skills to communicate with beneficiaries rather than engineers/architects. Technical drawings are difficult to understand by non-technical/illiterate people. The cultural appropriate figures are essential when modifying existing IEC material for specific areas.

• Annual scenario rehearsals

• Success of the PMER mechanism is depending on continuous practices (continuous improvement) and making it a part of the day to day governance and management at all levels.

• Generally try and avoid activities that make you part of the Problem that you are meant to be there to help solve. Make sure your convoy is properly briefed, equipped, has SOPs for what to do in emergency situations e.g RTAs, Breakdowns.

• hazard and vulnerability mapping linked with agro-ecological zoning and response analyses frameworks

• Dos and Don’ts of introducing new construction technologies

• Take the time you need to select sites properly including gathering a lot of secondary data and triangulating information. Define "disaster". It can have different connotations to different people/communities/countries.

Why DRR

• If appropriate DRR measures in place, the impact of an emergency is mitigated

Building / identifying capacities and HR

• Improving human resources in warehousing and logistics

• Building capacity of partners early - in case the situation takes a turn for the worst - Sri Lanka conflict post tsunami

• DRR/DRM human resources, with operational experience and not just theoretical/scientific, are difficult to find

• Developing hardware capacity is futile if no attention given on software capacity building and commitment to application of the Policies, procedures and guidelines.

• It is not just about formal training and the development of printed material.

• More often than not, only a small percentage of what is learned is actually put into practice.

• Established HR management system

• Developing competencies for disaster response

• One of the other things that we have learnt. We have a lot of specific skills like shelter, WASH. How do you ensure that you have the right people on the ground in the immediate aftermath of a crisis. So do you have a specialist on the ground from day 1 or do you try to broaden risk analysis skills across your staff. Particularly climate awareness for example.

• Any humanitarian worker must be well trained and equipped with skills of humanitarian interventions.

• The Humanitarian workers should have to understand the objectives of emergency-in terms of reducing morbidity and Mortality.
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- To understand the core Humanitarian principles if one is to deal with risk reduction –Humanity, Impartiality and Neutrality. In all above my experience is to deal with worst disaster or situation that I faced during the IDP and during Cholera epidemic that occurred in armed conflict and also the flood in Namibia, where there was no path to carry out the assessment.
- Proactive training of all staff - not just humanitarian assistance specialists, also development professionals
- The time to do this is thus during quiet times and not during emergencies. It should be programmed beforehand so that staff are able to adapt "of-the-shelf" solutions and training as part of a response.
- Requires technical expertise in governmental contact and negotiations etc
- Requires NGO staffers with town planning, agricultural, industrial and SME expertise as well as infrastructure knowledge and and and ... this is just not possible currently with most NGO's.
- Strategic planning for a range of sudden-onset crises with respect to key personnel, logistics, finances, management, communications.
- Thinking outside the box in the identification of potential partners in crisis response. For example, for the 2004 tsunami response in Sumatra, linkages with private sector charter-boat operators established through previous program activities enabled rapid and self-supporting response missions to reach extremely remote areas. These partnerships were extended into DRR activities post-crisis and were of value to all stakeholders, including the private sector actors.
- Institutional strengthening
- It's important to make sure that humanitarian workers understand the evidence basis for, and believe that disasters are largely preventable, and that their goal is to do themselves out of a job (won't happen in our lifetime, but it should be the goal)
- This isn't about "them", it's about "all of us". It should starts from a personal commitment. Humanitarian workers should all be required to undertake their own Household/Family disaster plan, prior to coming to the training, or don't take up a seat. They need to quickly be part of the solution, rather than part of the problem.
- Learn a lot about what not to do:
- The time to do this is thus during quiet times and not during emergencies. It should be programmed beforehand so that staff are able to adapt "of-the-shelf" solutions and training as part of a response.
- Staff are insufficiently trained/ lacks experience to identify realistic DRR options; too often proposal incorporate too much, are too wide and miss focus and choices. Knowledge of DRR is on conceptual level often OK but practical experience to formulate and implement realistic activities is often missing
Q10. What would help you to better incorporate DRR into humanitarian responses?

This section highlights areas for improvement in DRR responses and where issues of concern or where further development is required. It also helps to identify where training should focus on improving skills / issues of concern.

Learning / Staffing / staff development / communities of practice

• technical support by coaching or mentoring
• Training
• Training on specific DRR strategies under each programmatic sector and subsector  Understanding what donors are best to approach for funding of DRR pilot activities
• Training on best practices for DRR in specific countries or regions
• Quality staff
• General training should be offered free online.
• Discussions with experienced people and networks.
• Conducting of regular trainings on DRR to the titled staff.
• Membership to International Humanitarian Aid Networks/ Contact with UN Organisations
• International Training on DRR
• Training - Knowledge of adapted GIS tools for example personally, a formal training since I learn by doing so far
• Experienced agencies should work in a consortium with less experienced ones that have a local presence in disaster prone areas. This will increase the necessary local DRR implementing capacity, particularly in areas with frequently recurring disasters like flooding and drought.
• Institute a multi-stakeholder forum of all actors- preferably hosted by a mandated government agency and periodically meet to reflect on the current situation
• More trainings
• Good knowledge and staff experience. Beyond the concepts!
• Personally, through practice, I perceive what are the weakness of the system and I try to improve them and pass that knowledge to the others
• Advance training provided online for those deploying or deployed.
• Qualified HR (with practical field experience and not just on policy level)  - Specialized trainings
• Training scenarios. Behaviours of people.
• a fully developed curriculum
• Problem solving skills can be sharpened and honed by using a team approach involving planning, incident command, and post event organization that focuses on various types of scenarios presented randomly. Again, making these scenarios as realistic as possible can produce sense of urgency for the training team to address various issues
• Randomly assigning trainees to teams comprised of people who have never worked together before adds another element of reality in creating an environment where cooperation and support with and for each other becomes paramount to the mission.
• A shared "learning object repository" and collaborative authoring system for rapid development/ adaptation of public education materials. For me personally certain additional training like needs assessment, logistics and how to coordinate and manage people in emergencies would be very helpful as certain things proved to be a real challenge in Brazzaville, Congo.
• Furthering the training to equip with skills in DRR for better humanitarian response.
• -A formal training linking WASH or any emergency intervention with DRR will enrich my experience and adopt new approaches to help people during humanitarian work  Regular inclusion of gender in all DRR trainings, orientations, etc.
• There is a need to enhance the response knowledge of regular program staff across each sector. If the daily people in charge of the programmes knew what emergency response requirements for their sector looked like, they could build it into their program
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• Program staff need to look at programmes from a risk analysis perspective. Understand how to achieve a risk assessment (potential threats= Likelihood * Impact)

• It would be more useful to learn from other programmes how they incorporate DRR responses in their work so as to compare and improve on the work we are currently doing. Measures vary from place to place and depends on the cases in question. This sharing can be done through exchange visits, or online or through sharing of bulletins or newsletters.

• Learn about practical examples, and lessons learnt from these

• Awareness of the issues - how to assess disaster vulnerabilities, what to look for. Types of responses available (i.e. should we look to the local community, government or internationals?)

• More in depth knowledge on DRR for those who are working at the field level on different programmes like watsan, livelihoods, etc.

• Better understanding of DRR from the side of all partners, including the Cluster system

• Advanced HR competency-based management of both expatriates and national staff (as opposite to the current HR practices which are based on assumption that everyone should be polyvalent and know everything)

• Good qualified staff

• Learning DRR and auditing operations.

• Awareness

• personally I am in need of: - basic hard skills and information - exposure to the practical experience of others -

• I will learn how to react in some situation, to lead others (volunteers, persons which need help), to change some experience with other members of training

• Examples of good practices

Funding and commitment of organisation and key staff

• need to negotiate with donors prior to disasters

• Donor interest.

• Policy priority required and monitored from the top of the organization. However, it shouldn’t another add-on priority but a deliberate choice to focus on DRR and delete at least one other priority. DRR implies a different way of thinking, a different approach to humanitarian and development work; without a well thought through decision, it is a temporary thing that will disappear is sson as funding is not available.

• Funding; hardly available at the moment

• Make it a requirement in the ECHO Single Form, unless properly justified more time / less work (over) load forecasting

• Have successfully implemented in some countries, but have not been able to identify donor funding in many others.

• Humanitarian Aid Principles / Code of Conduct

• Having staff understand the significance and not just an add on.

• The multiple means with which UN Agencies and NGOs seek funding for emergency response is wasteful in itself. Thus such initiatives as CERF and Central Humanitarian Funds are useful (although often very cumbersome to administer).

• Donor support Effective and efficient needs assessment methodology and tools Taking an organisation development approach within INGOs, partners and donors - e.g. more flexible funding for starters, then less division in structure, strategy, systems, culture, capacity and leadership between humanitarian and development programmes

• Adequate funding mechanisms

• Make it a requirement in the ECHO Single Form, unless properly justified

• Donors placing accepting the value and need for DRR is a critical shift - this requires advocacy and lobbying, which is best done in partnership with others humanitarian actors.

• Also a question of funding. Encouraging donor flexibility. Funds that can be diverted between long term development projects and then redirected towards genuine emergency work as necessary.

• In the case of <our organisation>, we are getting acceptance in the country as a major player in the DM arena. We need to continue to promote this role in order to gain the leverage needed to influence other stakeholders to make DM and DRR a priority. However, as <our organisation> is a new society, there is limited technical capacity within <our organisation> and <our> staff need capacity building opportunities. This is limited due to funding issues.
ANNEX 2 – Q.10 DOING DRR BETTER

- Increased availability and accessibility of funding for disaster risk reduction strategies before reconstruction and rehabilitation phase.
- Increased funding
- More specific funding
- Clear policies and strategies, political will, funding
- Provision of funding for DRR activities as part of emergency / rehabilitation activities (e.g. reconstruction activities flanked by safe-construction trainings/campaigns). Often donors understand the need of such activities but their mandate forbids them to fund them.
- To make it more accessible in terms of practical examples of how humanitarian agencies can include it in their programming, and how to get funding for it
- If DRR was prioritised by donors, clusters and government then this would ensure we focused on it (shouldn’t be like this, but it is!)
- Genuine buy-in from donors to the idea - accepting that a certain proportion of most/all humanitarian response project budgets would be targeted for DRR interventions.
- Develop clear mandate and responsibilities, engage donors worldwide...
- Donor committed to support longer term DRR strategies. Donor willing to accept DRR activities in emergency phase.
- Commitment from managers
- Change of Nature of Proposal Writing to something more practical and put more emphasis of traditional Systems of beneficiaries to better improve DRCC into H.Responses?
- First of all we should start by highlighting the benefits of risk reduction versus disaster response. Incorporate developing country’s negative attitude towards investing in risk reduction

**Tools / guidance / compilation of tools / best practice**

- Tools and guidelines
- Some tools developed for the South Sudan context which are used by all clusters would be really helpful as SS is unlike other countries and needs tools designed for this context.
- A differentiation in planning tools for DRR between slow onset disasters and sudden disasters
- Guidelines
- e-Handbook with a range of scenarios
- A clear and relatively easy-to-use methodology, which would ideally be incorporated into the organisation’s programme development processes (in the case of DRC - the Programme Handbook)
- An internationally agreed template of DRR to incorporate into crisis planning
- Having a set of guiding principles and a set of reminder questions to encourage teams to consider the what-if scenarios and devise ways to integrate approaches and activities in programs and projects that will minimise the adverse effects of those scenarios. Questions that pose challenges to ensure DRR has been considered.
- Research briefs (2-10 pages) that summarize and provide key research literature, and current findings, on various specific topics. This is the single biggest need that I think we all have.
- Specific concepts and tools
- Better knowledge and understand of DRR will help us to include such components in our programs
- Linking DRR to programmes and ER
- Planning
- Motivation of linkages between DRR and responses
- The greater contingency plan and DRR, the lesser burden in response to emergency
- Some simple tools/checklists to do risk analysis within the humanitarian needs; - Some good communication/IEC tools that spells out simply what DRR looks like in different sectors during a humanitarian response. A series of short videos would be helpful.
- Strengthen the emphasis on ER and start it as early as possible Seize the post-disaster (and post-distribution) moment with communities and build on their concerns (although looking beyond the hazard the caused the most recent event)

**Beneficiary engagement**

- Engagement with local communities
ANNEX 2 – Q.10 DOING DRR BETTER

- All humanitarian workers should have similar understanding that DRR is an integral part of the response. Sometimes more beneficiary focused people are thinking investing over DRR is a misusing of relief fund. This myth should be eliminated. Therefore, more focus should be given to develop materials to convince some activists who are adamant.
- Less top down approaches, much more use of local / indigenous knowledge and capacity building.

Organisational issues
- Analysis of the situation at the highest levels in organisations.
- To establish a unit of DRR within the Structure of the organizations.
- Rebuild the basic thinking of NGO’s … or (and better) establish another kind of organisational group that specializes in DRR … if it were part of the policies and guidance of the agency and not a standalone program

Coordination and inter sector
- Better coordination of resources needed.
- Coordination and service delivery mechanism in DDR and humanitarian response
- Better understanding from technical experts (e.g. WASH or shelter sectors) on DRR. At the moment DRR is often ghettoized, and carried out as a minor part of a response, rather than an approach to be taken by all parts of the humanitarian response. This can lead to the response moving things one step forward and two steps back. However, I am somewhat sceptical about the idea of DRR being on an increasingly long and still ignored list of "cross-cutting issues" (gender, environment, child rights, conflict sensitivity DRR[?]…)
- The links between environment and conflict need to be explored much better, and DRR can help with this to make people understand the resulting effects in the longer term on water tables etc.
- Better coordination between various NGO
- A more holistic/strategic approach to DRR that facilitates recognition that sudden-onset crises can have a myriad of causes, so unless there is a clear risk of a specific cause (e.g. earthquake-prone areas), being prepared in a much more general sense permits DRR to be incorporated across any number of response types as a cross-cutting theme, rather than a separate program activity.
- Unified approach
- Better communications - but often communications are compromised Honest local participants Competent foreign participants
- Harmonized key messaging - the "what" of DRR, beginning with household / family level, later perhaps community. IFRC will have a contribution on this soon
- Better understanding of the different approaches
- Consistency amongst the various agencies; Make IEC material available for local NGO’s Promotion of DRR messages thru the IASC shelter cluster meetings, to ensure all the various partners share the same messages. Too often, the various agencies provide different quality standards in the same community. Very confusing for beneficiaries, especially when the poorest standards survive minor disasters.
- Having overview of DRR actions that are being taken by some organizations - Deeper knowledge of methodology - Learning of the other organizations’ experiences

Relief / development and conflict/disaster split
- DRR often is focussed on natural disasters. A lot of humanitarian response is conflict related. So there is a mismatch there.
- Strengthen OCHA’s and other humanitarian partners capacity to develop new strategies (diff than emergencies approaches) incorporating DRR.
- To have a clearer idea of what the horizon and length of the humanitarian interventions in order to plan a better phase out of the emergency mode to a development mode, using the DRR as a tool for this end
- Humanitarian response is too short-term and punctual to effectively implement DRR. DRR needs development programming and adequate budgetary support to be implemented. Without the commitment and total buy-in from local authorities and institutions DRR will not become and operational reality. Too much of DRR depends on official policies and decisions to work on a sustainable basis (land use, urban and regional planning, building codes, natural resource conservation, watershed management - just to name a few)
- Humanitarian Response is the last phase of a disaster management strategy. At the same time, it should also incorporate a livelihoods approach and longer term security objectives.
- Full appreciation of the fact that there is no such thing as a natural disaster. There is vast amounts of academic literature in the field of disaster studies going back over forty years (on which I am more than happy to elaborate) supporting the fact that hazards are natural, disasters are not [or needn’t be], as societal processes generate the
degree of exposure to hazards (i.e. vulnerability) and therefore influence the level of risk, thus underlining the fact that disasters are the socially constructed outcome of environmental extremes visited on human systems.

- Consolidated resources
- Overarching development strategies at NGO level supported by either UN (in the case of humanitarian emergency) or government (in the case of longer term development) strategies that put humanitarian/development assistance in the context of the future and simply in the moment (risk reduction is a future strategy rather than a current need)
- Understanding better not how to incorporate DRR in humanitarian responses but in development a strong idea of where humanitarian response can SUPPORT the development progress of our programmes and PROTECT the resilience of people we work with as well as ‘rocking up and saving lives’

**Government and policy**

- Suggesting governments to seriously manage issues of DRR and have separate ministries.
- Policy at OCHA HQ level and cluster principals
- There needs to be more acceptance and urgency at the National Level to incorporate DRR into national plans as well as to develop DM policies in the country.
- Also understand whose risk are you talking about ... our perception of risk may not be the same as the affected families.

**Other**

- How to best conduct an assessment focusing on building DRR strategies at different levels within a country
- Understanding of who the key actors are in DRR (at each level)
- Human development down the centuries, in whatever context one chooses to analyze (political, economic, social, environmental etc.), has required a threshold of acceptable risk to a variety of known hazards to be accommodated as part and parcel of daily life. Below this threshold ‘normal’ orderly societal activities and competence apply; above the threshold, disorder and the ‘un’-nesesses of disasters is found: the unexpected, unforeseen, unusual and unprecedented situations that derive from natural processes that are unscheduled, uncertain and unplanned for and where unawareness and unreadiness/unpreparedness often reflects the condition of their human victims.
- More prevention work
- Need to train staff in the full development cycle
- Often presented in a complicated manner - actually fairly simple
- Need to keep DRR simple and more tangible
- Much of the discourse is abstract
- Remove the separation of natural disaster and conflict and focus discussion around risk
- DRR needs to be adapted to national / local contexts with contextual knowledge. E.g. there may be different needs valley to valley - requirement for more practical solutions - and examples.
- Long-term thinking.
- Help communities to bounce back better so they are less vulnerable in the future.
- Vocabulary is often very complex- e.g. risk and hazard
- Humanitarian organisations often provide only a small component of recovery support - major actors are often not included in DRR - the 19902 were names decade of disaster risk reduction - leading to formation of UNISDR - initially this was advocacy - gaps remain in practical implementation
- Most people are already doing it.
- Analyse sectoral needs for DRR
- In DFID, a greater focus about building resilience to disaster. DRR is a part of this, but enhancing wider aspects of strengthening resilience. Part of the wider risk management context.
- Key issue is whether the organisation has decided to integrate risk into its programme approach - e.g when you are writing a proposal is risk integrated into formats or is it an add on
- Requires listening to local needs
- Talk with mayors - local authorities etc. are they being reached
- In DFID, a greater focus about building resilience to disaster. DRR is a part of this, but enhancing wider aspects of strengthening resilience. Part of the wider risk management context.
- Humanitarian Response is the last phase of a disaster management strategy. At the same time, it should also incorporate a livelihoods approach and longer term security objectives.
• Some simple tools/checklists to do risk analysis within the humanitarian needs;
• Some good communication/IEC tools that spell out simply what DRR looks like in different sectors during a humanitarian response. A series of short videos would be helpful.
• Make it a requirement in the ECHO Single Form, unless properly justified
• Risk - understanding of risk is important. Technical competent people are needed to understand specifics risks. Look at IPCC technical assessments.
• Any focus on DRR should rely on evidence, not hyperbole or emotion. Human population - politic changes, urban movements are also key.
• Make sure it is well integrated into humanitarian training and response.
• Emphasise the concept of resilience (the latest buzz word) into emergency preparedness and planning.
• Focus attention on downward accountability (ECB's Good Enough Guide is valuable for this). HAP principles and IASC guidance are useful here. Downward accountability obliges humanitarians to listen to the perspectives of those affected by emergencies, and invariably they think about the long term and focus attention on the most vulnerable. Is this a humanitarian issue? E.g. the Horn of Africa Lessons: chronic problem (draught), being responding to by emergency and acute projects. DRR should actually be addressing in development action. For orgs that have both development and humanitarian elements; in terms of response development actors and humanitarian actors need to liaise more and development actors need to plan for peaks and troughs.
• A broader scope than just natural disaster.
• Taking on board the conclusions of a very interesting study by Action Against Hunger: “DRM for insecure contexts”. Life is more complicated then looking at assessing the risk of the next earthquake. Extract: “This paper demonstrates how the integration of disaster risk management with insecurity programming can expand the scope of risk management to the mutual benefit of communities and aid agencies.”
• In DFID, a greater focus about building resilience to disaster. DRR is a part of this, but enhancing wider aspects of strengthening resilience. Part of the wider risk management context.
• Humanitarian Response is the last phase of a disaster management strategy. At the same time, it should also incorporate a livelihoods approach and longer term security objectives.
• Some simple tools/checklists to do risk analysis within the humanitarian needs;
• Some good communication/IEC tools that spells out simply what DRR looks like in different sectors during a humanitarian response. A series of short videos would be helpful.
• We currently working on this, focusing on agreeing “minimum requirements”. That means stuff that has to be done, but is proportionate so that teams aren’t overburdened with risk analysis. Risk should be an iterative process; not just sign off on something. But as the process develops there is an imperative to have an evolving holistic risk analysis (not just DRR).
• Talking to people on the ground.
• Understanding actual and potential conflict.
• Promotion of minimum skills sets; specific competencies. Also about getting the language into a format that is easily understood, both by relief personal but also to other stakeholders and communities.
• Budget issue: How narrow is your response? Response into recovery: perhaps it requires a separate budget. If you are trying to return people to a state that is safer than they were before, then you might want to consider a separate RR budget.
Q.11 Please list what you think are the top five knowledge areas for effectively incorporating DRR in humanitarian work

Additional answers in writing

- Set standards for min. level of service delivery of programmes. (avoid the failure of cheap fixes)
- Strong liaison and information exchange with donors and stakeholders
- To form the Emergency Response Team and identify the roles and responsibilities of its members in humanitarian field.
- Coordination between actors
- Capture and sharing of lessons learnt from past responses in the country
- Working with developmental actors; caveat: very difficult to evaluate the impact of DRR (how do you measure what didn’t happen?); causality is hard to attribute in complex multi-causal responses.
- Rigorous planning, particularly with regard to contingencies (ability to think the unthinkable). National and local political will and operational commitment.
- Consistency encourage creativity and critical thinking
- Demystify the concept
- Gender and other cross-cutting issues - which should be embedded in the accountability, dialogue and needs sessions at a minimum.
- Strong and practical appreciation of different capacities and vulnerabilities of social groups
- Identify and incorporate humanitarian response approaches that could enhance ongoing development and DRR work, across sectors
- Understand the culture and political system with respect to disasters
- Proportionality in all of the above is essential so you’re not overdoing it.
Q12. What are the most essential knowledge areas for effectively incorporating DRR into humanitarian response?

**Project Management / good programming**
- Manage safe infrastructure.
- The first few knowledge areas are summed up by ‘good planning.’ Lots of EHP related competencies.
- good programming is critical (“if you give someone a hammer they will look for a nail”)
- solid programming
- Disaster management, disaster mitigation and disaster preparedness
- Financial management and Surveillance.
- team management
- Disaster management at the field level
- Project management
- But generic skills might include understanding of both humanitarian and development approach, leadership, strong relationship management skills, strategic thinking - to see macro context and trends as well as real close up understanding of impact of local environment on local people
- Project Management
- Programmatic skills of all stages of a context and holistic approaches
- Management structures for response mechanisms including tables of authorities, roles and responsibilities. The assurance that those responsible for specific sectors (clusters) have the means and information with which to respond and will be present when it is time to respond (look towards business continuity for ensuring presence
- To establish your plan and follow it by regular updating and actions plan.
- Teamwork mindset
- How to organise disaster (e.g. earthquake, fire) simulation drills. These are often overlooked especially in countries where earthquakes are common.
- Leadership skills
- Skills in project cycle management. Security management

**Risk and link with programming**
- Determine risk not just at community level but involve other stakeholders.
- To understand DRR need to also have a good basis of knowledge of risk analysis.
- DRR a fancy title for good risk analysis.
- Disaster Risk Analysis;
- Capacity assessment, risk assessment, context assessment, self-assessment (what can our organisation do? What is our added value?), stakeholder mapping
- Need good disaster risk assessments
- risk = prob * impact
- Capability to conduct Identification of risks (risk mapping), contingency planning, and situation analysis
- Ability to analyse risk and understand it in context
- Determine key risk areas , sustainability
- Risk assessments; Risk mapping; Risks scenarios. Beneficiaries
- Effective Risk Mapping based in community
- Risk management
- Risk Assessment
- Pre-disaster risk assessment and activities (prevention, mitigation, preparedness); gap analyses
- Understanding risk management as a methodology and how it links to programme design * management (e.g. RAID approach to risk identification, minimising, mitigation, monitoring as part of programme plan & Log Frame)
- An assessment of disaster risks at all levels.
- Risk that people face?
- Preparation to avoid risk or to be prepared for outcome of risk?
ANNEX 2 – Q.12 KNOWLEDGE AREAS - CONTINUED

- Vulnerability mapping / Profound understanding of the concept of vulnerability
- Social/gender aware risk assessments techniques as well as risk management
- Risk assess at the local level to know how to react, to be prepared to have prepared team, based on volunteering
- Disaster Risk = Hazard x Vulnerability divided by Capacity
- Understanding of what disasters actually are - the interface between an extreme event and a vulnerable population. A storm which hits an uninhabited desert is not a disaster. One which hits a poor community with limited capacity to deal with it most likely is. A disaster overwhelms a community’s capacity to cope. A disaster doesn’t occur just when there is a rain shower or a regular storm (usually)
- Knowledge of the root causes of emergencies, and how development efforts can often increase vulnerability and exposure to hazard impacts.

Principles and standards
- Knowledge about the application of widely accepted principles and standards (Sphere, INEE, standards produced by the Clusters, etc).
- Humanitarian Aid Principles
- HFA and other similar frameworks: how effective and functioning? How can they be influenced, what will happen post 2015?

Contextual knowledge, assessment, engagement and analysis
- Understanding the vulnerability of populations to risk through a high-level understanding of social fabric. This is particularly important in urban areas. Difficult to get aid in, so preparedness is a key element. Understanding of the social context is very limited. DRR requires in-depth contextual knowledge that is hard for expats to access.
- Participatory assessment and meeting skills
- Knowing facts and figures of disaster types that can occur in the area of concern
- Knowing about the native culture of the community and involve them into the process, what other partners have done on the ground
- Political context
- Security constraints
- There is very limited specific knowledge you need to apply DRR in an emergency context. It is mostly a matter of focus you need to have. For this reason it is very important for humanitarian aid to understand what DRR is, but it is more important they could have the possibility to apply DRR focus in emergency context. Participatory approach is very important. To have a general understanding of CVA, although it could be difficult to apply in emergency context, would help. Research into the area you are going to provide relief to especially cultures.
- Be ready to apply principles of normalization and empowerment, and resist creating dependencies and infantilizing. Some good psychological first aid skills are also useful.
- Profound knowledge concerning DRR structures / mechanisms in place in the country / area of intervention.
- Sensitivity to cultural differences
- Profound knowledge concerning the target group’s culture and conventions.
- Should understand: connection between humanitarian response and longer term government objectives, and existing capacities (long terms risk reduction).
- Beyond the government accountability, participants should come out with hunger for knowledge of the context. An in-depth analysis of the community coping mechanisms and existing resiliencies. How do they see the risks?
- Understand the political conditions and climate in the respective country. Humanitarian response can best succeed in stable society.
- Working modalities with participation of all stakeholders towards DRR plan
- Deeper Problem Tree Analysis skills;
- Knowledge of regional/country humanitarian/ political context
- Context, including seasonality hazards and risks, and local strategies for coping and mitigation good understanding of humanitarian operations and willingness to work at the pace of the humanitarian actors
- Local context and flexibility Utilize community knowledge and work closely with them throughout project implementation
- It also important to learn and understand the population of concern and their understanding of such disasters. Sustainability of DRR measures to reduce recurrence.
• Indigenous knowledge of communities and information sharing of the concerned departments i.e. meteorology departments of the governments are advised to share information of disasters as alarm with communities through telecom networks and community DRRN networks of the CSOs.
• Working with communities
• DRR Concepts VCA SWOT Analysis
• Fully understanding the context and its dynamics in the short, mid and long term
• Community resilience
• good understanding of community / vulnerability
• Governments are key players.
• The DRR agenda is a good way to start a positive relationship with government.
• Awareness of what constitutes vulnerability - how to identify, assess and prioritise
• understanding that the community are the best resource: Make them aware of risk, hazards and capacities
• Preparing the government and the community in disaster preparedness
• Understanding of the political context of the country. In some countries (Philippines for instance), it is relatively easy to do pure Community Managed DRR. In others (China, Vietnam) which have a very top-down approach, it is much harder.
• Knowledge is less about external actors being masters of the universe and more about listening and assessing what people know (low cost tweaks) and re-design.
• Sound knowledge of the professional area of staff
• local conditions and cultural considerations - resource constraints and management of resources
• Ability to communicate with people of different cultures.
• Ability to understand the humanitarian context
• Local context (culture, perceptions, local capacities). Depends on what level/context.
• Profound needs assessment.
• National strategies for DRR - so that they work alongside government goals and policy - that then filter down to community level practice.
• Needs Assessment
• Initial Health disaster assessment in all areas or sectors-Health sector, Water and sanitation, Shelter and settlement, Food and Nutrition, health Services, Control of communicable diseases and vector, management of all wastes, Immunisation from the country of original, Knowledge in sphere project,
• Participation of beneficiaries in assessments and implementation
• Post-disaster needs and recovery (assessments and response)
• PRA type approaches and techniques
• solid knowledge of realities on the ground
• Outsiders don’t always have the best solutions!
• Local partnerships
• Design of scenarios matching the expected locations.
• To identify the resources of the information to area of operation.
• Understanding the dynamics at local level and the capacities and vulnerabilities of those who are affected by the crisis.
• Political and strategic considerations at the regional level (who is doing what to improve or hinder the situation),

**Practical examples / experience / knowledge of disaster responses**

• Specific examples of effective 'integrated DRR in sectoral approaches'
• experience of the realities of being a field implementer
• Technical knowledge of different types of disasters
• Knowledge of each type of disaster process and response procedure and key messages
• Case studies on past projects in other countries
• Specific technical know how in relevant sectors (WASH, health, shelter etc..)
• Specific examples of effective 'integrated DRR in sectoral approaches'
• Research based activities into humanitarian response
• To open question; in general moving beyond the concepts.
• Every training that I took was in one point very important for my work
• Capacities strengths and weaknesses of key stakeholders range of scenarios and classic response options
• Capturing and sharing past experiences in the country regarding disasters
• Building best practices and knowledge management support
• Hindsight needs to be applied. Local lessons need to be learned and lessons from other similar locations need to be learned too. E.g. failure of politicians and local authorities to ensure that essential infrastructure is adequately maintained and its suitability reviewed and failure to ensure that appropriate building codes are established AND adhered to. Disaster/Emergency Response Plans not only have to be established and agreed to but they also must be implemented otherwise it’s all a complete waste of time. E.g. Ouagadougou Floods, Burkina Faso, September 2010.
• The causes of disasters, nature and times of occurrence.
• What do good DRR plans (at different levels and for different sectors) look like and what are the most effective policy institutional frameworks to host and implement them

Understanding linkages
• Understanding the linkages between the other knowledge areas listed.
• Understanding the linkages between the first different knowledge areas.

Sectoral
• shelter, WASH, Health, Education, Nutrition

How to implement DRR
• Identify and incorporate DRR approaches that could enhance humanitarian responses
• how to incorporate DRR approaches
• Understand the reason why and how to incorporate DRR into humanitarian response

Capacity assessment and building
• Understanding of capacity and vulnerability Understanding of putting together advocacy strategies Appreciation of the amount saved by effective DRR
• capacity development
• Capacities to analyse, prioritise and evaluate
• Local capacity and areas of resilience (i.e. build on the strengths that exist)
• Accountability and capacity building to ensure that there is motivation and adequate resources to effectively respond to crises.
• Capacity building
• To know the skills and capacity of the actors.
• Who, what and where. Who has capacity, what capacity do they have, and where do they have capacity
• Institutional capacity building
• Capacity building (so you can train as many stakeholders from the country on DRR concepts and skills (ex: first aid for camp management team, DRR-building techniques for labourers)

Relief development continuum
• Phases of disaster response and longer-term strategic thinking
• The ODI document on system failure also identifies a key area: the relationship between long term development planning and emergency response and the flexibility between them
• Continuum of recovery
• Basic understanding of concepts and the difference between DRM, DRR, preparedness, risk reduction etc.
• Need to be able to step away from the day to day madness and allow time for longer term activities. Often, we start wrong and cannot turn it around, and then we end wrong

Cross cutting issues including gender and environment
• Knowledge of how to identify and work with vulnerable populations before an emergency, and especially how to support them to advocate for greater attention to safety and protection.
• Gender mainstreaming Disable Set up plan (contingency) Sphere guidelines Humanitarian charter Coordination among Gov, UN and INGOs, NGOs and local authorities
• Cross-cutting themes in DRR such as gender (including gender based violence, gender roles and implications, access to resources and services), HIV/Aids, livelihoods security.
• Understanding of environmental impacts and implications
• Understanding of ecology as a system (ecological-type systems theory - impact of activities) e.g. what the negative impact would be if a project is funded to build roads into the jungle in Aceh, so that the communities can expand their agricultural activities
• Participation, accountability, needs analysis - all incorporating gender equity programming
• An integrated approach to DRR - involving all stakeholders from community, local, national and international.
• Protection mainly child protection, and sexual gender based violence, coordination with other partners, HIV/AIDS, and the vulnerable groups.
• Affected groups and livelihoods

**International relief system and coordination**

• International relief system
• Coordination with other stakeholders
• Establishing relationships between agencies, and protocols/procedures/roles for within an emergency
• Social: Communications, negotiating, networking
• Knowing the appeal process.
• Understanding development actors.
• Liaising with the Host Nation authorities directly, and/or through National Embassies/Missions
• Liaise with other IOs and NGOs as appropriate to avoid overlap, duplication, "avoid treading on other parties toes"

**Access and government liaison**

• Negotiating access
• Liaise with Security/ police services to ensure you comply with local laws and Customs.
• Liaison with local authorities
• Knowing how to lobby support with authorities and partner agencies in the area
• Advocacy topic: the governments role and responsibilities on DRR into humanitarian response
• Understanding the complexity of such incorporations; obtaining buy-in from local authorities.
• Changing climate adaptation, social protection mechanisms, hunger safety nets, risk financing and risk spreading, national strategies for DRR - so that they work alongside government goals and policy - that then filter down to community level practice. Governments are key players. The DRR agenda is a good way to start a positive relationship with government.

**Mitigation**

• Mitigation activities
• Mitigation works

**Empowerment and accountability**

• Having sufficient knowledge and confidence to empower people to tackle the physical risk reduction and to convey that the purpose of response skills and provisions are to bridge the gap...they aren't the core strategy!
• Full understanding from the beneficiaries' side as to why, how and what are being installed/improved/included.
• Community mobilisation
• Working with people and listen to their needs and aspirations and ideas

**Preparedness**

• Early warning systems and community preparedness (when possible).
• Incorporating community level preparedness.
• Preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery should be looked at holistically rather than 'response' as an isolated element. The cluster approach and humanitarian reform to focus on a coordinated approach.
• Response units, emergency preparedness, etc: anticipate logistics constraints

**Impacts**

• Real impact of DRR

**Other**
• Chronic problems which are slow onset problems and here it’s harder to know what to do at what at what point.
• Changing climate adaptation, social protection mechanisms, hunger safety nets, risk financing and risk spreading. 
  note: organisational systems also have a knowledge component
• Standard of housing, security and services
• Systems for developing DRR strategies to address the individual needs of disaster affected communities
• Institutional implication (National Government and local municipalities): promotion of DRR budget in National system, municipalities, etc.  Role of the public works ministry, policemen, firemen, health workers, army, etc.
• Supporting and developing coping mechanisms
• Scientific, engineering, environmental, health, education and development sectors.
• Ideally there should be electoral/donor consequences of a failure to meet to needs.
• Cost effectiveness
• How to include DRR design/construction
• Understanding the situation and the people affected and where from it has occurred.
• Dealing with small disasters in post conflict situations. Developing a culture of community resilience to disasters.
• Pragmatic and understandable concepts and approaches
• To be aware of the importance of DRR in any humanitarian response.
• Involve beneficiaries and other partners towards achieving a common goal of minimizing risks from a disaster
• Requires technical expertise in governmental contact and negotiations etc
• Requires NGO staffers with town planning, agricultural, industrial and SME expertise as well as infrastructure knowledge and and and ... this is just not possible currently with most NGO’s.
• DRR is a future strategy and fits in with recovery planning & resilience building, not the initial humanitarian response (e.g. after plastic sheeting & timber for emergency shelters what follows is appropriate land-tenure durable materials, construction training. The same applies to food assistance - security - livelihoods; etc.)
• Understanding and properly using concepts (DRR, disaster preparedness, disaster management etc.) for research, policy purposes and furthering knowledge
• Having a framework for understanding the scope of DRR at all levels of intervention: - assessment and planning - physical and environmental risk reduction - response
Q13. Please describe what you feel are any areas of weakness regarding current DRR approaches in humanitarian work.

**Relief / development**

- The problem with DRR is that it is seen as a humanitarian issue, but that it should also be seen as a development process. There are still shocks and stresses to respond to, but DRR needs to spread more into development work.
- Aid workers involved in humanitarian response tend to have limited understanding of broader DRR, and what they can do during an emergency response to integrate elements of DRR.
- DRR is not effectively mainstreamed as it is seen as something which is complicated, takes a long time and will hinder the quick implementation of humanitarian response.
- Humanitarian work very often focuses on response, and there is a lack of articulation between development programs and humanitarian response.
- DRR has failed to effectively sell itself to the humanitarian actors, and even donor support tends to sit outside of the humanitarian teams.
- Medium- to long-term risks aren't usually taken into account when humanitarian response programmes are designed and implemented (especially the case with emergency response) - there is a severe lack of understanding of environmental issues and their interaction with humanitarian interventions among project/programme managers - often there is little use made of existing structures/coping mechanisms. There is a tendency within the aid community to try and transplant 'best practice' and 'lessons learnt' from other countries/programmes, without fully investigating the local context.
- DRR approaches often assume that populations of concern understand the risks and would like to completely alleviate them. In some cases, Disasters are used as tools of trade to attract humanitarian aid year in year out. It therefore means that some populations of concern 'benefit from such disasters! It thus imperative for humanitarian interventions to understand the significance of such disasters to the affected populations and demonstrate to them life without the effects of such disasters. This demonstration is supposed to show the benefits of DRR vis-a-vis the benefits accrued from playing victim to the same disasters.
- DRR is more linked to development. The development/humanitarian divide is counterproductive. More and more the two responses run in parallel or complement each other in the same geographic areas.
- The gulf between humanitarian and development thinking and practice.
- DRR as an add-on to humanitarian work.
- Humanitarian responses are too short-term and lack the human, organizational, programmatic and financial resources to carry out DRR. Most humanitarian response focuses on activities related to providing supplies - not building local capacities, which should be the cornerstone of an effective DRR). Impossible to do by way of 6-month emergency projects.
- I am afraid that DRR as expression is misleading when we speak about humanitarian work. There are several types of disasters (natural, political, economic etc.) and they can only be handled well when the society is healthy.
- DRR is sadly often identified on the field as a reactive field in which many stakeholders perceive their role as a matter of disaster preparedness and rapid response, rather than of finding long-term solutions to mitigate the effects of climate change. By their very nature, disasters have traditionally been associated with humanitarian assistance. This results in an emphasis on providing immediate relief rather than investing in long-term DRR activities. This misinterpretation of the concept of DRR, and its subsequent misapplication are key impediments to a DRR approach becoming mainstream in many humanitarian contexts.
- In emergency response, most of the NGOs ignore this vital sector (DRR).
- The urgency of emergency response limits the possibility of working on sustainable activities for DRR. Funding constraints
- Lacking mechanisms for spreading of simple live-saving messages
- Construction of mitigation measures which do not mitigate disaster risk (frequently bridges and roads). These contribute to livelihoods which can arguably assist communities when disaster strikes, but then, why not just do a livelihood program?
- Disaster cycle need to invest in building better
- Scrambling for relief supplies in the aftermath of disaster is a weakness. Use of pre-positioning can avoid this because you have the time to research and procure the most suitable materials and supplies.
- Some 1 year programmes try to incorporate DRR thinking that would take 5 years to do effectively.
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- DRR is long term endeavour. To have it integrated into a programme. It needs to be multi sector and start from stakeholders. DRR is in-depth. Longer term programming. The basic weakness is the time stand and being overly ambitious with objectives.
- The problem with DRR is that it is seen as a humanitarian issue, but that it should also be seen as a development process. There are still shocks and stresses to respond to, but DRR needs to spread more into development work. -
- Organisations have policies and guidance on DRR but they are not used during emergencies;
- too much on humanitarian response and too little on development and how DRR needs to be incorporated

Cross cutting issues
- Compartmentalized approaches to DRR treat it as separate programming vs. a cross-cutting theme
- Cross cutting issues are not successfully incorporated (for example; HIV) National Action Plan of DRR is still separated with Inter Agency Contingency Plan
- Lack of systematic consideration of gender (as above) and other cross-cutting issues including age (older people, child protection and adolescents) - needs, vulnerabilities AND capacities - and the contribution doing so makes to efficient and effective programming.
- DRR is not mainstreamed into programs
- Ghettoization of DRR into a programme area. Instead we need managers and technical specialists to be able to use DRR principles in their work, rather than going further down the track of having DRR as a specialism. In fact, DRR requires a whole range of technical skills (e.g. hydro-engineering, civil engineering/construction, agricultural techniques, geology/hydro-geology, epidemiology and so on, and so on), so it is unlikely that an individual can have mastery of all of these. Instead, the principles, methods, ideas and approaches need to be used by managers and specialists to inform their programme design and approaches. As a further result, DRR projects often take place in locations distant from other humanitarian interventions and projects, reinforcing the idea that they are separate and need to be treated as such. This results in missed opportunities for positive linkages between programmes.
- Often just a tick box exercise - which doesn’t lead to change in the way programmes are actually run. Without a whole system approach, DRR will often feel and look like an add-on, pushing for attention within humanitarian programmes
- In my opinion, DRR is taken too much as a ‘separate sector’ although this trend seems to shift. I advocate for a stronger livelihoods approach towards food security and welfare integrating DRR and other sectors to make the humanitarian and development interventions more holistic.
- Support coping mechanisms of vulnerable groups, e.g., elderly, children, women and persons with disability

Expertise and specific technical approaches
- DRR experts are not frequently involved from the beginning of a humanitarian crisis;
- Areas of incorporation of DDR with focus on agriculture and water resources to ensure food security.
- DRR experts are not frequently involved from the beginning of a humanitarian crisis;

Prioritisation of DRR and theory practice gap
- Organisations have policies and guidance on DRR but they are not used during emergencies;
- It is not seen as a priority!
- Firm understanding of DDR
- People see it as an add-on
- Using emergency response factor as an excuse for not undertaking a comprehensive disaster risk assessment of the affected areas
- National and local authorities tend to pay only lip service to DRR in order to attract major funding for staff positions and other institutional support. Enforceable policies are often lacking.
- No single classic textbook like Sphere (as far as I know)
- It is not seen as a priority!
- Gap between theory and practice
- Too theoretical - Should be linked to classic emergency responses
- Lack of commitment in humanitarian aid community towards DRR and resilient communities.
- Lack of knowledge (experience, existing or new tools, etc.)
- Lack of information
- Lack of mandate
- There is too much resting on laurels and complacency in current DRR approaches in humanitarian work.
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- Scientific non needs based concepts
- Too many agencies developing DRR-related materials but no one using it.
- Need for more evidence of how governments can prioritise development and humanitarian investments that will make citizens safer and more resilient.
- Doing DRR in single sector approach doesn’t lead to quality outcomes. Project approach that is multi-sector is better.
- I have this sneaking suspicion that it may be viewed by some as yet another hot-topic that we all need to become qualified in that, given a little exposure, could easily be incorporated into our toolkits of techniques.
- Too much focus on a narrow range of risks - challenges are where DRR is driven/funded from. Stakeholder analysis is not thorough enough.
- Can be made overly complex resources exist on analysing risks - however the impacts of interventions on reducing risks is less well understood / quantified most actors are slowly changing their mentality of quick response to more sustainable solutions - practically how can we achieve this?
- Not sexy or accessible - those in response feel it is a scientific job which they can’t contribute to
- Lack of clarity about the meaning of DRR, and thus how DRR concepts translate into action.
- We don’t bridge the gap between scientific/technical and indigenous knowledge as we should. We don’t learn enough specifics about the basics (e.g. disaster–resilient construction) and use our interventions as educational experiences
- Research based activities
- Remains on conceptual level;

**Standards indicators and approaches**

- There are no minimum standards set that programmers need to achieve. The field approach appears to be that if the community is better off now than it was as a result of a basic program intervention then that is sufficient and the box can be checked.
- Different donors have their favourite DRR approaches which cannot always be implemented Multiple humanitarian organisations with varying levels of DRR incorporation into their work; additional standards needed in addition to Sphere.
- Although there are guidelines and tool and methods which have been made available by the IFRC, many humanitarian NGOs are not aware of them or do not apply them. Furthermore, there is not enough collaboration between players on the ground in case of an emergency.
- Creation of new content instead of exchange of existing tools/materials
- No proper indicators for some organisation.

**Cultural issues and contextual knowledge**

- Lack of cultural sensitivity
- Often humanitarian agencies may arrive in a new country in order to respond to a disaster, but have no prior knowledge of the context, in terms of baseline conditions, likely outcomes, community resilience, etc. They tend to act before this knowledge is gathered, resulting in mistakes recurring in responses.
- Lack of context understanding - lack of time / resources / tools in projects to carry on proper participatory diagnoses
- Humanitarian organisations had already accumulated knowledge of potential risks by region or by country: it is time to capitalise on this knowledge and start working on preventive measures (as opposed to reacting to disasters after it happens).

**Differing understandings and strategies**

- I believe there is a disconnect between and within many Governments caused by different parts of Government pursuing different strategies towards disaster mitigation. This is not an easy area for the humanitarian community to criticise since donor Governments would clearly not warm to such criticism but somehow the problem needs to be tackled. Many of the problems in DDR flow from the above. For instance the following are of note: difficulties in coordination, different mandates, lack of resources in some areas but too much in others, political considerations determining decisions etc.
- Understanding strategic capacity
- DRR remains quite abstract and difficult to assess the real impact
- Time and willingness of humanitarian actors to move beyond the rhetoric and start actually doing it - understanding among actors about what specifically "incorporating DRR" means to them and the work they do. how should they change/adapt what they do
Access to information and locations
• Accessing to the affected areas.
• Lack of information and Data.

Management
• Mismanagement of the DRR.
• Implementation of DRR plans by the CSOs and government.
• Lack of sense of analysis and prioritization
• Sometimes it takes too long to decide and then less time remains for implementation and action.
• Inadequate planning and at times uncoordinated movement of both state and non-state actors leading to duplication of initiative
• Many small humanitarian actors do not have the critical organizational and technical skill sets to implement DRR effectively. Their efforts frequently take the forms of seminars and workshops that never result in practical application.

Funding
• Having not been on a recent deployment, but from personnel experience of humanitarian agencies - allocation of funding and usage of funds. Lots of paperwork before actually doing the work, people want to see results not wait for paper - it slows down the tempo of the reactive approach.
• Lack of budget
• Lack of funds for "peace-time" work; the funding tap only gets turned on once the disaster has already struck.
• Budget support is often lacking.
• It's often seen as being expensive and therefore not implemented or it introduces new technology that cannot be fully adapted/adopted/owned by the beneficiary community.
• Donor driven
• Funding limited to only the emergency and no link to rehabilitation and development

Staffing
• The weakness is being employing people with no training skill, or knowledge in humanitarian work experience.
• Aid workers involved in humanitarian response tend to have limited understanding of broader DRR, and what they can do during an emergency response to integrate elements of DRR
• Inexperienced staff are trying to implement high technical programs
• Too theoretical - too computer based. The (often young and highly qualified) practitioners often follow a procedure rather than intelligently thinking outside the box.

Coordination
• Cluster approach works only when there has been prior thought, discussion and agreement within the country
• Integrating DRR into the different sectors of the Cluster System is an ongoing process still needing development.
• Inter agency communication and coordination still needs development.
• Lack of coordination between actors arriving on the field for disaster response (ex: Tsunami - 2004, earthquake Haiti 2010)
• Coordination with other institutions; usually it is not clear who should lead
• UN Clusters seem to lack the impartiality, power, authority, geographical access or resources to lead responses on the ground and this may also relate to the same issues when it comes to preparedness and ensuring that each country can meet minimum standards and has a real capacity to respond.
• As above - there is no link between the initial emergency response and recovery planning & resilience building (e.g. de-mining organisations create grid maps of all villages that they have cleared, but these maps are not used in re-construction planning by other NGOs/UN cluster coordination).
• Lack of motivation among partners. DRR is mostly an exercise UNDP lead, with the support of the WB. Either organizations have very little know how/expertise in terms of “hands on” emergency preparedness and response.

Risk
• Risk assessments; Risk mapping; Risks scenarios.

Conflict
• Conflict: - Ok in reasonably stable environment but in conflict the context can rapidly change.
• We haven’t done enough to bring together the experiences of natural hazards impact, man- made hazards, and violence impacts, so the relevance isn’t always clear.
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- A narrow focus on natural disaster risks - conflict and risks from underlying inequalities are also important.

**Local capacity and community engagement**
- Topism (top down / outside) approaches being prioritised / forced on local populations
- Do rely too often on local capacity and partnerships without ensuring (or obtaining) real commitment from local partner (sustainability in question)
- mapping exercises are focussed on GIS and other tools, while the community does not even understand the approach nor the outcomes and are not involved
- Agencies/organisations need to work more with local government and grass-root organisations to understand 'real' needs and constraints and develop DRR capacities.
- We don't involve enough the local actors, population and victims (often the same population) in our assessment and response.
- They Ignore the role of beneficiaries and don't see them as capable people
- Training communities usually is not effective.
- Knowledge on working with community participation in humanitarian is not fully developed.
- If it becomes a programme for the benefit of the organisation and not the ultimate beneficiaries
- Too little emphasis on ‘capacities’, hand in hand with a too ready tendency to brand certain populations (women in particular) as ‘vulnerable’ thus also undermining the usefulness of the very notion of vulnerability
- Local knowledge for DRR is often not considered
- Sustainability Integration to the community's development
- Too much emphasis on social activities that do not lead to recovery and also use of rudimentary technology in addressing DRR
- That everybody think that we are, when something happens, we are a super hero just come and resolve everything. We help persons to learn how to help themselves.
- Top down approach; humanitarians telling communities how to “build back better”

**Scalability**
- Scalability: - ok at community le el - but provincial / national / scalability?
- Failure to really scale up interventions to a level that it matches the needs in disaster prone area involving stakeholders as well as beneficiaries in the whole process, putting high expectaions ,

**Engagement with governments and authorities**
- Cooperation with local authorities and logistic might a challenge.
- We don't sufficiently work with existing state, civic society and community structures to support them, and develop their capacity, ESP due to hum work experience in fragile states. Often big divide between intl NGOs and local partners
- Lacking inclusion of institutional stakeholders

**Monitoring, evaluation, accountability**
- Poor or non-existent monitoring
- Purely quantitative monitoring focusing on number of people trained, number of items constructed, but not on whether people have changed behaviour, used and maintained the construction properly etc...
- Quality Applications and Monitoring & Evaluation of them
- Accountability

**Other**
- “It's not our job” A lack of concern - or perhaps turning a blind eye - to the adverse effects of humanitarian work e.g. distorting local economies or environmental impacts (what does happen to all that engine oil, dead batteries and used tyres from the LandCruisers?)
- Early warning systems based in people (not in technology!)
- General public awareness is low. DRR and CCA are becoming more and more urgent issues. Therefore basic understanding of these issues needs to be included in the school education system. That will ensure that future generation understands these issues. That will lead to better results when such projects are implemented as they will not need further convincing of the need for this work.
- Reliance on NGO's to do this work.
- Focus on construction of mitigation measures (bridges, roads etc)
• Poor site selection not focussing on the most vulnerable with regards to disaster risk. Site selection influenced by personal biases of government, staff involved favouritism towards certain ethnic groups, laziness...
• Example from Haiti, the bottleneck at the airport caused huge delays to assistance. Certain DRR issues related to logistics/access need to be prioritised.
Q14. Are there any other issues/concerns/ recommendations you would like to raise with or offer to RedR?

Relief / development
- Failure of emergency and development programming on providing changes on extreme vulnerability/poverty
- DRR after a humanitarian disaster can probably be more easy addressed as DRR before a disaster, due to funding
- add ‘development’ to ‘DRR approaches in humanitarian work’
- There must be an understanding that DRR is essentially a developmental issue. Preventing a child from suffering malnutrition costs a $1 a day; it cost $80/day to treat malnutrition. Thousands of lives could be saved through better preparedness and developmental work. Tackling DRR on to the end of a disaster response is bolting the door after the horse has bolted. A one-day workshop to thrash out these ideas would be more valuable.
- A definition of DRR and its “fit” within humanitarian response is important so that actors have a common, shared understanding of the term & the opportunity. For me it is small “d”, big “RR”. Disaster can come in many & any form but Risk Reduction is a tangible tool & methodology that people can be trained in and can practically build into humanitarian response plans and recovery/resilience programme plans.
- To build sustainably you need to be in a durable situation –not always possible
- In five days you can give that livelihood lens to response. In Haiti for example - a huge natural disaster - saving lives is your priority and is paramount. But you can do this in a way that also enhances resilience at the same time.

Why DRR
- Comparative financial advantage of DRR approaches

Cross cutting issues
- Gender perspective and analysis should be included in all related activities to ensure effective humanitarian response
- Include a strong gender component in all training, research etc.

Government
- Advocacy to Gov is needed to have set aside contingency budget to work DRR and response related activities
- Dual Mandates  Encourage community resilience  Recognized private sector involvement
- Problem of restrictions of access and difficulty of coordination of the response with local authorities
- In many contexts a top-down decision-making approach severely hampers local governments throughout the country in implementing a comprehensive disaster management strategy. The multiplication of DRR actors also leads to problems of co-ordination as local DRR initiatives are inappropriately integrated into the national plan.
- need some degree of enforcement -  e.g. work with government

Training
- Training should be done along with the clusters (somehow) so that the NGOs who are newly equipped to mainstream DRR are backed by the clusters in accessing funding. Also ensure that the DRR tools which are being introduced are acceptable to the donors in country and to the government. Basically there is a need to ensure wider buy-in rather than simply training and handing over a CD of tools.
- If you can get programme people into DRR thinking than DR is more effective.  By getting operations and program staff to build up an emergency response structure out of the principles of Business continuity -see BS 25999, then operations provide the support needed for the DR to be faster and more efficient. Emergency response planning becomes a significant DRR achievement. But it needs to be structured.
- Is there a way to get this training out to national authorities?
- Invite experienced people to share their experiences.
- There does need to be some communication of common technical concerns or issues in Disaster Risk Reduction, but the real gains will come if RedR is able to communicate the skills and mindset necessary to make the right kind of analysis/evaluation of a situation or activity and see the possible impacts of a proposed intervention. Given that, suitable interventions can be proposed/developed by those responsible. It’s more important for people to learn how to approach a problem from this perspective and understand the complexities and impacts in a situation than to understand specifics about e.g. approaches to construction in cyclone prone areas (not saying it’s not important, but that is technical specifics, rather than a general approach).
- Need for DRR trainings to train in the same messages. Sharing training materials would be positive!
- DRR is currently the fashionable thing with donors; it would be good to seek their input to any planned training.
- If an employee was sent onto a RedR DRR course, she would want that person to come away and be able to: explain how their agency could contribute to longer term DRR strategies, do a capacity analysis of the
government, know 4-5 indicators to study for the above analysis, have creative ideas about with whom to partner  
(not just govt...cub scouts, universities).

- There is a dearth of DRR training more generally - a LOT of the people across the development and humanitarian community come into DRR from another area, e.g. education, livelihoods, or academic risk-related areas. But there is no consolidated training on DRR - just the plethora of readings that could be done. Which makes it very difficult to build a career or identify a base from which to develop DRR or CCA expertise? Could REDR fill that gap too??
- Capitalise on what is already existing in terms of training
- Will share IFRC Key Messages consultation version within next couple of weeks. Also template for a Household Family Disaster Plan....
- Some very good e-learning tools have been produced by CARE;
- ADPC has long experience with providing training on DRR. It is not a problem of lack of training material available; it’s ensuring it reaches the right people.
- Development DRR training material for incorporating DRR into humanitarian response MUST be done in collaboration with the main users and particularly some of the bigger players, i.e. Oxfam, CARE, WVI, etc.
- What are you going to do within 5 days? Should be incorporated with EHP. Might be too similar
- Need for RedR to design training resources and material that complements and does not duplicate the massive quantity of material already existing on this topic.
- Please ensure that your technical staff are psychologically prepared to work in this field. Sending the “wrong” staff to implement these programmes to maintain political correctness will certainly subvert your aspirations.
- The training module have a hands on training with simulations real emergance scenarios

Other resources
- NRC colleagues working with Camp Management have developed and interesting coaching manual / hand-book that includes a "participatory sphere of influence exercise" that could be useful when consulting affected communities as part of DRR.
- It will be great to include in the training the recommendation of UNICEF "The School is not an emergency shelter" The work with children in schools about DRR can be highly productive
- Maybe include some basic standards for DRR into the SPHERE guidelines...

Evidence base
- To collect more information, findings and lessons learned from affected areas by Disaster all over the world and use it as guidelines in designing the course of DDR.

Information sharing
- Fostering an ethos of timely information sharing is critical; with regards to rapid assessments (which often determine the scale and focus of an agency’s response); results are shared very reluctantly if at all, due to embarrassment over poor methodologies.

Funding
- The cost of DRR programming is often prohibitive.
- Funding - how is funding specific to DRR implemented - e.g. which donors fund DRR activities and how. There are seldom calls for proposal for DRR activities in response - need for it to be institutionalised / integrated into other proposals

Other
- Be wary of following the latest trends in the sector.
- Whether In the field or working with Ministers and Heads of State - youth is at a severe disadvantage, grey hairs are effective aids to negotiating!
- Capacity development of national partners often relies on generic tools. Not seen very good methodologies for identifying capacity gaps in existing provision. This is important and should be inspectoral.
- E.g. using wealthy / influential members of society to champion DRR / make it fashionable - e.g. Make DRR houses the cool thing to live in.
- NGO should be better aware of perceptions of their work and the impact (other than immediate relief) that NGO have made in the country/region of their presence. Perception of one NGO influences perception of the whole humanitarian systems and it already have a strong influence on our work.
- The politics of humanitarian response need to be more understood and exposed so that we the practitioners don’t feel surprised and dismayed by the appalling behaviour of some senior UN staff when purporting to respond to humanitarian emergencies as humanitarians (rather than as politicians - people more concerned with pleasing authority and progressing their careers).
• establish another kind of organisational group that specializes in DRR ...
• for all programmes, an active decision is required on whether to implement DRR components
• Teaching local communities on fire-fighting, Search and Rescue and first aid is an essential component
• drivers for the future - there is rapid change in relation to climate, population growth, urbanisation, vulnerable sites, poverty, environmental degradation

Case studies
• Case studies of good and bad DRR practices would be very useful
• How does Japan do it?
• Good examples: messages in schools - if water goes out tsunami is coming, hide under school desks if earthquake.

Risk
• Need to better use risk analysis in understanding DRR - e.g. engineering has been used in concrete design since the 70's

Land and property
• Land and properly is a key issue - people need ownership to invest - many of the most vulnerable areas are slums / often squatted areas where there is a reduced incentive to invest. Often the only available land is the most vulnerable land

Resilience and Community engagement
• Resilience - need to embed/institutionalise/enforce
• Local knowledge is important.
• Communities being able to take part in the assessment process.
• Double flow communication is important in DDR.
• Our programmes are very weak at getting feedback from communities we help. This is important for impacting resilience.
• Communities being able to take part in the assessment process.