

UNITED NATIONS DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME
(UNDP)
Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (BCPR)
Disaster Reduction Unit (DRU)

(short version)
Local Level Risk Management
Draft

15 March 2006

E. Pluut

List of content

1. Introduction
2. Context
3. Conceptual approach
4. Methodology

5. Synergies between local development and risk reduction
6. Risk Management seen as a process and not as a product
7. Participation, appropriation, and sustainability
8. Transverse and integral nature of risk management
9. Local management within a regional and national framework

Annexes

- I Bibliography
- II List with acronyms
- III Description of projects

1 Introduction

There is a clear niche for UNDP to strengthen local capacities progressively to reduce disaster risk as part of the sustainable development process. Building on the wealth of knowledge already accumulated through years of Local Level Risk Management experience, BCPR/DRU has embarked in a global project to extract lessons learnt and best practices from past and ongoing initiatives, to derive general principles, tools and methodologies to transfer knowledge across continents. The project's objective is to contribute to disaster risk reduction by addressing its root causes at the local level and ultimately by mainstreaming Local Level Risk Management needs and priorities in the national development strategies, plans and programmes. The objective of this paper is to provide examples of good practices for Local Level Risk Management (LLRM). The audience of this (shortened) paper are UNDP staff in the field and partners interested in LLRM. The full version of the paper is in draft form.

For the purpose of this global analysis, the following working definition of Local Level Risk Management will be applied:

A social process through which society manages to reduce the levels of disaster risk and foresee and control the emergence of new risks, through organisational and institutional structures, individual participation and motivation.¹

2 Context²

Most of the African, Asian, Latin American and the Caribbean countries are prone to numerous large-scale disasters, as well as a growing number of persistent small and medium scale disasters. These small and medium scale events, cumulative accounting for very significant losses, and indicators of ongoing risk accumulation, tend to be recurrent and have to be dealt with by local authorities or families, often without support or even recognition from the national level.

Communities are often faced with the consequences of national policies, regional and global trends that have an impact on their environment and increase their vulnerability to disasters. They are the first lines of response to events of a localised nature and have the potential to better recognise and address disaster risk accumulation in their respective habitat. The importance of the active participation of the local population has been widely recognised and efforts have been systematically made to strengthen local capacities for disaster preparedness and response. Less consideration has been given to increase primary risk-management capacities: identifying and reducing hazards, reducing vulnerability and increasing social resilience.

Local level preparedness, early warning systems and risk reduction have been promoted by many international organizations and national institutions and community-based organizations following recommendations from the International Decade for National Disaster Reduction.

3 Conceptual Approach²

LLRM is a process that involves geographical areas and actors that transcend the strictly defined political/administrative boundaries of a municipality or of a community. It entails activities carried out in an area defined in space by similar natural and physical environment, similar hazard and risk exposure or common experience of disasters and common concerns or hopes regarding the reduction of disaster risk. It is not the territorial extension that defines neither the "local level" nor its political delimitations. A river basin may include one or several local authorities (municipalities). It would be of little impact to consider local risk management in only one of these municipalities. In the context of risk management, thus, "Local Level" may have a rather extensive territorial implication.

An ideal scenario for local level risk management is when it is fully integrated and adopted by the local actors themselves, with or without participation of external actors. In such a situation ownership and understanding of the root causes of risk is likely to develop capacities and sustainable actions, and

¹ Working definition utilised in UNDP-sponsored project CAM/99/001 "Regional Risk Management Project for Central America"

promote risk management as a cross-cutting issue in the local development process. Effective LLRM can promote democratic governance and those democratic processes that empower local actors to take an active part in the effective design, implementation and assessment of their own development efforts. It therefore also contributes to building social capital. A local level risk management strategy and process considers the community members and their organisations as the main assets for development.

Disaster risk is in many cases the consequence of unsustainable or inadequate development practices, where a large part of the population is excluded from the opportunities and benefits of development. LLRM should therefore not be limited to corrective or protective measures but should also include measures to avoid new risks through future development. It aims at avoiding a dependency on external actors to intervene in risk management, and to develop capacity and make advances in poverty reduction, improvement of the quality of life, and the population's security.

Throughout the document several expressions indicating local level are used, in the Asian countries reference is made to village and ward/cluster committees, and district level, whereas in Latin America municipalities, municipal level and community level are used.

4 Methodology

UNDP sponsored projects were reviewed in Asia, Latin America, the Caribbean and Europe to assess the potentials and limitations for UNDP to programme for Local Level Risk Management initiatives in the context of the country cooperation frameworks of the most disaster-prone countries. The present document is based on the global review methodology, the reports of the countries reviewed, and on other UNDP documentation relevant for Local level risk management.

The reports of the project reviewed were written by Zubair Murshed, Gustavo Wolchez-Chaux, Xavier Moya and Mihallaq Spirollari. The reviewed projects are: Orissa Disaster Management Project and Community Based Rainwater Harvesting (in drought affected areas) in India, Upgrading Disaster Management Capacity in Nepal, Transitional Recovery Support to Flood Disaster in South and South West in Sri Lanka, Risk management in La Paz in Bolivia, Creation of a Municipal System for Disaster Prevention and Response (SIMPAD) in Colombia, Radar Project in Jamaica, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, Support for Local Risk Management in six Municipalities in Nicaragua, Local Risk Management in the peninsula of Yucatan in Mexico, and Disaster Risk Management in Albania. A description of each project can be found in annex III. A complete overview of all documentation reviewed is available in the bibliography (annex I) at the end of the document.

Good practices for LLRM

5 Synergies between local development and risk management

Projects that combine risk management and reduction with (an increase of) income-generating activities and thus have an evident impact on the living conditions of the target communities.

Risk and its management make little sense if it is not seen as a dimension of development planning. They are a component of development processes and practices, and cannot be separated from developmental frameworks, processes, objectives and planning. Sustainability of development is impossible in the absence of adequate levels of security for investments and practices (development requires low levels of current or potential risks), and the vulnerability that defines the level of disaster risk of a locality, population or community is frequently built on or derives from prevailing conditions from every-day or chronic risk (unemployment, lack of income, malnutrition, health problems, substance abuse, family and social violence, etc.).¹

Ideally the approach is to begin with central development issues and then consider disaster risk, its reduction and control as a way of complementing development objectives and promoting more integral, secure and sustainable development.¹ Options for spreading the practice at the local level are greater when the projects promoted start by dealing with local development issues and integrate considerations of risk, its anticipation or reduction. The chances of the risk-disaster-development relationship being understood

and taken into account increases considerably when the local actors involved in the project are actors in the development process as such.¹

The principal focus is not simply protecting existing development from disaster loss, but to look at risk generating conditions that form part of the existing development process and create more adequate conditions for promoting social and human development and livelihood resilience which in themselves turn out to be disaster risk reducing mechanisms. Thus establishing how the reduction of the risk factors will enhance development, but also how existing development models lead to risk in the areas. This requires greater investments and time, and is not so easily adjusted to the demands of the agencies financing projects that directly address disaster issues.¹

UNDP is globally and nationally in a unique position, due to its mandate to facilitate the development of methodologies that emphasis upon developing collaborative efforts among the three key players, i.e. the government, the civil society and the communities.⁶

5.1 Mobilizing at community level: The municipality should be the principal leader and supporter of local development and risk management structures.¹

- Building of Technology Demonstration units to promote safe but cost-saving building construction in the villages Public awareness materials on disaster preparedness and mitigation, including safe-building-constructions material are prominently displayed on boards. The construction of these TDUs promotes other community members to use similar construction technologies to avoid further impact on their houses during future disasters.³
- The villages having committees are better prepared in the event of disaster to evacuate people to safer areas, thus better prepared to save lives and property.³
- Restoration of Common Property Resources in a few villages in India to provide income to the villagers and minimize the land and water degradation. The arrangements for benefit sharing and maintenance were formulated in consultation with the village committees, thus resolving the conflict between short- and long-term interests.³
- Emphasizing on improving the perceptions of the community on the benefits of risk management to improve the daily quality of life in a direct way and not by means of a disaster.^{7 10}

5.2 Implementing development/environmental activities: The options for spreading the risk management at the local level are greater when the projects promoted start by dealing with local development issues and integrate considerations of risk and its anticipation or reduction.¹

Environmental/development activities carried out in the different countries:

India - Community-based rainwater harvesting

- Drought mitigation
- Livelihood Support for the Vulnerable Families
- Protection of CPR
- Farming activities
- Training Program on Land Fisheries
- Training on Integrated Pest Management
- Direct wage employment

Nepal - Upgrading Disaster Management Capacity

- Construction of dykes
- Seed grant

Colombia - Creation of a Municipal System for Disaster Prevention and Response

- Creation of ecological parks in the neighbourhoods
- Improvement (renovation) of housing and construction of roads, public places in high risk zones

Jamaica – Radar project

- Set up planning process with the private sector
- Process of redesigning Kingston

Yucatan - Local Risk Management in Yucatan

- Beekeeping projects and negotiating insurance for these projects

5.3 *Linking with other organizations/stakeholders: There should be no real need to create new institutions or organizations which respond to the particular requirements of risk management.*¹

- By building strong linkages and relationships between SGO-NGO/INGOs-GOs working in the district, the confidence of the local community was increased to continue income-generating and other activities, to receive technical and financial support to pursue community-led disaster mitigation activities, and raise the awareness of the local people. This also reduced and/or minimized the dependency of the local community on one development project or organization.⁴

5.4 *Contributing to Conflict resolution: Risk management providing a dialogue between different or even opposing groups*

- Contributing to Conflict Disaster Risk Management can serve as a strategic-entry-point to resolve social and political conflicts by bringing the conflict-affected-communities together. Risk management provides dialogue among different groups offering a window of opportunities to re-establish co-existence between different groups and/or with government representatives.^{7 10}
- As with many other regions in Latin America, in the Radar project area the combination of conflict and high risk zones for natural disasters cohabit, thus contributing to the vulnerability of an already vulnerable population. Due to problems of non-governability the legitimacy of the authorities is little acknowledged, and invasion of risk zones continues, communities settling on unsuitable terrain.⁹

Risk Management contributing to Conflict Resolution⁴

The experience of Jagatpur community in Chitwan district Nepal shows that natural hazard related risk management can contribute to bringing together divided communities and can contribute to reducing tensions and building consensus. This community is in an area affected by Maoist insurgency. Before the floods of 2003, Jagatpur was a divided community. The community was severely affected by the floods. Huge extensions of agricultural land were submerged by the swelling river. Almost all houses were destroyed. Given the lack of any capability to cope with this kind of situation, the community was confronted with the options of either migrating out of the area, or taking actions to avoid such disasters in the future. UNDP and other agencies provided recovery support. It was at that juncture that the community realized the benefit of working together to reduce the disaster risk. They formed a community organization, which in collaboration with external agencies started implementing disaster risk management measures. This community is now more cohesive and has built its own capacity to take concerted actions to reduce disaster risks.

UNDP is one of the few agencies able to work in this conflict prone region. In this regard, the UNDP strategy focused upon gaining the trust of Maoist insurgents and emphasis was placed on ensuring participation of all groups, parties, castes and classes in the community organizations. The most salient features of this strategy were:

- Working very closely with the deprived people;
- Equal representation of all segments of the community in organizations: castes, political parties, poor/rich, male/female
- Transparency in financial management down to the community level

6 Risk Management seen as a process and not as a product

Projects transforming from an emergency committee in to a committee that prioritizes risks, capable of correcting or transforming using its own capacities, in their own pace, stimulating cooperation and negotiation among different actors.

Risk management is achieved through the process of socially constructing and dimensioning a problem and implementing its solution, as opposed to beginning with preconceived problems, products and interventions. The process should be participatory and flexible. The following components (or phases) assist in the building of the process:

- Unmasking, understanding and awareness of risk construction processes, their concrete forms and characteristics and their relationships with local development models.
- Understanding the wide range of local level risk issues, their hierarchy and prioritization regarding the development problems of the area and information on the levels of social acceptability or unacceptability.

- Knowledge of the area's development objectives, opportunities and options and the relationship between these and present risk environments.
- Outlining of the risk reduction options taking into account the types and content of development projects and the most typical and traditional risk reduction instruments available.
- Development of intervention strategies and particular instrumental options.
- Implementation of schemes and projects.¹

Process oriented interventions require more time and resources. Financing agencies need to take into consideration that process oriented projects have a wider timescale, need more resources and greater margins of flexibility. This does not contradict obtaining tangible products, but they are defined through the process by the local actors who should be at the centre of the analysis of the problem and the selection of the intervention options. The process requires the continuously constructing and strengthening of local management structures and organizations.¹

6.1 *Establishing/strengthening existing organizations at Community level through the gradual and continuous establishment of conditions for permanent implementation of local risk management systems or structures, with the presence of the most important social local actors, including the municipality.*¹

The village committees met regularly, to discuss the issues related to the project work and to carry out household appraisals in overall food/cash/fund utilization. The villagers made their voices heard through their representatives in the committee. The transparency of the project enhanced greatly due to sharing of information on the process, downward accountability and strengthening of social audit of the inputs. The monthly meetings also allowed for the VDMC and other community members reviewing past performance, planning for forth-coming weeks and deciding on priorities. Information on current status and future projections were painted on walls at prominent places in each village in the local language.³ The VDMC included representatives of all classes, castes, and hamlets as well as women members.³

- Community capacity building through organizing community groups and training and awareness raising of broader community issues and implementation of risk reduction measures in Nepal.⁴
- The community members, who had received training under the project, in turn shared their learning with other people in the community through village level and community organizations' meetings.⁴
- The UNDP efforts (in Sri Lanka) at establishing village committees as permanent entities and making them functional through development of plans for local level risk management are a strategic contribution to institutional capacity building and in meeting the policy requirements.⁵
- An essential element for the continuity of projects is the linking with ongoing processes that existed prior to the start of the process and that continued after the ending of the project.¹⁰

Through SIMPAD a community network of 170 disaster neighbourhood committees was set up in Medellin, Colombia, consisting of volunteers who meet and strengthen their capacity in prevention, response and recovery of disasters and emergencies, within and outside their communities. The objective is the turn their neighbourhoods into safe places to live, increasing the quality of life for the whole population. In addition, the committees monitor continuously the vulnerabilities and threats of the sectors where they live, elaborate mitigation plans, and keep the population informed on dangerous situations that might occur.⁸

- Existing structures were strengthened based on zone development committees defined by geographic, political criteria and/or community unities. The interest of the population is proportional to the number of disasters experienced. Hence, it is difficult to maintain groups that only have as its function risk management - if the community is not affected within a time period the interest disappears.⁹

6.2 *Establishing Village funds: The idea of process does not contradict the notion of obtaining tangible products, au contraire, the process defines these products.*¹

- The setting up a system for financial contributions to the Village Committee utilized for village development activities, resulted in a sense of ownership of the program and the generated funds. The funds are used to maintain and manage community assets, without depending on external sources, bringing the community one step closer to building a self-reliant community in the long-run. Transparency in operating funds and food stock was the key for involvement of stakeholders.³

- The community taxes and community level income generating projects are deposited in the disaster fund. The direct involvement of community members in financial transactions helps to build trust and a sense of ownership. For the first time, the community developed a sense of common-interest, irrespective of the caste, political affiliations, or class.⁴

6.3 Strengthening existing organizations at district level: This process requires the continuous promotion and strengthening of processes, and establishes the need for legitimate, broad based consensual and highly participatory local organizations and structures.¹

- By locating the National Project Coordinator (Sri Lanka) in the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC), joint decision making was ensured, and strong institutional linkages built between the UNDP and the NDMC.⁵
- The intervention resulted in two major accomplishments: (i) the development of Disaster Management Committees (DMCs) at the district and divisional levels and (ii) the formulation of District and Divisional Disaster Preparedness and Response Plans in the five affected districts.⁵

6.4 Involving stakeholders - This process must take into account the opportunities, capacities, and resources of the zone and necessary alliances among local actors.¹

- Multi-hazard Disaster Management Plans, including the vulnerability and risk profile of the area, detailed inventory of resources, maps showing the location of shelters, alternative routes, weak embankments, standard operating procedures, and preparedness and response checklist need to be developed at different levels (village, regional). Involving local institutions in the project implementation helps in institutionalization disaster risk management into the government system, as ownership is developed right from the start of the intervention.³
- UNDP has followed a good partnership approach, functioning as a facilitating and enabling agency, recognizing the disaster risk management space of other agencies and working together with them. UNDP provides support to NGOs to liaise with the government and the NDMC.⁵
- The identification of hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities needs to be done through inclusion of technical teams to ensure a thorough scientific and social process and not only through consultations with the district and division level officials (usually administrators without technical knowledge).⁵
- Political will of the administrators is a decisive factor for the success of risk management, and can generate political and social performance. Risk management occupies an important position of the political agenda of the municipal government, and is included in the election plans of the candidates occupying public posts.⁷
- Coordination between the different actors is extremely important. Project need to take into consideration, from the formulation to implementation, the perception and priorities of the local actors. The projects should not compete but strengthen the processes. The achievements of the project need to be immediately included.^{9,10}

7 Participation, appropriation, and sustainability

Inter-municipal projects within areas of common, ecological, environmental and development characteristics involving the different stakeholders in all planning and implementation activities

Participation and appropriation are key factors in the sustainability of management processes. Local actors' participation in the design of the project proposals increases the chances for success of an intervention. If this is only limited possible in the development of a baseline project, it should be corrected during the project process.¹

The process by which knowledge and understanding of the local dynamics and the relationship between risk and development patterns are achieved is important, using participatory, integral diagnostic methods and the drawing up of local risk maps with full local participation. The analytical process should include the widest possible local representation. Participation should be considered as a fundamental component in the social construction of knowledge and the achievement of consensus through discussion sessions, training options and the exchange of ideas on causes and solutions. The participation and appropriation of the local management process is easier when the project operates through already existing organizations

linked to the issues of development. It is more feasible to work with permanent organizations, focusing on permanent problems or at least relating to permanent and visible problems in the locality, than to create structures around problems which are less palpable and apparently not of permanent concern as is the case with the problem of disaster and disaster risk.¹

Appropriation can be made concrete by:

- Including permanent local consultation, discussion, consensus building, planning and decision making processes that promote the introduction of risk criteria in development, land use and environmental planning processes.
- Consensus building and coordination bodies among organized local and regional actors.
- Ensuring capacity of local actors to negotiate with external actors on the direction of future interventions and their adaptation to the existing development model.
- The decision to apply methodologies and instruments derived from risk reduction projects in a permanent manner.¹

Sustainability can be described as a process that is constantly renovated and consolidated and receiving continuous feedback from new activities at local level. Sustainability has greater chances of success if the projects manage to provide a convincing argument for the pertinence of the issue in the achievement of sustainable development and if the analytical and decision making instruments and methodologies are acceptable to local actors to the extent that they appropriate and duplicate them in future development initiatives.¹ The following aspects are key factors while analyzing sustainability:

- The intervention is demand driven and a priority to the local LLRM stakeholders.
- There is evidence of support and capacity from key local, national or regional institutions to continue the LLRM process.
- The intervention is adapted or integrated into social and cultural conditions and local development plans.
- The stakeholders have taken ownership and they have participated in the process as active agents of development and risk management.
- The intervention is compatible with the appropriate use of natural resources and it is environmentally sustainable.
- The technology and methodology used are adequate for the social, cultural, and economic conditions.
- The most vulnerable population was considered in the process
- Support from key local, national or regional institutions is available to continue the LLRM process.
- Local stakeholders have the appropriate organizational, technical and financial capacities to continue the LLRM process on their own.²

7.1 Involvement of stakeholders: Only if the intervention answers the felt needs of the local people, the project activities can be effectively implemented, successfully accomplished and sustained. The decision-making process must be participatory and transparent.⁴

- The government of Orissa had initiated several programs to mitigate the drought in chronic drought affected areas but met with little success as these programs followed a top-down approach and did not involve the stakeholders in the project implementation. The sense of ownership was the major limiting factor. UNDP implemented the “people at the centre strategy”, essential for ensuring ownership and long term sustainability in drought mitigation and livelihood improvement programs in Orissa.³

The involvement of community members (in India), district officials and other stakeholders in conducting risk assessments and action planning is essential in order to build ownership and enhance their capacity to undertake risk reduction interventions on their own. However, in this case the activities were conducted by external consultants, who considered these activities as highly technical which could not be undertaken by local stakeholders. Also the consultants were pressed for time that hindered the participation of local stakeholders. The communities were not directly involved in the risk assessment component, although they did the action planning on their own. The district officials were neither directly involved in risk assessment, nor in the action planning process, but only through consultation. The result being, that the communities and district officials lack the capacity to undertake such assessments, which impacts the sustainability of the intervention negatively. Secondly, the involvement of the district officials and communities in these processes would have helped in developing a stronger sense of ownership.⁴

SIMPAD focussed on real local risk management through the development of the network of 170 neighbourhood committees. These committees had an impact in the different neighbourhoods where they were operational, creating access for SIMPAD to areas that were not accessible for other actors. SIMPAD continued building on the knowledge they had achieved on existing risks in the city and the adequate way of having managed these risks to avoid conversion into a disaster, at the same time using the political weight that risk management had obtained through their work.⁵

7.2 *Coordination at community level: The municipality should be the principal leader and supporter of local development and risk management structures. The municipality has the legal responsibility for promoting local development and land use planning.*¹

- Achieve sustainability by including the development of ownership amongst the beneficiaries by involving them in all planning and implementation activities, through maintaining transparency, and by building community assets. Other activities to achieve this are the active involvement of local institutions, the formation of Village Drought Management Committees, the development of multidisciplinary technical teams and setting up of Village Funds.³
- Encourage participation of women in decision-making process by conducting series of focused group discussions, thus creating confidence in women groups and the women no longer felt alienated from the decision-making process. Empowering the women by building their skills and their involvement in decision making significantly helped the program since their participation brought improvement at the micro-level planning.³

All the SGCs have been implementing disaster mitigation activities based on indigenous knowledge and locally available materials with the support from the project. Through effective social mobilization the communities have strengthened their coping capacity to withstand the effects of natural disasters. Out of the total 18 SGCs established during the project, 16 have been registered as NGOs. One major reason for registration of the SGCs as NGOs was the need to transfer funding from UNDP and the subsequent requirement for legal registration. These organizations can now access resources from other government and non-government agencies to implement development activities in their wards/settlements.⁴

7.3 *Coordination at district and central level: Consensus building and coordinating bodies among local and regional actors enhances appropriation.*¹

- The DDC has included risk reduction activities in the Periodic Plans, and intends to use funds from its development budget for the implementation, increasing the chance that the risk reduction activities will continue. The UNDP team has continued working with the Local Development Officers and other officials, which has helped in developing awareness and ownership in the DDCs.⁴
- Establishing disaster management committees and the development of action plans to be done in collaboration with agencies that represent the central government. In the absence of any policy directive or legislative order, the officials do not consider disaster risk management work as part of their regular jobs, but as an “additional” task, that has been added to their portfolio as a consequence of the flooding in their districts last year. Work on establishing a policy directive or legislative order is thus crucial.⁵
- The effectiveness of the intervention was limited as the monitoring and supervision of the project work was being done by the UNVs and the project staff only. Non-involvement of national or district disaster committees in project monitoring and supervision hinders the development of ownership of the activities carried out in the districts.⁵
- The political will on the side of the mayor of La Paz and the prefect of the department of La Paz has been crucial for the appropriation and sustainability of the project and Risk management appears on the agenda.⁷

7.4 *Financial sustainability: Establishing local sources of revenue generation enhances financial sustainability of the activities carried out within the community.*

- Financial sustainable risk reduction interventions at community and district level are viable. The community organizations have established local sources of revenue generation through various kinds of taxes to implement their activities. Some also managed to access funds from outside sources.⁴
- The private sector participates in the management of the housing subsidies and other family compensations. In addition they have the possibility to influence the establishment of new housing (anti-seismic and location) and the strengthening of existing houses. In the actual development plan of the municipal administration funds are assigned for the implementation of risk management activities.⁸
- The project relies heavily on outside (international) funding for continuation. “Once the donor leaves, the action stops”. Risk maps were designed but not used, and the developing of risk maps was not continued due to ending of the funding. Jamaica uses 70% of its national budget to pay off external

debts, while with the remainder hardly manages to pay for the basic day-to-day operations of the government.⁹

7.5 *Capacity building: The local population should be a fundamental component in the social construction of knowledge and the achievement of consensus through discussion sessions, training options and the exchanging of ideas on causes and solutions.*¹

- Public awareness activities should not be seen as a one off campaign. Continued public information and training activities are necessary to sustain the Community Based Disaster Plans and the mitigation activities. The membership of committees change and new members need technical training to perform their functions. It is important to establish local level technical resource centres to provide technical assistance and training on a continued basis.³
- The capacity building, aimed directly at the district, divisional and community level through participation of government offices, allows for a way forward to local and national capacity building in a context where national level policy and institutional changes are hindered due to structural reasons. This approach offers an opportunity to build a bottom up movement within the government system for policy and institutional reform. A top down approach towards policy formulation and institutional reform in the NDMC means waiting perhaps for decades to be able to bring the benefits to communities.⁵
- Tools (concepts, methods and practices) were provided to the municipal government of La Paz to accompany the process of risk management within the municipal sphere, including the capacity building in risk management of the different development actors, and the design and implementation of a strategy to inform the public on risks and disasters. The latter being one of the most noted achievements in the process of strengthening the capacity of the administration of La Paz in risk management in the legal/judicial sphere.⁷
- The Albanian Red Cross (ARC) participated actively in the elaboration of a Disaster Risk Management training curriculum and eight manuals for regional and local actors involved in DRM. The ARC also served as the main sounding board for the development of adequate public awareness messages on flood and earthquake risks and also on risk from every day emergencies, such as gas explosions and electricity fires at home.¹⁴

8 Transverse and integral nature of risk management

Projects that are being used for initiating dialogue and decision making, that goes beyond risk management, emphasizing strategic partnerships with other institutions, attracting other partners that complement the program and its specific goals.

Seen from the perspective of the phases of the disaster continuum, risk management is a transverse and integral practice that includes activities and orientations not only related to prevention and mitigation, but also in terms of preparedness, response, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The point of reference is the changing conditions of risk. Continuity is accepted as something that typifies risk from the outset and the practices which reduce or anticipate it. For local level risk management the focus is on using projects themselves for initiating dialogue and even decision making which goes beyond the particular problem under discussion. The interventions are more integral and inclusive and are not necessarily circumscribed to a particular facet of risk reduction but rather to the range of risk continuum issues. The vision of a risk continuum allows capturing the dynamics of existing scenarios with more clarity. An example is how the use of maps and risk scenarios for reference (in early warning) can give rise to discussions on aspects that are more related to risk reduction through land use planning, relocation, watershed recuperation.¹

8.1 *Wide-spectrum stakeholders: Through sharing of information and partnerships between stakeholders, each group benefits of the technical resources and political influence of directly relevant organizations at national and district levels.*

- A multi-stakeholder approach was followed in the designing and implementation of the project activities. These included key agencies related to disaster risk management at national level, and almost all local level public sector and community based stakeholders. As a result of this approach the UNDP project benefited from the technical resources available and the political influence of the other agencies, and helped promote the concept of local level risk management in partner organizations.⁴

- The intervention and the sharing of experiences with other stakeholders brought disaster risk management into the mainstream debate within the technical and directly relevant organizations at the national and district levels, e.g. the National Disaster Management Centre (NDMC) perceiving the intervention as a support to its mandate. By locating the National Project Coordinator in the NDMC office, a relationship of trust and partnership between the UNDP project team and the NDMC has been built.⁵

Examples of linking with other stakeholders:

- ADPC is among the few actors that has promoted and supported the local level risk management in Sri Lanka. The work done by CHPB and the three Urban and Municipal Councils was supported by the ADPC, both technically and financial.
- National Building Research Organization has a representative at each district level. The organization focuses on promoting safer construction and has implemented initiatives on local level risk management in relation to Landslide hazards.
- Sri Lanka Institute of Development Administration is a key institute providing training to local government officials. Therefore, it can be an important player in promoting local level risk management.
- The Ministry of Local Development: The Local Government Management Unit of this ministry provides training to civil servants. This Unit can be developed into a technical resource centre for capacity building of local level civil servants in disaster risk management.
- ITDG has experience in district level action planning on drought mitigation in Monaregilla and Putlam districts. These plans, in use by the district authorities, are single hazard focused and their emphasis is upon vulnerability reduction and mitigation and don't have any provision on disaster preparedness.⁵

- Risk reduction was introduced as a transversal theme in to the management of the municipality, including the defining of the development actors depending on their role corresponding with risk management, the development of a normative framework at municipal level, and the concordance with the national legislation on incorporating risk management in the plans of the municipal and sectoral development planning.⁷
- Increasing awareness activities of organizations such as Civil Defence have been undertaken, on risk management as a multidiscipline dimension of development that transcends the aspects of preparedness and emergency response, and that needs to involve social actors and institutions that go beyond the first-response agencies. Risk maps developed are used as orientation tools to take decisions.¹⁰

Local governments need to be empowered to make their own decisions to ensure that infrastructural works that are critical for the development of the community are not carried out against the policy of municipal administration. A striking example is the construction of a gas station in an area, identified by the municipality as a risk zone for inundations by the river Matagalpo, not authorized by the local government, but with a permit delivered by national level. The local processes and criteria need to be synchronized with national processes and criteria to strengthen mutual interests and to avoid the cancelling or contradictions of decisions. Another example is the urgency of re- and construction after a disaster that led to urbanization in areas of high risk through which the vulnerability of the community increased instead of decreased.¹⁰

- Active participation of NGOs in risk management facilitated the incorporation into their vision and programs. At the same time the collaboration with NGOs enriched the concept of risk management through the incorporation of their experiences and concepts on gender, sustainable development and participation of the community.¹⁰

8.2 *Capacity building: The need exists to coordinate both local and external efforts in order to strengthen the capacities of the individual stakeholders/social actors.*¹

- Government officials from the project districts participated in a three day disaster management training programme to develop their skills in risk assessment, action planning and risk reduction measures and assist the district officials in the implementation of the Disaster Management Action Plan. The purpose of the training of the DDC and other line ministries was to: 1) Show how their activities can contribute to mitigation of disasters at district level; 2) Inform what UNDP is implementing at the community level and what contribution they can make in this process; and 3) Provide guidance on how to use resources in an appropriate manner for the benefit of the communities.⁴

- The capacity building strategy is to involve the district and divisional officials in the planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation of the risk reduction activities. In addition, the project provides training to the officials on the Sphere minimum standards. It is important to include formal training on technical disaster risk management subjects to district and divisional committees.⁵
- Collaboration with major scientific sources is necessary to take decisions. The political, administrative, economic and social stakeholders and institutions collaborate with SIMPAD through the technical and education committees to better implement risk management.⁸

8.3 *Dialogue at district and central level: Using the projects for initiating dialogue and decision making that goes beyond the particular problem under discussion.*¹

- At the district level, for the first time in local history, the project provided an opportunity for dialogue and coordination amongst the disaster management players, including an interface between the at-risk communities and the district government and the line ministries, thus contributing to the establishment of links between disaster risk management and development at the district level. The inclusion of disaster risk management in the District Periodic Plan assists in incorporating risk management in the policies and plans of the different ministries.⁴
- At the national level the intervention contributed to a change in perception with the National Planning Commission (NPC) for the need to link disaster risk management with poverty and development in general. However, national level policy and institutional changes may take time, these changes being influenced by political expediency, rather than by the development needs.⁴
- Political will and decisions are crucial for the continuity of the process of risk management cannot do without. Important decisions for disaster prevention and response are taken at the highest legal/judicial institute of the area.⁸

9 Local management within a regional and national framework

Projects concentrated on a particular area, locality or municipality, but which anticipate a ripple effect to other areas where analysis shows that risk factors are generated outside the spatial limits of the area (sources of river pollution, deforestation, mine tailings).

Projects developed in the geographical context of watershed areas, economic regions, and fault lines.

The local level is a component of a larger territorial reality. The risk expressed at local level is a result of multiple, inter-linked and inter-related processes whose social and territorial origins exceed local limits. The local management process is more effective when collaboration, reflection, agreement and activities extend beyond the local level and are carried out in coordination with the regional and national levels. Projects are more successful when they are conceived in relation to groups and municipalities, communities or localities and based on objective risk regions that comprehend the sum of factors and processes relevant to the issue under analysis and subject to intervention. Examples include:

- Integral productive or ecological zones/areas
- Watersheds
- Development regions
- Groups of municipalities¹

9.1 *Linking with district and national level: The role to be played by different actors and authorities within an integrated risk management system differs at each spatial level, but the option of having actors with different roles and authorities/functions interacting within a single group provide the local levels with more powerful risk reduction options.*¹

- Regular interaction with the line department officials at various levels such as district/block, organizing joint site visits and mutual confidence building helped to improve the flow of information, confidence and cooperation among the partners. Convergence with different Government Department's initiatives was visualized as important goal of the project and efforts were made to form linkages with other line departments like District Rural Development Authority, Block, Social Forestry, Fishery, Revenue and Agriculture for better implementation of the drought mitigation action plans prepared. The efforts of UNDP in this process were successful.³

- The UNDP intervention is multi-sectoral by nature as it involves most of the stakeholders at the district and divisional levels, therefore providing an opportunity for cutting edge work on collaborative strategic planning and policy and institutional development in a multi-stakeholder scenario. The NDMC appreciates the intervention as a support to its mandate and a relationship of trust and partnership developed with the UNDP project team. The officials in Matara district mentioned that before the start of the UNDP project there was no coordination between units of the government and communities horizontally and vertically, and are appreciative of the project since it is the first time that a coordination and planning mechanism is in place.⁵
- The prefect of La Paz developed a project on regional risk management using the lessons learned from the previous “La Paz project”. UNDP contributed to the design and consolidation of the project within the framework of other risk management projects in Bolivia. The achievements at local level convinced the decision makers at higher levels, thus facilitating the expansion of risk management to these higher levels.⁷

9.2 *Inter district sharing: Local risk is generated in wider territories with the participation of external partners.*¹

- The local level risk management in situations such as flooding should not follow an administrative area approach; e.g. the VDC or district. It should follow a watershed management approach, since the problem of flooding cuts across administrative boundaries. The local level administration cannot resolve the problem without collaborating with other regions and stakeholders. A watershed management approach focuses on establishing multi-district level coordination bodies, which undertake collaborative strategy planning to solve the problem.⁴
- The hazard mapping and vulnerability analysis, undertaken with the technical inputs of ICIMOD, has produced a wealth of information and lessons for similar undertakings in other VDCs/districts of Nepal. Some of the results can be generalized and are useful to develop local and national strategies for disaster reduction. The partnership with ICIMOD will assist in replicating similar tasks in other areas. The project introduced people-to-people interactions which have broadened contacts among the target communities, and have encouraged community-to-community sharing of knowledge and cooperation through which people in different localities exchanged information and learned from each other.⁴
- In Sri Lanka the project covers 5 out of 25 districts and the intervention can serve as a model for capacity building in the context of small size countries. The successful completion and replication of the intervention implies that non-governmental players can develop disaster risk management capability at a significant scale, through direct involvement with local authorities, without waiting for high level policy and structural changes. Committees have been formed in selected divisions, and this will be initiated in other divisions as well.⁵
- The district approach resolves the problem of coordination. At the national level it is extremely difficult to bring all the line ministries and other stakeholders together, which is a must for a collaborative strategic planning approach in order to form a common framework and ensure its implementation through periodical interface. However, at the district level most of the agencies work together on a regular basis for planning and development, through forums like the District Development Committees and the District Coordination Councils (DCCs).⁵
- Spreading of the lessons learned is done through the National Institute for disaster prevention and response that assists in a process to develop community networks for prevention and response to disasters in other cities of the country, based on the broad experience in Medellín. At the same time there is the need to translate scientific studies into political decisions and community tools.⁸

9.3 *Cross border experience sharing*

Under the Transitional Recovery Project in Sri Lanka, International United Nations Volunteers (IUNVs) provided technical support to the National Disaster Management Centre. The IUNVs were able to influence the NDMC to have a more open attitude towards other actors in disaster risk management, resulting in the establishing of an email group of Disaster Risk Management practitioners in order to share experiences. At the same time the UNVs helped streamline the information at district level. The District Social Services Officer in Kalutara (who was trained by UNVs) became more active in information collection on losses as well as taking preparedness actions. In the same district eight divisional officials have started developing disaster preparedness and response plans on their own. People recognized the UNVs’ technical skills and the ability to coordinate, and media, government and other stakeholders acknowledged their role. This

exercise opened more doors for and helped change the image of the UNV program as an entity. The UN volunteers' comparative advantage has been the interventions at the community level in capacity building of local organizations. Many UN agencies utilize UNVs in various projects in different countries.⁵

The National UNVs, closely collaborating with the IUNVs, mentioned that they learned technical and management related knowledge and skills through working with the IUNVs. The IUNVs shared written and audio-visual materials about their experience on community based disaster management in India, including newsletters, videos and articles. The process of learning and support between the IUNVs and the NUNVs in Sri Lanka was not one way. The IUNVs also had the opportunity to learn many things from the NUNVs and received support from them, such as cultural sensitivity, commitment to serve their people, building upon personal strengths, organizing team work, and the opportunity to develop networking with different organizations.⁵

Annex I Bibliography

1. Laval A., Local Risk Management, Ideas and notions relating to concept and practice, Regional programme for risk management in Central America, CEPREDENAC –UNDP, 2003.
2. UNDP, Reducing Disaster Risk: The Local Level Risk Management Approach (Extract from the Global Review of LLRM Initiatives) UNDP.
3. Murshed Z., Local Level Risk Management in India, Assessment Report, UNDP, August 2004.
4. Murshed Z., Local Level Risk Management in Nepal, Assessment Report, UNDP, 2004.
5. Murshed Z., Local Level Risk Management in Sri Lanka, Assessment Report, UNDP, 2004.
6. Murshed Z., Local Level Risk Management in Asia, Assessment Report, UNDP, September 2004.
7. Wilches-Chaux G., Gestión del Riesgo en el Municipio La Paz, Bolivia, UNDP, 2004.
8. Wilches-Chaux G., Sistema Municipal de Prevención y Atención de Desastres de Medellín, Colombia, UNDP, 2004.
9. Wilches-Chaux G., Proyecto Radar para establecer un sistema de alerta temprana basado en un sistema de radar Doppler en el Caribe, UNDP, 2004.
10. Wilches-Chaux G., Apoyo a la Gestión Local de Riesgos en seis Comités Municipales de Nicaragua, en el marco del Sistema Nacional para la Prevención, Mitigación y Atención de Desastres, UNDP, 2004.
11. Wilches-Chaux G., Lecciones aprendidas en América Latina y el Caribe, UNDP, 2004.
12. UNDP, Proyecto de Atención a Contingencias en la Península de Yucatán, Propuesta marco para el Desarrollo de Proyectos de Gestión de Riesgos, UNDP.
13. Moya X., Manejo Local de Riesgos en la Península de Yucatán, Marco Lógico de Proyectos, UNDP, 2005.
14. Spirollari M., Local Level Risk Management: A Case Study from Albania, UNDP, December 2004.

Annex II Acronyms

ADPC: Asian Disaster Preparedness Centre
BCPR: Bureau of Crisis Prevention and Recovery
CBO: Community Based Organization
CBRWH: Community based rainwater harvesting
CCF: Community Contingency Fund
CHPB: Centre for Housing, Planning and Building
CPR: Common Property Resources
DCC: District Coordination Council
DDC: District Development Committee
DNCRC: District Natural Calamity Relief Committee
DRDA: District Rural Development Authority
DWIDP: Department of Water Induced Disaster Prevention
FFW: Food for Work
GP: Gram Sabha (village council)
ICIMOD: International Commission on Integrated Mountain Development
ITDG: Intermediate Technology Development Group
IUNVS: International United Nations Volunteers
MLD: Ministry of Local Development
MoHA: Ministry of Home Affairs
NDMC: National Disaster Management Centre
NGO: Non-governmental organization
NGOCC: Non-governmental Organizations Coordinating Council
NPC: National Planning Commission
NRCS: Nepal Red Cross Society
NSET: National Society for Earthquake Technology
NUNVs: National UN Volunteers
OSDMA: Orissa State Disaster Management Authority
PDMP: Participatory Disaster Management Program
PRI: Panchayati Raj Institutions
PRSP: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
RWH: Rainwater harvesting
SGCO: Self Governing Community Organization
SHG: Self Help Groups
SLIDA: Sri Lanka Institute for Development Administration
SLRCS: Sri Lanka Red Cross Society
TDRM: Total Disaster Risk Management
UNDP: United Nations Development Program
UNV: United Nations Volunteers
VC: Village Committee (India)
VC: Village Council (Nepal)
VDC: Village Development Committee
VDMC: Village Disaster Management Committee/Village Drought Management Committee (India)
WSHG: Women's Self Help Group

Annex III Description of Projects

India 1 – Orissa Disaster Management Project³

Prior to the Orissa super-cyclone, the Orissa Red Cross was the only organization implementing preparedness programs. After the Cyclone, the Orissa State Disaster Management Authority (OSDMA) was set-up. UNDP in collaboration with the OSDMA implemented the Orissa Disaster Management Project from March 2001-October 2002 that focused on capacity building at the community, Gram Panchayat and Block levels in 10 coastal blocks.

The objectives of the pilot project were:

- To prepare of district, block, gram Panchayat and village level Multi-hazard Disaster Management plans;
- To form and train of various Task Forces (e.g. Medical First Aid, Search and Rescue, Sanitation, Shelter Management) to respond to emergency situations;
- To enhance the community preparedness to face natural calamities and skill up-gradation for faster recovery after calamities;
- To train and build capacity of various stakeholders (e.g. NGOs/CBOs, Youth Clubs, Self Help Groups, Govt. Line Department functionaries) in Disaster Management;
- To reduce vulnerability and Risk through incorporation of disaster mitigation into the existing developmental programs/planning;

The intervention was implemented in ten selected coastal blocks. The stakeholders and actors on local level risk management in Orissa include, the at risk communities, the local government bodies such as the Gram Panchayats, the Block Committees, the Orissa State Disaster Management Authority. Other actors include Orissa Red Cross, Gram Vikas (a local NGO), Oxfam and other NGOs.

India 2 – Community Based Rainwater Harvesting (in drought affected areas)³

The government of Orissa had initiated several programs to mitigate the drought in chronic drought affected areas but met with little success as these programs followed a top-down approach and did not take the stakeholders into account. UNDP wanted to move away from the traditional approaches to drought mitigation, and emphasised on a livelihoods strategy: increased water and food availability, reduced migration, reduced health problems, a higher literacy rate and other development indices.

The goal of the project is to restore livelihoods of the vulnerable households in the drought affected areas of Bolangir and Nuapada districts, Orissa. The project's objectives are:

- To provide livelihood support in the form of food for work in 50 most vulnerable villages in two districts. (The immediate task is to provide livelihood support to the families in distress that is to be addressed through food and cash for work programmes for their gainful employment.)
- To create rainwater harvesting structures on the basis of village plans through food for work. (Poor recharges of ground water, meagre intervention in terms of scientific rainwater harvesting and recycling with lack of ownership by the local communities in the ongoing schemes are some of the reasons for the failure of area based development schemes.)
- To build capacity of the villagers through Multidisciplinary Community Volunteers to develop community based plans for rainwater harvesting, implementation and its sustainability. (UN volunteers' comparative advantage within the UN system till date has been the interventions at the community level in capacity building of local organizations. Many UN agencies utilize UNVs in various projects in different countries.)

The stakeholders in the project included the Panchayati Raj Institutions, the village volunteers, the poorest of the poor, the District Rural Development Authority, UNDP, the agriculture department and other agencies.

Nepal – Upgrading Disaster Management Capacity⁴

The geographical setting of Nepal and its physical environment makes it vulnerable to floods, landslides, earthquakes, windstorm and fires, etc. In Nepal some of the disasters are localized and seasonal such as floods and landslides, whereas others are occasional and widespread, e.g. earthquake and drought. Some parts and districts of Nepal such as Kathmandu Valley and Central Nepal are more vulnerable.

Cohesive policy, institutional machinery or legal framework for disaster mitigation and preparedness is nonexistent. Nepal's strategy towards disaster management is still evolving. A Natural Calamity Act was introduced in 1982, focusing on emergency response. The flood of May 2003 heightened people's awareness of the problems leading to the disaster, thus offering opportunities to examine the past and to look for new ways to improve security.

The objectives of the UNDP interventions that focused on local level risk management are:

- To develop the capacity of the community by mobilizing women and men into self-governing community organizations as the local institutional basis to cope with natural disaster.

- To strengthen selected Village Development Committees (VDCs) and District Development Committees (DDCs) in their disaster management capacity.
- To increase the Disaster Management capacity of the ministry of Home Affairs and other related organizations during the program cycle.

Stakeholders include community groups, ward committees, village development committees, municipal councils, the District Development Committees, the District Natural Calamity Relief Committee, line ministries, the local Red Cross chapters and local NGOs.

Sri Lanka - Transitional Recovery Support to Flood Disaster in South and South West⁵

Prior to the intervention, target districts had not faced any serious disasters for about thirty years. Hence there were virtually no arrangements in place for disaster response or disaster risk management, particularly in the public sector. The Sri Lanka Red Cross Society (SLRCS) was the only organization that had branches active in the target districts, although SLRCS' work was mainly focused on emergency response.

The current intervention, mainly originated from within the UNDP system, was welcomed by other stakeholders since it was fulfilling a policy requirement of the National Plan on Disaster Management. UNDP's decision to adopt the district level capacity building strategy was triggered by a number of factors:

Involvement of UNDP in emergency response to severe floods and landslides of 2003 in five districts in Southwest Sri Lanka, and not wanting to pull out immediately after the recovery.

Awareness of the important contributions UNDP had made in the past, and an understanding that local level work can be more effective than activities at national level, considering the structural barriers in bringing about an institutional change at the national level.

The emergency response nature of the work was part of the project design. At that point UNDP did not have enough experience and resources, and the approach was really a first step or entry point to be built upon in future. Due to the recent experience of people, it was easy to mobilize support for disaster preparedness and emergency response work.

The stakeholders of the project include the communities, village development committees, Grama Niladhari (local government officers), divisional and district government officials, municipal councils, urban councils, Pradeshiya Sabhas, some specialized technical organizations, government organizations and NGOs.

Sri Lanka – United Nations Volunteers⁵

In May 2003 unprecedented floods and landslides hit five districts in South and Southwest Sri Lanka. The disaster, caused by the floods and landslides, was considered the worst in the past 50 years in the area. In the aftermath of the disaster, UNDP and other UN agencies worked very closely with the government in coordinating the response, assessing the initial rehabilitation needs and laying the foundation for a recovery program. UNDP Sri Lanka deployed UN Volunteers from UNDP India to various districts where they worked directly with the district government agents. Their main tasks included coordination and collection of base line data to be fed in to the Colombo Operations Unit on a daily basis. A group of national UNVs (NUNVs) were attached to the Indian UNVs to ensure continuity of the intervention. The NUNVs were involved in assisting the district administration in information management and coordination activities, in identifying the gaps in the activities of various agencies involved in relief and reconstruction and needs of the districts.

Most of the Indian UNVs left after two months of emergency response work. UNDP continued the intervention under the project, "Transitional Recovery Support to Flood Disaster in South and Southwest Sri Lanka". One IUNV was deployed as the Technical Advisor to coordinate the implementation of this project. In addition to provision of support for recovery, the intervention also focused on Local Level Risk Management. The UNVs were involved in working with the District Secretaries, and facilitating the formation of district and divisional level committees and development of Disaster Preparedness and Response Plans (DPRPs).

Bolivia – Risk management in La Paz⁷

La Paz is built in a valley covered by some 220 small rivers and streams of which 70% are either vaulted or channelled. No maintenance of these vaulted water systems have been undertaken, they cannot deal with heavy rainfall, and the surrounding soil can no longer absorb the excess of water due to construction. In addition, there are the risks caused by El Alto, a municipality located on the top of the city, with a rapidly increasing population (700,000 inhabitants), no structures and plans for disaster risk management are in place, and some 50% of the housing is illegally built on a terrain not suitable for construction. The earthquake of 22 May 1998 and the effects of the phenomena El Niño on the agriculture in Bolivia resulted in the process of creating the National System of Disaster Reduction and Assistance (SISRADE). Only since 2002 does the administration of La Paz see risk management as important.

The objective of the program is to reduce the risk levels of the city of La Paz by strengthening the capacity of the Local Government in risk management in the legal sphere.

The results of the project will be that the administration of La Paz will have:

- Included risk reduction as a central theme in the management of the municipality.
- Developed tools – concepts, practical methods – to assist with the implementation of risk management.
- Implemented intervention measures to reduce the risks.

Stakeholders in the project are the local government (administration) of La Paz, the National Government (Civil Defence, Ministry of Sustainable Development, specifically its department of planning, the Urban Development Council and the National Information System on Sustainable Development), the Regional Government, as well as organizations such as National Council for Risk Reduction and awareness, Ministry of Indigenous Affairs, National Food Security System and Early Warning, Meteorological services, Naval hydrological services, Mine and Geological services, and UNDP.

Colombia – Creation of a Municipal System for Disaster Prevention and Response (SIMPAD)⁸

The eruption of the Nevado el Ruiz volcano in 1985 and the subsequent mud stream that destroyed the city of Armero, constituted a milestone for risk management in Colombia. The National System for Disaster prevention and Assistance was set up in collaboration with UNDP. The process has moved forward and with the assistance of UN organizations have been, both technically and operational, institutionally strengthened. In line with this UNDP has developed the project Creation of a Municipal System for Disaster Prevention and Assistance (SIMPAD).

The project is implemented in Medellín, that is faced, as are other Colombia cities, with growing migration of families displaced by violence in rural areas. The majority of these families lack resources which would enable them to set up home in safe areas. The greatest risk in Medellín is the ungovernability, expressed in terms of little acknowledgement of the legitimacy of the authorities, resulting in little respect for the decisions these authorities try to impose.

The project mission is to coordinate the policy and activities required for disaster prevention, response and recovery in disasters and emergency situations, promoting the development of prevention measures in the community through education processes, and planning and organization in coherence with the development plans of the city. SIMPAD is structured around the objectives of risk management in the areas of development and institutional organization, the analysis of risk and incorporation of disaster prevention and assistance in the planning, the operational procedures for emergency awareness, and the capacity building and participation of the citizens.

The stakeholders include the national government (National System for Disaster Prevention and Awareness), Municipal government (Mayor and other community organizations), District government (Secretary of Health), Scientific and Academic institutions/organizations, International Cooperation (KFW, GTZ, and UNDP), First Aid organizations (Fire brigade, Red Cross, Civil Defence) Private Sector, ONGs, and community organizations.

Jamaica, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic - Radar Project⁹

The project Radar-Supported Early Warning Systems for weather related Natural hazards in the Insular Caribbean, was set up in Jamaica, Haiti and the Dominican Republic. The system will allow communities to be informed and oriented on what to do in the case of an alert for an inundation or hurricane. The National Disaster Offices of the respective countries can rely on the technical assistance provided by the national meteorological institutes to timely communicate the warnings and/or evacuation orders to the population. The review of the project only included Jamaica.

The objective of the project is for the National Disaster Offices to be able rely on the technical assistance of their respective National Meteorological Offices to timely communicate alerts for inundations and/or hurricanes to the population as well as orders for evacuation as needed.

Activities include capacity building within the National Disaster Offices to obtain and distribute the information obtained from the radars, and awareness raising on how the availability of information is part of preparedness activities.

Stakeholders of the project are national actors, including the National Disaster Offices, Office of Disaster Management (in Jamaica), Red Cross societies, government institutions (Meteorological institutes, Water Resources Authorities, Mines and Geology Division, National Environmental Planning Agency, Urban Development Council) the communities, University of West Indies (Earthquake Unit) and the Commission for Urban Development.

Nicaragua – Support for Local Risk Management in six Municipalities¹⁰

Nicaragua has suffered a series of disasters in the last four decades, among which the earthquake in 1972 that destroyed Managua, hurricane Joan in 1988, a tsunami on the pacific coast in 1992, hurricane Mitch in 1998, a civil war that affected the country for a decade, and a succession of corrupt governments. The vulnerability of the country

translates into the fact that half of the population lives below the poverty line, and second, the country is highly dependant on the International Cooperation for economic resources as well as for setting the priorities. Following Hurricane Mitch hitting Nicaragua (1,863 deaths and more than 368,000 victims), UNDP assisted in the process that led to establishing the National System for Disaster Prevention, Mitigation and Response (SINAPRED). In 2001, UNDP started the project for Support for Local Risk Management in six municipal committees in the framework of the above mentioned National System for Disaster Prevention, Mitigation and Response.

The objective of the program is to reduce the levels of vulnerability by strengthening the technical and organizational capacity of SINAPRED, through capacity building (training) at community level.

The stakeholders of the program are the local governments of the six communities, the village level committees, the District Committee of Development, members of the village council, and UNDP.

Mexico – Local Risk Management in the peninsula of Yucatan^{12 13}

After the destruction caused by hurricane Isidore (September 2002) in Yucatan, the local NGO FMAM (?), in collaboration with UNDP, decided to initiate a project to strengthen the local capacity to reduce vulnerability for future disasters. The pilot project focuses entirely on the communities. The objective of the project is: To build capacity of the rural communities and civil society of the peninsula of Yucatan to mitigate the risks and respond organized to any event.

Stakeholders include ONGs - FMAM, UMAC (?), local governments (municipalities from Yucatan), State (government) of Yucatan, Quintana Roo, Campeche, Tabasco, OBC (?).

Albania – Disaster Risk Management¹⁴

In 1999, as a result from the war in Kosovo a massive number of refugees from Albanian ethnic background fled into Albania, prompting the country to develop a more comprehensive system for the management of disaster risks. A national law on “Civil Emergencies” was adopted in 2001 and a “General Directorate for Civil Emergency Planning and Coordination” was created within the Ministry of Local Government and Decentralization. As of 2002 UNDP provided substantial assistance to this process via a Disaster Risk Management (DRM) Program.

The objectives of the program include the strengthening of Disaster Risk Management in the different qarks (regions) an intermediary administrative level between central and local authorities. Since the program had no direct physical presence at the sub-national level, the Albanian Red Cross, which has substantial experience in DRM, was brought on board, in close consultation with national counterparts.