



Global Network
of Civil Society Organisations
for Disaster Reduction

IF WE DO NOT JOIN HANDS...

Summary Report

Views from the Frontline

Local reports of progress on implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action, with strategic recommendations for more effective implementation

May 2011



IF WE DO NOT JOIN HANDS...

The evidence of the Views from the Frontline 2011 study is that there is a growing gap between the UN's 'Hyogo Framework for Action' and its implementation at the frontline where disasters impact. The framework aims to 'build the resilience of nations and communities to disasters'. Much is being done at international and national levels to develop understanding, policies and plans. However, consistent progress in local implementation – reducing the vulnerability of those in urban neighbourhoods and rural localities – remains beyond reach.



'If we do not join hands, no one person or group can make change happen'

Lawrence Temfwe leads a small NGO in central Zambia. The lives of the people he works with are typical of those at the frontline all over the world. They face multiple challenges of natural, social and economic disasters, drought, famine, floods, HIV/AIDS, growing unemployment and lack of basic services.

Lawrence challenges local and national authorities to take action. However he also challenges local people to play their part. He strongly believes that national and local government, businesses, civil society, community associations and religious groups all need to recognise their roles and responsibilities. Only when they start to work together will peoples' lives improve. 'If we do not join hands...' he says 'no one person or group can make change happen'. If everyone works together in partnership, real progress can be made.

We believe that the answer to the challenge of effective implementation of the Hyogo Framework lies in Lawrence's words: 'If we do not join hands . . .'. Unless we do, change will continue to prove elusive.


The biennial review of the Hyogo Framework taking place in Geneva in May 2011 calls for 'increased investment in local action'. It makes this call against a backdrop of limited and fragmented implementation over the course of the framework. A paradigm shift is needed.

'If we do not join hands . . .' we won't see sustained change. Only when we *do* join hands – listening, forming partnerships, involving everyone, building clear understanding of needs and resources and working together to secure them – will we achieve consistent and effective 'investment in local action'.

Front cover picture: Children in Mapalo, Ndola, Zambia, one of the communities where Lawrence Temfwe and his Non-Governmental Organisation 'Jubilee Centre' works.
Photograph © 2008 Richard Gibson



Global Network
of Civil Society Organisations
for Disaster Reduction



ONE

WHAT IS VIEWS FROM THE FRONTLINE?

Views from the Frontline 2011 (VFL 2011) is the second phase of the VFL programme, focusing on 'local risk governance'. Over 500 organisations in 69 countries embraced the challenge and collected more than 20,000 views on 'local risk governance.'

VFL is an ongoing research and learning programme. It collects and shares views from organisations and people around the world who work on local level disaster risk reduction.¹ Led by the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR), the VFL 2009 study gathered views on progress in implementing the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA).² Over 7,000 local government officials, civil society organisations and community representatives across 48 countries in Africa, Asia and the Americas offered views on risk reduction activity at the local level.³

VFL 2009 showed that progress in establishing national policies and legislation had not generated widespread changes in local practices. GNDR members identified supportive government cultures, open to the formation of local partnerships, as the single most important factor to accelerating implementation of risk reduction policies at a local level.

This report presents VFL 2011's rationale, methodology, findings,



conclusions and recommendations. Building on VFL 2009, it assesses where progress has or has not been made over the two-year period. It invites specific commitments from people, organisations and institutions working at every level; translating risk reduction policies into action at the frontline, where the most vulnerable people continue to lose lives and livelihoods as a result of disaster.⁴

VFL has four specific objectives:

1. Provide an overview of progress of local risk governance that contributes towards a reduction in the loss of lives and livelihoods
2. Strengthen public accountability for disaster risk reduction (DRR) policy execution by establishing a local level monitoring system and relevant baselines
3. Enhance civil society monitoring, research, analytical and advocacy capabilities
4. Increase dialogue, understanding and collaboration between different groups at different levels, all working towards reducing risk.

¹ The Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction (GNDR) is a network of over 500 Civil Society organisations concerned with effective implementation of Disaster Risk Reduction policy at the 'frontline' where billions of people vulnerable to disaster live and work.

² With the objective of substantially reducing the loss of lives and livelihoods caused by disasters, 168 countries adopted the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015 (HFA) at the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Japan in 2005. To help measure progress, the UN has produced Global Assessment Reports in 2009 and 2011. See www.unisdr.org for details. The VFL programme is designed to support and complement this UNISDR-coordinated monitoring and review process by providing a 'bottom-up' perspective from people living and working at the frontline of disasters.

³ See "Clouds but little rain": Views from the Frontline – a local perspective of progress towards implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action, 2009 – available for download from <http://www.globalnetwork-dr.org>

⁴ Further detail about Views from the Frontline 2011 is available on the GNDR website: www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011, including country-specific data, background information and over 90 'Action at the Frontline' case studies highlighting successes and challenges in local risk governance.

TWO

WHAT'S SO IMPORTANT ABOUT LOCAL RISK GOVERNANCE?

A country's ability to prevent disasters is not just about financial resources. Decision-making processes are vitally important. They determine how resources are allocated and managed. The public's access to information and ability to mobilise themselves are helped or hindered by these processes. Local government is a critical link in the chain; coordinating government resources and cooperating with all local level stake holders to reduce disaster risk. Information management, communication, consultation, coordination, decision-making and allocation of resources are the building blocks of 'local risk governance'.

Governance is about people, power and politics. It determines relationships between people, the state and other actors. In so doing it determines the choices and trade-offs societies make. At the local level, effective local risk governance happens when a capable, accountable and responsive local government works together with civil society, the private sector and at-risk communities. However there are larger political, social and economic forces putting people at risk of disaster. These can't just be tackled at the local level. People need links to higher-level institutions and broader political processes to make effective progress.

In its *World Disasters Report 2010*, the International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies concludes that most examples of

'I think the local government is selfish where partnership is concerned. They don't talk to us, when decision making is concerned, as a partner. When there are problems they just send a paper saying "Tell your people to do this or that" which is not good.'

VFL 2011: Cameroons

governments tackling disaster risk reduction come from nations or cities where popular pressure and political reforms have made local governments more accountable and responsive to their citizens.

"Our message to our clients, whatever their political system, is that you cannot have successful development without good governance and without the participation of your citizens."

Robert B. Zoellick, President, World Bank: April 2011.⁵

In reviewing findings from VFL 2009, GNDR members identified local risk governance as key to accelerating implementation of risk reduction activity at the local level. Consequently, gathering and sharing views, conclusions and recommendations about local risk governance is the specific focus for VFL 2011. Through a process of establishing features of effective local risk governance three key aspects of local risk governance were identified: 'Inclusion and Participation', 'Local Capacity and Capability' and 'Accountability and Transparency'.

⁵ The Middle East and North Africa: A New Social Contract for Development, Robert B. Zoellick, President, The World Bank Group, April 6, 2011

Indicators for each aspect were established and are explained below:

a) Indicators of Inclusion and Participation

The challenge of building resilient communities is a shared one. At the heart of good governance are local authorities prepared to share decision-making power with local stakeholders. Everyone in the community, including people of different age, gender, ethnicity, religion or socio-economic position should be involved in thinking, planning and deciding about disaster risk. Women, children and young people in particular bring unique knowledge and experience to discussions. Unless poor people have a political voice their concerns and priorities get ignored.

Inclusive governance processes lead to greater coordination and collaboration. Linking different line ministries (such as agriculture, water and health) and different themes (like climate change and poverty alleviation) at the local level is an important step towards this goal.

Focusing on local government as a key player in ensuring inclusion and participation takes place within local risk governance; VFL 2011 established

five indicators on which to seek views:

- There is participation by all, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups, in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation
- There is gender equality with women and men participating equally in decision-making and implementation
- The specific needs of children and young people are taken into account
- Local volunteers take part in disaster prevention measures
- Partnerships exist between local government, community, private sector, civil society, academia and others.

b) Indicators of Local Capacity and Capability

Effective local risk governance depends on leaders, state authorities, private and public organisations being able to get things done. Working openly in partnership on technical and functional tasks such as risk assessments, planning and budgeting requires a range of skills, experience and knowledge. Some of these can be acquired through formal education and training and others through 'learning by doing' and sharing of experiences. Building

The challenge of working together in **Malaysia**

Consultation and discussion with local communities needs more attention from local authorities. In areas where good communication, understanding and relationship has been established, such as in Tumpat, Kelantan, authorities and communities work together very well in managing disasters – responsibilities are distributed but shouldered equally.

However in places where there is no proper communication, communities seem to have more complaints, more negative feedback and are less appreciative of government efforts (even if they are more dependent on them).

For example in many parts of Terengganu, communities complain that development is increasing the impact of disasters. One community leader suggested that the private consortium responsible should provide compensation, instead of government footing the bill. What's needed is effective coordination, which starts with communication. *Malaysia: VFL 2011*

capability depends on understanding and maximising local, indigenous knowledge and where necessary, combining this with outside specialist expertise. In addition ensuring access to necessary technical assistance, institutional capacity-building support, financial resources, authority and supporting legislation is required. Without these core ingredients of capacity and capability, people at the local level can't play their part in increased implementation of risk reduction activity.

Nine indicators were established

to help understand local government levels of local capacity and capability in local risk governance:

- Disaster prevention policies are in place to protect vulnerable people from disasters (elderly, ethnic minorities, children and youth, disabled, migrants) and these policies are regularly reviewed
- Local disaster prevention practices take into account local (indigenous) knowledge, skills and resources
- There is a local plan of action to turn disaster prevention policies into practice

'Holding Hands, Joining Hearts, Facing the Threat of Climate Change': **Thailand**



The conference 'Holding Hands, Joining Hearts, Facing the Threat of Climate Change', held in Bangkok in December 2010, launched a new programme for local collaboration: 'Increasing Coastal Community Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation'. The project is implemented by Global Network member 'Sustainable Development Foundation' (SDF), with the Thai Red Cross Society, the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation and a regional climate change research and training institute 'SEA START RC'. It is funded by the UN Development Programme

and the Special Climate Change Fund of the Global Environment Facility. At the launch, Thailand's Prime Minister Abhisit Vejjajiva said "Mitigating the impact of natural disasters should no longer be seen as the duty of just one agency or sector, but rather as a priority that every person and sector in society should work to address. The government has prioritized the establishment of strategic action plans . . . for action by individuals, communities, groups, networks, and organizations and agencies in the governmental, non-governmental and private sectors."

A declaration of support was signed by Thai Red Cross Society and the Department of Disaster Prevention and Mitigation and also by wide-ranging organizations including the Office of the National Economic and Social Development Board, the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment, and the 'Assembly of Non-governmental Organizations for the Protection of the Environment and the Conservation of Natural Resources'.

Jonathan Shott, of SDF, says "We work a lot with communities facing extensive risks – drought, repeated or prolonged flooding, coastal erosion. This requires collaboration by local communities, local administration authorities, and local government. Authorities are often constrained by rules, regulations and bureaucratic systems. This national framework will help them work together much more effectively." *Thailand National Coordinating Organisation: VFL 2011*

- Local government has an adequate budget for disaster prevention
- Local government officials have clear roles and responsibilities to carry out disaster prevention
- Disaster prevention training is provided for government officials, the community and civil society leaders
- There is sufficient expertise in local government to carry out disaster prevention
- Traditional and scientific knowledge informs local action planning
- Disaster prevention activities are coordinated between local government and other government officials and ministries.

c) Indicators of Accountability and Transparency

Public accountability is a powerful way of increasing political commitment for local risk governance. Accountable governments and institutions are far more likely to develop risk-reducing policies and implement programmes that really work. Establishing transparent baselines, targets, budgets, timelines with clear roles and responsibilities and a measurement process are all features of effective local risk governance. Ensuring community participation in, and awareness of these features helps strengthen 'social demand' and enhance accountability.

With a focus on local government, VFL 2011 established six indicators to assess levels of accountability and transparency in local risk governance:

- A reference point or baseline has been established from which to measure progress in implementing disaster prevention policies
- There is regular monitoring and reporting on progress on disaster prevention
- Communities and civil society are involved with local government in monitoring disaster prevention
- There is a way for vulnerable people to make complaints and to get a response when there is a lack of progress in disaster prevention
- Information gathering regularly takes place to collect, review and map disaster risks and climate change
- Updated and easily understood information about risks and prevention measures is regularly provided to vulnerable people.



Participatory budgeting builds a road: **Venezuela**

In the municipality of Sucre, in the state of Miranda, located in North-Central Venezuela, many of the roads are nearly impassable. When it rains, the water wreaks havoc, washing away everything in its path. Neighbours have tried to find a solution to this problem for years, but have not been successful. Now, with help from 'Fundasucre', a foundation responsible for the implementation of the municipal participatory budget, the neighbours have begun to confront this problem.

The community councils of "República Unida" and "Luz y Esperanza" and the "Upar 2000" worked with the residents of República Unida, Juventud Bolivariana and El Encantado to present a joint road improvement project, requesting funds from the Sucre City Government's "Our Own Path Participatory Budget". They wrote the project proposal with technical assistance from the city government, and received 765 thousand BsF from Fundasucre for the projects. Local residents were responsible for the project; they participated in training to prepare them to administer it.

The Participatory Budget has allowed the neighbors to solve their road problem: the El Encantado sector has rebuilt a 4.5 meter high wall that had collapsed, and built 20 meters of the road that had disappeared. The

neighbors in Juventud Bolivariana and República Unida were also able to build 30 meters of road besides the planned 70 meters with the budgeted funds. These projects were well built and stood up to the intense rains that fell on Caracas in December of 2010. Initially there were conflicts between neighbors holding differing political views, but these differences disappeared as they saw the benefit as of the project - unusual in Venezuela where people are often politically polarised.

The construction workers, plumbers and general labourers – all local residents – had the opportunity to work, but more importantly earned widespread recognition for their hard work. They also learned how to present financial reports, a skill that is necessary in order to access the remainder of the resources. It allowed the community to engage actively in the distribution and spending of the resources; they were able to make the funds stretch further and guarantee the quality of the construction project by doing it themselves. The clear cut guidelines for the spending and implementation helped eliminate the political polarization, allowing local citizens to express themselves and have an active role in decision making.

This 'Our Own Path Participatory Budget' directly transfers 30% of public spending to communities, and aims to broaden its reach and resources until 50% of public spending is designated for community based projects.

Venezuela: VFL 2011

THREE

GATHERING VIEWS FROM THE FRONTLINE

How well is 'local risk governance' working to bring about progress in disaster risk reduction? VFL 2011 study has two steps: firstly, gathering information (quantitative and qualitative through face-to-face activity and also using internet and mobile phone technology) and secondly, as part of an ongoing process, sharing this information in a series of consultations at international, national and local levels to generate communication opportunities, enabling issues to be explored and developing greater understanding.

Gathering information face-to-face at the frontline

Led by a small central GNDR team, the VFL process depends on the capability and commitment of members to gather information from people living and working at the frontline.

Covering 11 regions around the world, Regional Coordinating Organisations (RCOs) helped design, test and develop the VFL 2011 survey content before training and coordinating National Coordinating Organisations (NCOs) in 69 countries. These NCOs then supported a network of 511 Participating Organisations (POs) to have face-to-face, one-to-one interviews and also structured focus group discussions with over 20,000 local government officials and members of local communities. Training and technical support from RCOs and NCOs was important to ensure consistency amongst participating countries. In each country, target communities were selected to represent a range of at-risk communities from urban and rural situations. Surveys were collated at national level and data analysis was organised by the GNDR central team.

The Huairou Commission conducted a specific study with women's organisations, and Plan International led work to discover the views of children and young people.⁶



To help make sense of the *quantitative data* from the VFL 2011 survey, GNDR members were also invited to gather case studies to highlight local risk governance in action. More than 90 'Action at the Frontline' case studies have been produced so far, many with supporting images and video, to provide valuable, practical *qualitative information* about constraints, good practices and what is required to achieve a 'substantial reduction of losses'.⁷



⁶ See <http://www.huairou.org/> and <http://plan-international.org/> for more information

⁷ A gallery of short 'Action at the Frontline' (Youtube style) videos is available on the GNDR website: <http://www.globalnetwork-dr.org/acting-for-change.html>

The twenty VFL 2011 local risk governance indicators are related to the 'Global Assessment Report HFA Monitor' indicators for 'Priority for Action' 1: 'Ensuring DRR is a national and local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation'. However it is important to emphasise that governance is a broader issue, which underlies all the HFA Priorities for Action.⁸ Measures of governance use 'proxies' for the concepts they are intended to measure, which underscores the importance of the qualitative information obtained through case studies, to interpret these indicators.

As well as asking 20 questions to explore views on local risk governance, information relating to respondent's age, location, gender, and also role was invited. Also, two broader questions were asked to establish views on the threat of disaster and of progress in reducing disaster losses.⁹

Ranking:

For quantitative questions please use the following scores to respond:

- 1 No
- 2 To a very limited extent
- 3 Some activity but significant scope for improvement
- 4 Yes, but with some limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 Yes, with satisfactory, sustainable and effective measures in place
- X Don't know

Answers to questions were based on a 1-5 score

1.13	Monitoring	Does the local government regularly monitor and report on progress on disaster prevention?
1.14	Participatory Monitoring	Does the local government involve communities and civil society in the monitoring of disaster prevention?
1.15	Complaints Procedures	Does the local government provide a way for vulnerable people to make complaints and get a response for lack of progress in disaster prevention measures ?
1.16	Information Gathering	Does local government regularly collect, review and map information on disasters risks and climate change?

Questions were asked relating to each of the 20 local risk governance indicators



Using technology to increase the reach of VFL

In addition to face-to-face surveys, VFL 2011 has piloted surveying people living in disaster-affected countries using SMS (short message service – known as texts) on mobile phones.

In collaboration with a commercial company 'txteagle', experienced in large scale surveying using mobile telephone, GNDR is exploring the potential of expanding the reach of VFL to maximise the opportunity created by dramatic increases of mobile phone usage in many of the low, to low-middle income countries affected by disasters.¹⁰ This pilot gathered over 36,000 responses to a shortened VFL 2011 survey using SMS and the internet, as well as testing an experimental mobile phone 'protocol' to overcome some of the disadvantages of SMS. Alongside the benefits of scale and reduced cost (less than 10% of face to face methods) this approach reinforces other recent uses of SMS in highlighting the potential for citizen engagement through this channel.¹¹

⁸ See <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/hfa/hfa.htm> for more information about the Hyogo Framework for Action

⁹ See Annex II for the VFL 2011 Survey

¹⁰ See <http://txteagle.com/> for more information

¹¹ See section 4 for more detail on this pilot technology project.



Sharing 'Views from the Frontline'

Following data collection, the second phase of VFL 2011 is an ongoing process to share findings, conclusions, recommendations in a series of VFL consultations at international, national and local levels. The Global Platform-DRR in Geneva, May 2011 is the first international opportunity to present

'Views from the Frontline has helped us meet with and get to know different actors in our area, even with people that it was difficult to get access to before'

Jaime Mok, PyE, GNDR: Peru

these findings, and will be followed by a series of other international, national and local meetings and working sessions to explore the implications of these findings and support acceleration of risk reduction activity at the local level.

An unexpected, but important learning from VFL 2009 was that alongside gathering content, a valuable benefit was the process of forming new partnerships and collaborations. GNDR members reflected that conducting surveys led to consultations, interviews and meetings – new connections were made. In many cases local government officials, community and civil society members started to build mutual understanding, trust and collaboration – strengthening 'local risk governance'. Maximising the value of VFL 2011 at local and national levels is therefore an

ongoing and critical part of this 'living project'. In the many countries that have participated, national reports are being drawn up which look at the local context and challenges. These provide the focus for a programme of national and local consultations, which are a first step in sharing knowledge, learning lessons and applying them through new and strengthened partnerships for action.

"Views from the Frontline findings on progress led to the creation of Afghanistan's first DRR platform bringing people together to try and tackle the challenges we have."

*Takeshi Komino,
GNDR: Afghanistan*



Progress through partnerships: The community experience of Hotel de Cañas in the construction of a dam in the canton of Cañas, Guanacaste, **Costa Rica**

Hotel de Cañas is located 11 kilometres south-west of the city of Cañas, Guanacaste Province, Costa Rica's North Pacific. It is located in the middle of the Cañas River basin area of high flood risk. During the rainy season the river overflows, causing flooding in the community. In 2002 the Development Association decided to form a Community Emergency Committee (CEC) to tackle the problems of the area.

Under the leadership of a dedicated group of mostly elderly women the dam project was proposed as a response to the problem of flooding. Without partnerships and synergies between the central government, local government, international cooperation and private enterprise this vision could not have become a reality

Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA) became involved through "Project BOSAI" (based on the Japanese words for "protection" and "disaster"). In this programme learning processes are used to develop risk reduction strategies with local communities, building on lessons learned and good practices at the municipal level and community level.

In 2004 the community, with Japanese technical cooperation, developed an environmentally viable solution to the flooding: building a dam 50 meters long, easily built using reusable materials, which would match the river dynamics based on a 'gathering of knowledge', both technical and from the community.

Everyone got involved: Young people, men and women and older

citizens all voluntarily contributed to the construction of the dam. In total 56 men and women of all ages were trained on dam construction. The student population along with young people have participated in the reforestation campaigns on the banks of the river Cañas.

The participation of youth in the first stage of the dam was a motivational factor for 15 young people today, who understand the technique of construction of the dam and have other responsibilities in reducing risk within the community. The Municipal Emergency Committee also collaborated closely with the community.

Construction commenced in 2009, under the technical supervision of Japanese team, with women, men, children and young people involved. The Municipal Emergency Committee joined the work with private companies doing their part. The dam was successfully tested during the rainy season of 2010 and the final phase of construction started in February 2011.

What have we learned?

- The dam as a work of mitigation allowed us build capacity among different actors and sectors.
- It was important for all stakeholders and sectors to show that it is possible to design a work of mitigation from a meeting of knowledge (technical and local).
- Is it feasible to build a dam design and easy construction, low cost, and reusing waste material that is replicable in other localities with the participation of multiple actors and sectors.
- When there is commitment from all parties, it is possible to link resources and capacities of actors and sectors such as private enterprise, local government, the central state, communities and international cooperation for disaster risk reduction in local-municipal level.

UNDERSTANDING VIEWS OF LOCAL RISK GOVERNANCE – ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

‘If we do not join hands...’ – if all those concerned for effective implementation of disaster risk reduction don’t work together more effectively – then progress will be limited. What do the findings of the VFL 2011 show? Has there been progress? Where are the major challenges?

This section summarises the key results and findings of VFL 2011, reflecting views of local risk governance from over 20,000 survey respondents, involving over 500 civil society organisations in 69 countries. Also included are the findings from the pilot SMS and Web survey, which were analysed separately.



HEADLINES FROM THE FRONTLINE



‘Changes in disaster losses (lives, livelihoods and assets) in your area since 2005?’

57%

felt losses had increased over the last five years, compared with only 21% who felt disaster losses had decreased.

58 countries feel disaster losses are getting worse. Only 8 countries feel they are decreasing

Countries reporting the most dramatic increases are Pakistan, Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, El Salvador, Gambia and Armenia.

Bangladesh, Nepal, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Egypt, Algeria, Malawi and Ethiopia feel that disaster losses have reduced.

Local governments and local communities share similar views on changes in disaster losses and disaster threat

Disaster losses and threat are felt to have increased more in rural than urban areas – EM-DAT data confirms this perception.

Over 42% of the sample believe their communities are at high or very high risk.

25% of the sample regard themselves as being at minimal or low risk of disasters.

Perceptions of losses correlate with actual losses (as measured by EM-DAT data)

Least progress is happening where the threat is greatest

Perceptions of losses are greatest in highest risk areas¹

¹ <http://www.emdat.be/database>

‘Local Governance: in your opinion what level of progress has been made?’

2.4*

– the overall rating of progress from the survey
 – corresponding to ‘To a very limited extent’ / ‘Some activity but significant scope for improvement’

... showing marginal progress from the VFL 2009 PFA 1
Governance average score of 2.36

What progress has been made on the Governance Indicators?




Chart 2: Mean scores for Governance indicators

The governance indicators show that government functions of coordination, planning and partnerships are not being matched by sufficient expertise and resources for effective implementation – policies and plans may be in place but the resources and expertise are definitely not.

Progress at the National and Local level?




Chart 1: Overall Governance scores by region

EMDAT is the international disaster database from the Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) - see <http://www.emdat.be/>




Chart 3: VFL and GAR assessment of progress in Governance

Progress in national policy is not matched by local implementation.

The GAR reports: ‘most countries across all geographical and income regions report relatively low progress in assigning dedicated resources to strengthen their risk governance capacities. Resources allocated for sectors or local governments are even more limited’. Although 80% of lower-middle income countries report local government have legal responsibilities for DRM, only 26% of countries confirm dedicated resource allocations.

* on a range from 1 to 5



The frontline perceptions of disaster losses is that they are increasing

Understanding the risk of disasters and associated losses motivates people to call for reduction in the impact of disasters.

VFL 2011 asked all respondents whether the level of disaster losses in their locale had changed since 2005 (the year the HFA was adopted by 168 national governments).

All regions reported an increase in disaster losses.

When data assessed at country level, 57 countries report a worsening situation, against 8 countries reporting that disaster losses have reduced.

56% of individual respondents felt disaster losses have increased since 2005, compared with 21% who felt disaster losses had decreased.



Chart 4: **Changes in disaster losses since 2005**
(negative scores represent an increase in losses)

‘Without social demand (popular pressure) for investments to prepare for and mitigate the impact of disasters, DRR will continue to be a political challenge for governments’.

UN GAR 2011

What makes for good governance? Views of progress

The overall picture

Overall there is a need to strengthen local risk governance. The local governance indicators show that capabilities are very limited, requiring substantial inputs in terms of skills, capacities, resources and authority. Without this, policies and plans will not be implemented in a participatory way at grassroots level. More account needs to be taken of peoples' needs and priorities, particularly for those considered most at-risk.

This finding contrasts with governance scores at national level : The GAR 2009-11 assessment showed 48 countries (58%) reporting substantial or comprehensive progress towards HFA PFA 1 (Governance).

Reading the map – highs and lows

The chart shows that whilst many of the indicators are rated at similar levels, there are markedly higher scores for governmental coordination and partnerships, and markedly lower scores for resources.

Financial resources achieved the lowest overall score of all the 20 governance indicators. Access to funding is clearly restricting an increase in investment in local action.

'The City promoted the development of an Emergency Plan in the municipality with the participation of the community and all institutions, but it is limited by the lack of resources.

Today we continue to spend significant financial resources, public entertainment events knowing that to date there are families living in squalid conditions without receiving food aid, medicines or diapers for children' Chile: VFL 2011

The governance indicators show that government functions of coordination, planning and partnerships are not being matched by sufficient expertise and resources for effective implementation -




Chart 5: Mean scores for Governance Indicators

policies and plans may be in place but the resources and expertise are not.

'Local governments have no support from central government, so while responsibilities are decentralized they are not allocated sufficient resources' Honduras: VFL 2011

Countries where people perceived most progress in risk reduction (for example, Nicaragua, Philippines), tend to give higher scores for partnerships and gender inclusion (this correlated positively with a reduction in disaster losses)

'It is important to establish baselines to measure progress and support the involvement of citizens to monitor progress and demand their rights' Honduras: VFL 2011

The 'Accountability and Transparency' indicators (for example baselines and monitoring) have lowest ratings as a group, suggesting that gathering, disseminating and managing disaster risk information are key constraints to effective risk reduction.

These findings echo those at country level and those of the HFA Mid Term Review and GAR 2011:



- 'Most countries across all geographical and income regions report relatively low progress in assigning dedicated resources to strengthen their risk governance capacities. Resources allocated for sectors or local governments are even more limited. Although 80% of lower-middle income countries report local government have legal responsibilities for DRM, only 26% of countries confirm dedicated resource allocations'.
- 'Most countries report difficulties in comprehensively assessing their risks and in factoring risk information into national planning, investment and development decisions. Disaster loss information is a prerequisite for understanding risk'
- 'Unless local governments have the capacities and resources to fulfil their functions the decentralisation of DRM responsibilities is useless.'

Source: UNISDR Global Assessment Report, 2011

Lack of resources for building local state / non-state institutional capacities and dedicated budgets for programme implementation remain a primary constraint to building local resilience.



Different views from the frontline - Regions, countries, young, old, male, female, urban and rural

The headline messages from the frontline show a similar pattern across a range of places and demographic groups. However there are differences; and this section shows how people in different localities and groupings responded.

69 countries across 11 geographical regions participated in VFL 2011. The project has expanded considerably since 48 countries took part in VFL 2009, reflecting a growing commitment to local-level monitoring by civil society. Most countries reached between 150 and 300 respondents.




Chart 6: **Assessment of progress in governance by region**

Of the 69 participating countries 32% are classified by the World Bank as low-income countries and 32% as low-middle income countries. The level

of participation of low-income countries is particularly encouraging given the strong correlation between poverty and vulnerability.

¹² Charts are colour coded in red for scores up to 2, orange for scores up to 3 and yellow for scores up to 4




Chart 7: Assessments of Governance at Country level



All regions other than Central Asia and Eastern Europe report an assessment of progress between 2-3 ('limited or some activity but significant scope for improvement').

The contrasts are more striking at a country level (chart 7 above)

The overall picture shows a very limited level of progress. It should be recognised that cultural differences may also have an effect on the scores; for example network members in Vietnam reported a cultural resistance to respondents offering negative views of progress.

Perspectives of different Respondent groups: role, age, gender, location

Chart 8

- The sample is male biased – 58: 42 Male: Female. Women have less positive view of progress than men.

Chart 9

There are marked differences in views held by rural and urban residents – urban residents have a more positive of the performance of local governments across all the indicators

- The overall sample is predominantly rural (68%), although in some countries the sample was highly urban.
- The young (under 11 years) are underrepresented.
- 25% of respondents declared themselves to be members of local government. The proportion of men involved in local government is higher than for women.

Chart 10

Those in local government indicate a more positive view of their performance than others This was also a finding of VFL 2009. This may reflect a lack of interaction between other groups and local authorities concerning disaster risk reduction.

- Perceptions of disaster threats and possible losses increase with age and are highest amongst older community respondents.

Understanding gender perspectives is important. However in the UN HFA survey the majority (80%) of countries indicated that gender-disaggregated information is not collected by governments.¹³

The general View from the Frontline 2011 is that only very limited or no advance has been made across all the indicators reflecting the limited capacity and accountability of local government. Progress on local risk governance is essential in reducing risks.




Chart 8: Governance indicators by gender




Chart 9: Governance indicators by rural and urban respondents




Chart 10: Governance indicators by age group

¹³ Source: UN Global Assessment Report 2011

VIEWS ON PROGRESS SINCE 2009

Although the focus of VFL 2011 is substantially different from VFL 2009, comparisons with the related PFA 1 (governance) indicators can be made.



The comparison shows a mixed picture: there are reported improvements in government coordination, partnerships and planning; but overall there appears to have been little or no progress over the two-year period 2009 – 2011.

- In comparison to VFL 2009 governance scores on most indicators are similar, with slight improvements shown in governmental coordination, partnerships and planning over the reporting period.




Chart 11: Comparison between related indicators in VFL 2009 and 2011

- VFL 2011 indicators all score lower than equivalent governance indicators within the GAR 2011 review.
- Overall the gap between national progress (measured by GAR at 3.4) and local progress (measured by VFL at 2.5) persists.

VFL 2011 results contrast with the national level findings reported by the GAR 2011 which claims improvement across all priority areas in the 2009 – 2011 reporting period. It shows 42 countries reporting substantial or comprehensive achievements in Priority for Action 1 – dealing with governance, government structures and implementation. The global average score for GAR PFA 1 was 3.4 compared with an average of 2.5 for VFL 2011.

It is clear that reported progress at the national level does not automatically translate into effective disaster risk management at the local level. This is consistent with the HFA Mid-term Review which reported notable progress in setting up institutional structures and developing plans but much less on providing resources and local implementation. These differences may in part be attributed to a ‘phased approach’ to the outworking of the HFA, with activities progressively shifting over time from national to local level. However there is little evidence that a systematic decentralisation of the necessary authority, responsibilities, financial and technical support to drive local progress is actually happening.

VFL 2011 indicators all score lower than equivalent governance indicators within the GAR 2011 review.



Linkages with other Indices

Governance is a cross cutting issue that affects every aspect of disaster risk reduction and, more generally, sustainable human development. Therefore, a number of statistical tests were done to see what relationships might exist between the governance indicators and perceptions of progress in reducing risk with a variety of conventional development indicators.

The correlations were small, but statistically significant in the following cases:-

- Local government scores are higher in countries with lower levels of corruption - showing that people's perceptions reflect other measures of government performance.
- Countries with more equitable income distribution have performed better.
- Countries with lower under-five mortality performed better, showing that DRR is related to overall development.
- Availability of financial resources appears closely linked with overall poverty indicators, showing that peoples' perceptions of available resources reflected other measures of the wealth of a country.

Comparing perceptions with other measures?

We found that reported losses are greatest in the countries with the greatest perceived level of risk. (EM-DAT data base). This indicates that peoples' perceptions of risk reflect measures of actual disaster losses.



TEXTS FROM THE FRONTLINE

A strength of 'Views from the Frontline' is its extensive evidence base – the large number of views provided by people in vulnerable communities. Is it possible to extend that evidence base using electronic communications to complement the labour-intensive 'face to face' surveys?



Internet access is still limited in the majority of localities where views have been gathered - estimates put it at approximately 20%. But, it's a different picture for mobile phone use, where access is 80% or higher. Mobile phone and text (SMS) communication is therefore increasingly a feature of disaster response, in Haiti and Pakistan in 2010 for example.

This VFL 2011 SMS and web pilot shows that it can also be an important tool for disaster risk reduction – it reached a total of 36,790 respondents (compared with 20,990 in the main face to face sample).

The first phase of the SMS pilot, also offering a web option, yielded primarily

web responses. There seemed to be resistance to use of SMS - possibly due to cost. A different option was offered: 'UCMP' (Universal Cellular Messaging Protocol), which whilst similar SMS has the benefit of being free to the end user. 27,993 responses were received via the web, and the UCMP test generated 8,797 responses.

Results were similar to those in the face to face survey, but a comparison of responses in ten countries where face-to-face surveys were conducted as well as the pilot SMS, web and UCMP surveys shows more positive responses from people completing the shorter 'electronic surveys' - see chart 12.



Both electronic methods confirm the overall view that disaster losses are increasing.

The view of threat is also less pessimistic in the electronic samples than in the face to face sample.



What about views of governance in the electronic survey?

Examining the responses to the questions about governance showed a similar pattern in both face to face and the web survey, with one significant variation - see chart 14.

The most marked divergence in the two data sets is on the 'financial resources' indicator, where face-to-face




Chart 12: Changes in disaster losses shown through different sampling methods (a positive figure indicates the view that disaster losses have increased).¹⁴




Chart 14: Comparison of pilot face to face and web data.

data universally rates progress lowest, but web respondents rate this higher than nearly all other indicators. As with overall perceptions of losses and threat, the responses to the indicators are higher than those in the face-to-face survey.

More detail on this analysis is available at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011.



Did the electronic survey reach a representative range of people?

Did it succeed in reaching people more widely than just (for example) urban

professionals with internet access?

The answer to this question is critical as the aim is to reach groups in at-risk situations.

Gender: All methods, including face to face, show a majority of male respondents. However the web survey is most strongly biased in this direction.

Urban/Rural: The web survey showed a clear bias to urban respondents. However, the 'UCMP' survey showed a rural bias. This suggests that this 'free to end user' option was more widely acceptable than the web method.

'Financial status': The electronic survey also included a 'years of education' indicator which could be used as a proxy for financial status. The web survey showed 30%

of respondents were educated to 'incomplete secondary' level (those with less than 12 years of education). The UCMP survey showed a higher level of 40%, suggesting it was reaching people of lower financial status. The possibility of using this indicator to identify views of vulnerable sectors of the sample is investigated in the detailed analysis (www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011)

Overall the pilot suggests that the use of UCMP is particularly effective in reducing the gender bias and achieving greater reach into the rural population and to those of lower financial status, compared with web surveying.



Developing the use of electronic surveys

The use of electronic media as a tool of VFL has great potential. The pilot survey shows that it is possible to get views from a large number of respondents, and that these views fit similar patterns to the face-to-face survey. Observation of respondents in Bangladesh to the SMS and UCMP survey highlighted an enthusiastic response, but technical issues as well as the cost of normal SMS were challenges.

'This is an excellent idea, this is the age of technology and this is a great use of technology. It supports us to express our opinions and express our views, to share our views with others.'

Bangladesh: Text survey respondent

The subsequent 'UCMP' protocol test - 'free to end user' successfully circumvented the costs and some of the other technical barriers.

To be confident of the 'meaning' of the data more research is needed clarify who is responding, and how they are understanding the questions; in other words 'market research'.

The potential for this method is striking: it can cost-effectively reach large populations, potentially giving a voice to millions of people in a new and innovative way. Further development will be part of the ongoing VFL programme.

¹³ Unusual results such as those from Bangladesh and Nigeria are discussed in the full data analysis, available at <http://www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011>



FOCUS ON CHILDREN AT THE FRONTLINE

More than 1,000 children from 49 countries took part in VFL 2011. Six countries (Albania, Cambodia, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Indonesia and the Philippines) spoke with 900 children, and produced enough statistical data to generate child-focused findings (all 1,318 children's responses are included in the main VFL 2011 survey analysis).

More than 1,000 children from 49 countries took part in VFL 2011. Six countries (Albania, Cambodia, Cote d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Indonesia and the Philippines) spoke with 900 children, and produced enough statistical data to generate child-focused findings (all 1,318 children's responses are included in the main VFL 2011 survey analysis).

This child-focused data indicates the importance of children's participation for accurate and responsive results and education for resilience and meaningful participation.

- Children's responses show that in four of the six countries their views on local governance tend to be less positive than those of adults in all respects (the exceptions are Philippines and Cote d'Ivoire).
- Across all 67 countries the survey question focusing on the needs of children and youth sees a consistently negative opinion among the under-18s compared with adults up to 61. This suggests that children have contributions for, or views about, the process of improving local governance for disaster risk reduction, which are unique to children and not yet being taken on board.
- The large numbers of children who answered 'don't know' to questions highlights the need for education (both formal and informal) in order to ensure that participation is meaningful. More children who have a deeper understanding about risk reduction will lead to more children engaging actively in local decision-making and action.

In Ethiopia, young people reported on the challenge of deforestation and the changing climate:

14 year old Zuleka stated: "The coverage of forest in our country is 3%" but Rahel, also 14, added: "following pressure from our community... the government has started to plant trees to prevent climate change."

To establish an accurate picture of disaster risk reduction at the community level children must be fully informed and actively involved. Working together at the local level means including everyone – women and men, boys and girls – in local debates, decision-making and action for reducing risk. For local governments this means supporting children's actions for reducing risk; and creating opportunities for children's input in all stages of risk identification, reduction, preparedness and monitoring. This will enable them to build their own resilience in the face of disasters, and that of their communities. With the right support and information, children can play an important role in

Ethiopia

In Ethiopia, young people reported on the challenge of deforestation and the changing climate:

14 year old Zuleka stated: "The coverage of forest in our country is 3%" but Rahel, also 14, added: "following pressure from our community... the government has started to plant trees to prevent climate change."

helping implement national disaster prevention policies at the local level. Local governments may need to develop expertise to facilitate children's participation, or engage civil society to support. But challenges can be overcome, and successes identified: such action in the Philippines helped one town win the 2011 Sasakawa Award for DRR.



¹⁵ For guidance on child-centred disaster risk reduction, see www.childreninachangingclimate.org

¹⁶ See <http://www.unisdr.org/eng/sasakawa/>



FOCUS ON WOMEN'S VIEWS FROM THE FRONTLINE 2011

In VFL 2011 women ranked local government progress lower than their male counterparts in 19 of the 20 indicators.¹⁷ Women were less likely to think local government ensures that women and men participate equally,¹⁸ and less likely to give a positive evaluation of the local government's progress in other areas. This section investigates Women's Views from the Frontline, focusing the views of women-led grassroots organisations.

The Huairou Commission a coalition of grassroots organizations, NGO's, networks and partners, undertook this investigation.¹⁹ Grassroots women-led organizations in 10 countries with experience in resilience-building participated, meeting as communities and with local authorities, and generating 421 responses. The process of conducting the action research provided promoted engagement with local governments for these organizations in Bangladesh, Bolivia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Jamaica, Nepal, Nicaragua, Peru, and the Philippines.

Respondents reached by organized women's groups gave even lower scores than men and women in general in 15 areas. Greatest differences were in 'participation', 'monitoring', 'information dissemination and 'taking into account local and indigenous knowledge, skills and resources'. Women are identified as a vulnerable group, which usually leads to them being excluded from decision-making. On the other hand, when there is investment in grassroots women's groups, their practices and knowledge; this can reduce vulnerabilities of local communities and strengthen local government efforts to prevent disasters. Huairou's World Resilience Campaign currently has more than 350 community trainers in 20 countries in Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, with a demonstrated capacity to transfer

practices. These are increasingly being asked to train and advise local governments.

The difference that the successful inclusion of grassroots women's groups can make is shown by some contrasting results: for five of the indicators, women's groups' respondents actually had a more positive evaluation of local government progress than either men or women in general, including in 'planning', 'financial resources', and 'training'.²⁰

This may be because women-led groups are engaging with local governments, helping them improve their performance.




Chart 19: Comparing responses of woens groups with those of men and women in the overall VFL 2011 survey

¹⁷ See Women's Views from the Frontline 2011 Detailed Report for fuller information on survey results. Thirteen of those differences are significant statistically, see detailed data analysis: www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011 ¹⁸ See full VFL data analysis, table 20 p36: www.globalnetwork-dr.org/VFL2011 ¹⁹ Huairou Commission also conducted, and authored a report for, the Women's Views from the Frontline 2009, in partnership with the Global Network of Civil Society Organizations. ²⁰ These comparisons are illustrative rather than statistically significant due to the small sample size of the womens' groups

Though all sectors (women, men and women's groups) rated financial resources (whether local governments had an adequate budget for disaster prevention) as the element in which the local government has made the least progress, women's groups respondents were less negative (indicator 1.8). This may be because their negotiations with local authorities may be showing that local governments benefit from decentralized budget allocations, leveraging resources from national government to address resilience priorities and the knowledge that resilience depends on more than financial resources.²¹ For instance, in Peru, after community mapping and negotiations between the grassroots women's network GROOTS Peru²² and local authorities of El Agustino in Lima, the municipality was able to access approximately USD \$43,000 from national funds in order to build an embankment and support reforestation to reduce flooding, to be overseen by grassroots women.

Women are often excluded from decision-making. However is clear that involving them in decision-making and collaboration is an important driver of progress.

Involving women works: **India**

In India, the experience of Swyam Shikshan Prayog (SSP) has demonstrated that involving the most vulnerable in decision making and implementation is effective and can be scaled up. A Community Based Health Mutual Fund was launched in 2006, improving resilience by empowering women to take proactive control over the health of themselves and their families, while institutionalizing partnerships with government officials. Working collectively by helping women access public and private health care, this program provides low cost services and preventive health measures for more than 15,000 members.

Recommendations from Women's Views from the Frontline 2011

1. Set aside resources to support demonstrations that invest in grassroots women to show how their knowledge, practices and partnerships contribute to building resilience.
2. Establish decentralized DRR programs that incorporate incentives for local authorities to engage grassroots women's organizations as collaborators.

Women are often excluded from decision-making. However is clear that involving them in decision-making and collaboration is an important driver of progress.

Working with Local Government: **Indonesia**

In Indonesia, Komite Perjuangan Rakyat Miskin (KPRM), a community-based organization of neighbourhood groups, led by women, mobilized a constituency of 70,000 urban poor in the 2008 Makassar election to build partnerships with local government. It is now working with the mayor to draw up guidelines to plan settlement restructuring with integrated disaster response, disseminate disaster management information in schools, and strengthen a formal disaster response partnership.



²¹ The Union de Cooperativas de Produccion Agrícola Las Brumas de Nicaragua (Las Brumas) initiated a community mapping process, dialogued with local and national government about priorities, and developed a formal partnership with the municipality, which signed a resolution to set aside 5% of its budget to address grassroots priorities. Las Brumas successfully advocated for a 'gender desk' inside the municipality, which can monitor progress on institutional responses to women's interests and a new decentralization law that provides budget and mandate to implement DRR locally.

²² GROOTS Peru is a coalition of grassroots women's groups including CONAMOVIDI (a network of women's popular kitchens), La Central de Bancos Comunes del Agustino y Santa Anita, Red de Mujeres de Lima Este, Mujeres Unidas para un Pueblo Mejor, and Servicios Educativos del Agustino (SEA).

FIVE

LESSONS AND CONCLUSIONS

If we do not join hands... then effective and sustainable progress will not be achieved. This is the starting point for this study. Over 50,000 people in over 80 countries have been consulted through face to face discussions and meetings, complemented by the experimental web and SMS survey. Over 500 civil society organisations have been mobilised to do this work.



VFL 2011 has gathered a substantial body of evidence - from surveys, case studies and comments providing insights into local risk governance.

What does this all add up to? Understanding what the data and case studies say about progress and possibilities is vitally important. The UN Hyogo Framework for Action is past the halfway point and the stated goal of a substantial reduction in disaster losses translates into the possibility of better lives and more secure livelihoods for millions of people in at risk communities. This section reaches the heart of the matter. What can we learn from VFL 2011?

Clouds... but still little rain

The majority of HFA-signatory countries self-reported themselves to have achieved “*substantive*” progress at the national level. However, the general view from the ‘frontline’ in 2011 is that “*very limited / some*” progress has been made. This is the assessment of over 20,000 people at the frontline on one of the most critical aspects of the HFA - *local risk governance*.

A capable, responsive and accountable local government – working in partnership with active civil society and communities – is essential to achieving sustainable reduction of disaster risk. VFL 2011

results demonstrate a positive correlation between local risk governance capabilities and a country's performance in reducing disaster losses.

Local governance indicator scores were also higher and disaster losses lower in countries with lower levels of corruption, lower under-five mortality and more equitable income distribution. These relationships all emphasise that disaster risk reduction is primarily a development issue.

National progress isn't reaching the frontline

A comparison of national and local level monitoring results shows a persistent gap between national policy and local action. According to the GAR 2011, 48 of the 82 reporting countries found “substantial or comprehensive” progress on risk governance indicators (HFA PFA 1). By comparison, none of the 69 countries participating on the VFL survey reported “substantial” progress at the local level, with significantly lower scores, similar to those reported in the VFL 2009 survey.

The general perception across more than 20,000 individual VFL respondents was that the overall threat of disasters and associated losses has increased since 2005, with least progress made in countries where the threat of disaster is greatest. This view is shared by residents and local government workers alike. Importantly, perceptions of increased disaster losses at the local level correlated with actual increases in losses as reported through the EM-DAT statistics.

The general view from the ‘frontline’ in 2011 is that “very limited / some ” progress has been made.



Liquid gold – solving water shortages in **Swaziland**: An NGO takes the lead in identifying local capacity and resources

In Shiselweni region of Swaziland rural populations rely on subsistence farming. However since 2002 this region has been affected by recurring droughts resulting in failed harvests and fires on the maize farms, leading to increased hunger and poverty: Maize is grown both commercially and as a subsistence crop. It requires good summer rains. Since December 2010 there has been no rainfall, leaving the soil very dry without water.

The Disaster Reduction team of the Swaziland NCO, 'Christian International' undertook disaster surveillance in the region as part of the VFL 2011 project. The main aim was to bring to the attention of local Government and community leaders the indigenous capacities and resources that could be utilized. The result of the survey was surprising.

“It is time to take action and do something for ourselves, rather than folding our hands, crying and waiting for external forces, which might not arrive.”

They found there were pockets of rivers and waterfalls in the mountains and rocks that could be used as drinking water and for irrigation in the rural community farms. However, none of these rural community resources are being used.

'This latest finding is bringing all the stakeholders together. Community members are now talking and looking for a way discuss with government agencies how to utilize local resources. The National Disaster Management Agency, the government agency in charge of disaster management is already sending their team to the region for a proper assessment and way forward.'



Together these findings provide compelling evidence that **unless there is a massive scaling up of action at the local level the HFA will not achieve a substantial reduction in disaster losses by 2015**. Although interpreting disaster trend lines is problematic (and discounting reductions in flood mortality risk across all regions) at current levels of progress it is probable there will be a significant increase in disaster losses over the ten-year timeframe (2005-2015).

When one takes into account largely unnoticed “extensive” disaster losses – those small and moderate events that are localised, recurrent, taking smaller numbers of lives but eroding livelihoods – the picture becomes even bleaker. Cumulatively these ‘everyday disasters’ trap large numbers of people into a cycle of poverty and disaster as livelihoods are set back again and again.

Policies and plans – but inadequate means to implement

The VFL programme shows that government policies, legislation and plans are weakened by a lack of resources at the local level to carry them out. Public administrative functions such as planning, coordination and partnership building are not matched by sufficient finance, technical expertise and capacity building for effective implementation. VFL 2009 and VFL 2011 both demonstrate an urgent need for alternative financial strategies to scale up local risk governance capacities.

Public administration culture: ‘The local government does not have the expertise and they don’t accept the assistance of qualified people in various areas whether environmental, educational, social and others. They are not familiar with the concept of cooperation especially whenever disasters occur. They feel intimidated and refuse any kind of assistance.’
Lebanon: VFL Survey 2011

Actions need to match words

Allocation of financial resources for disaster risk reduction is an indicator of political commitment to risk reduction. Decisions about resource allocations are shaped by those who have influence on government decision-makers. Where vulnerable people have little influence their needs and priorities are ignored. The result is that allocation of DRR measures is biased against those most at risk.

‘*Natural Hazards, UnNatural Disasters*’, published by the World Bank, shares this conclusion.²³ Establishing political commitment for investment in community- and local-level approaches and risk governance requires greater participation, public accountability and transparency. Where accountability is earthed in popular awareness and participatory processes, then at-risk people can exert influence on the political system in their country.

‘The local government has a plan of action but it is not well implemented on the field. For example in the case of the 2006 Bonduma landslide, the government pinpointed some areas of risk zones, but shortly after they themselves gave permits for people to build in those areas.’
Cameroon: VFL 2011

Not surprisingly, in the majority of countries participating in VFL 2011 governance indicators related to participation, accountability and transparency scored in the range ‘*only to a limited extent/some progress but significant scope for improvement*’.

“One way that can promote progress towards good local governance is through the incorporation of communities in governance. Their views need to be taken into account. People in communities know their problems best. Therefore they should be given participation in decision making.”
Venezuela: VFL 2011

Those countries where most progress has been made (for example Nicaragua and the Philippines) are those where popular pressure and inclusive decision-making processes

Where vulnerable people have little political voice their needs and priorities are ignored.

influence policy and action. These make local governments more accountable and responsive to citizens – findings that were also highlighted in the IFRC’s *World Disaster Report 2010 Focus on Urban Risk*.

There are always good, even impressive plans developed by various agencies on development and disaster mitigation. However, the implementation, and even enforcement of these plans are sometimes a different story altogether, as they do not always follow through with these plans. These may be because of a general lack of awareness and sense of urgency towards the matter. There usually is not enough will power from authorities, or even from the ground, to drive such efforts successfully.
Malaysia: VFL 2011

Changing the culture of public administration means “joining hands”

Local level actors cannot address all the structural causes of vulnerability on their own. Discussions on reforming and strengthening local risk governance capabilities have to be set within the broader challenge of political reforms to national governance.

Political reforms leading to phased decentralisation and stronger local democracies are required. Very few local authorities have sufficient financial and technical resources to invest in disaster risk management without the support of national governments.

‘The only solution is the constant cooperation and coordination between all the concerned ministries and the local communities. It is also the responsibility of the people to ask for their rights from the local governments which should consider the issue of preparedness their responsibility.’
Lebanon: VFL 2011

²³ World Bank 2010: <http://www.gfdrr.org/gfdrr/NHUD-home>

Where the culture of public administration is open to working in partnership with civil society and other actors, there is plenty of evidence to suggest it is possible to harness financial resources. Public and private, national and local resources can be mobilised to support collaborative actions which scale up local disaster risk management initiatives.

The culture of partnership includes adoption of inclusive decision-making processes – facilitating citizenry engagement and fostering local ownership. VFL 2011 qualitative data shows a range of effective local risk governance practices for which participatory and partnerships approaches are essential. Examples are inclusion of communities across the programme cycle; in assessments, planning, budgeting, implementation and monitoring.

These individual examples of good practice contrast starkly with the generally low scores accorded to equivalent governance indicators across the VFL quantitative survey.

Bringing about widespread changes in the culture of public administration poses a considerable challenge and will require political, legal, economic and in some cases humanitarian incentives. For example, the *World Disaster Report 2010* reports that in Central American countries recurrent disaster events have prompted governments to adopt principles of participation, partnership, devolving responsibilities to the lowest appropriate level and accountability in their approaches to disaster risk reduction.²⁴

Whilst each country has different governance arrangements there are consistent functions and characteristics which lead to progress. For example the rights of all groups to information about risks and risk reduction measures, participation in decision-making, budgeting, planning and implementation must be explicitly recognised in policy, legal and institutional provisions. These must shape local government practice.

Local level actors have limited jurisdiction and powers to tackle all of the deeper political, social and macro-economic forces that put people at-risk.

Therefore, discussions on strengthening risk governance can't be disconnected from those on other development processes. Building resilience always requires trade-offs between competing objectives and priorities. For example there is a tension between promoting rapid economic growth and reducing people's exposure to the risks that inevitably accompany economic growth. As learnt in Pakistan (and more recently Japan), economic growth is ultimately not sustainable unless disaster risk is factored into economic development processes.

"Trade-offs" are influenced by a variety of factors, for example vested interests of different stakeholders who exert pressure on resource allocations, and capacity to map and quantify disaster risks associated with investments. Investment decisions are also shaped by societies' perception of an "acceptable level of risk" – which differs between countries and changes over time as a consequence of significant events. Shifting public attitudes towards the safety of nuclear power generation in a post-earthquake Japan are an example of this.

Public perceptions of risk are dependent on access to appropriate risk information, combined with an understanding of the responsibilities and obligations of different stakeholders in reducing risk. Results from the GAR and VFL 2011 show that knowledge of risk at local and national levels is severely lacking.

Empowering local stakeholders is the key to progress

Access to information is not only essential to make informed investment decisions; it is the single most important factor in building accountability. The generation and dissemination of appropriate risk information is one of the most important priorities for action at both the local and national levels. Accelerating progress toward building local disaster resilience requires systematic mapping of disaster risk, utilizing participatory hazard, vulnerability, and capacity assessments. The risk information can be used to inform public investment

decisions and action planning in the principal development sectors.

Undertaking local level risk assessments and mapping on a national scale can be achieved through a collaborative action between public and private sectors, civil society and other relevant stakeholders. A key finding of VFL 2009 was that there is a great deal of experience and expertise at the local level. This is particularly true of civil society organisations. These have a good understanding of local hazards and vulnerabilities, gained through working alongside vulnerable people. Civil society organisations, particularly grassroots women's groups, can play a vital role in mobilising and facilitating community engagement.

It is tempting to suggest that a country's ability to prevent disasters depends purely on financial resources. However it is clear that optimising resource mobilisation to strengthen local capacities requires a commitment to public accountability, transparency, participation and partnerships.

The solution to building the resilience of nations and communities is more a political than a financial challenge.

DRR and Climate change . . . it's all one

At the grassroots, climate change, disaster risk and poverty are all experienced as part of one challenge: the security of lives, livelihoods and assets. Like DRR, climate adaptation aims to reduce vulnerability and build resilience. It requires assessment and mapping of local vulnerabilities and capacities.

Collaboration to assess, mitigate and monitor risk can promote synergy and prevent duplication of efforts. This should include strengthening of information and knowledge management, education and public awareness.

With the exception of earthquake, tsunami and volcanic eruption, all hazards addressed by DRR are related to climate. As with DRR, strengthening local governance capabilities to implement community-based climate adaptation depends on participation, partnership, accountability, transparency and devolving responsibilities to the lowest appropriate level.

²⁴ <http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/disasters/WDR/WDR2010-full.pdf>



Participatory Budgeting: **The ‘Community Resilience Fund’**

In late 2008, GROOTS International and Huairou Commission launched the Community Resilience Fund in five countries: India, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua and Peru. The purpose of the Fund is to enable experienced grassroots organizations to:

- Experiment with grassroots-led solutions to address locally identified risks and priorities;
- Build stakeholder platforms to link local priorities and practices to national agendas;
- Link and leverage resources from poverty, development, social protection, DRR and adaptation programs.

In 2010, the Community Resilience Fund expanded to 8 more countries: Jamaica, Uganda, Kenya, Philippines, Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka and Turkey.

By investing in demonstrating local capacities of grassroots women’s organizations, locating the demonstrations within grassroots learning and advocacy networks and promoting collaborations with local and national governments, the CRF is continually widening the scope and influence of grassroots organizations living in disaster prone settlements, thus building a demand for decentralized, locally responsive disaster risk reduction programs. In India, Guatemala and Honduras, the CRF is being scaled up with funds from the South-South Program of the World Bank’s Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. In Guatemala the Presidential Secretariat of the Defender of Indigenous Women has signed an agreement to scale up the Fund.

In each country, grassroots women’s

organizations have CRF committees to manage the fund and determine how it is used. For example in the Philippines a community mapping process organized by DAMPA in Metro Manila involved more than 5,000 men and women, catalyzing negotiations to halt evictions and the create local multi-stakeholder platforms in which urban poor could partner with national and local government to find new resettlement options. In Uganda a grassroots-led survey of 400 households by Women from the Slum Women’s Initiative for Development (SWID) found that community food security was severely impacted by drought, unpredictable rain and the privatization of land. In response, SWID has organized women to plant drought-resistant crops, plant trees and pool women’s savings to buy a 3-acre plot which can be collectively farmed.



Building linkages and supporting collaborative actions between different sectors and levels is crucial if climate adaptation and DRR synergies are to be realised. Through collaboration, the additional resources mobilised through the Cancun Adaptation Framework could be used to reform and strengthen local risk governance capacities, addressing both disaster and climate risk.

If we do not join hands . . .

How can a substantial reduction in disaster losses by 2015 be achieved? Closing the gap between national policy aspirations and local practice on the ground is fundamental to achieving this. It will demand significant financial and technical resources at the local level. Strengthening risk governance capabilities – enabling risk to be quantified and incorporated into planning and investments – is vital.

Whilst countries are different and there is no one-size-fits-all solution, a growing body of evidence shows that

optimising local and national resources for local-level disaster risk management requires commitment to participatory governance and multi-stakeholder partnerships. The challenge of building resilient communities is primarily a political rather than a financial or technical matter.

‘So will the day come when we begin working together as civil society and local governments? In reality we are all one community affected by the same disasters. This is a big question and its answer is simple in the presence of good intentions for building our societies and becoming stronger.’
Lebanon: VFL 2011

VFL 2009 showed that it is not easy to empower communities and local authorities through access to information, resources and changed decision-making processes in countries where there is a history of mistrust between civil society and government.

Intuitively, we know we can achieve more by working together. However, power is often seen as a zero sum game in which empowering one group disempowers others. Changing the culture of public administration to build participation and partnership requires investment in actions that build dialogue, trust, mutual understanding and constructive relationships between state and non-state actors.

Participatory risk assessments, planning and monitoring, for example, serve not only a technical but a political function. They build social capital, foster local ownership and engagement, increase accountability and transparency, raising awareness, consensus and social demand.

These actions are mutually reinforcing. Implementing them individually is not effective. Therefore coherent national-level implementation strategies which build synergies and virtuous relationships between different activities and actors are vital.



SIX

REQUIREMENTS FOR LOCAL RISK GOVERNANCE – AN AGENDA FOR CHANGE

Findings from this VFL 2011 study so far indicate that, while local risk governance is critical to accelerating risk reduction activity at the local level, dramatic changes are needed for this to take place more effectively. This section returns to the three core aspects of local risk governance that have been explored in this research and learning project and provides an Agenda for Change:



ONE

ENHANCE INCLUSION AND PARTICIPATION



Political governance reforms: recognise rights of all groups (men, women, girls, boys and youth) to participate in disaster risk reduction decision-making and planning process through policy, legal and institutional provisions and in actuality, not just on paper.



Administrative governance reforms: adopt partnership approaches in public policy implementation, for example through participatory risk assessments, planning, budgeting, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.



Tie performance reviews and incentives, such as promotion in government service, to results achieved in implementing partnership approaches in public policy.







Decentralise local risk governance systems to the local appropriate administrative level, including clear, delegated authority, responsibilities and resources.

Findings from this VFL 2011 study so far indicate that, while local risk governance is critical to accelerating risk reduction activity at the local level, dramatic changes are needed for this to take place more effectively.

TWO





DEVELOP LOCAL CAPACITY AND CAPABILITY

-  Undertake nationwide periodic climate-sensitive vulnerability / capacity assessments at the local level; with participation from civil society and high-risk groups
-  Develop information management systems; collating, mapping and disseminating local risk information, which is triangulated and cross-checked with national and regional information. Strengthen knowledge-sharing networks, fostering lateral and vertical exchange of good practices, lessons learnt and connecting local indigenous and scientific knowledge.
-  Disseminate outside specialist knowledge such as flood maps and climate forecasts in forms and language that are culturally appropriate and through accessible local media.
-  Run public awareness and media campaigns to promote widespread dissemination of risk information and raise awareness among at-risk citizens and key stakeholder groups.

-  Utilize the local risk knowledge of women, girls, boys, youth and men to inform planning and investment decisions within principal development sectors including finance and planning, trade and industry, transport, energy, agriculture, environment, health, education, urban planning.
-  Conduct institutional capacity assessment, development and training for local state and non-state actors in disaster risk reduction, using participatory approaches.
-  Adopt innovative financial strategies such as community risk reduction and adaptation funds to provide sustained support for institutional capacity building of local actors.
-  Provide adequate dedicated programme budgets at district and municipal levels in support of DRR activities.






BUT IT'S NOT JUST ABOUT THE LOCAL LEVEL...

Whilst many aspects of local risk governance depend on local level actions, collaborative approaches through coalitions and alliances at national and international levels are needed to enable and support local activity:

-  Develop national DRR implementation strategies to ensure coherent and complementary approaches, unlocking synergies between different actions and actors, especially at the local scale.
-  Strengthen networks and alliances at all levels that promote civil society harmonisation, information exchange, coordination and joint actions.
-  Develop common local level resilience frameworks, associated tools and implementation guidelines for climate and disaster risk assessment, coordination, planning, implementation and monitoring.
-  Establish and use resource coordination mechanisms that foster collaborative working across sectors and programmes through interdisciplinary multi-sectoral coalitions (e.g. climate change, poverty alleviation, etc.). Promote coordination between line departments/ ministries (e.g. health, education, agriculture, water, urban planning, etc.) to avoid competition for funding and to break down "silo" cultures in governments.

THREE

ENABLE GREATER ACCOUNTABILITY AND TRANSPARENCY

-  Set out the right to information about risk and risk reduction rights and obligations in public policy and legislation. Publicise these regularly.
-  Audit disaster risk reduction progress regularly through local-level multi-stakeholder monitoring, reporting and verification systems with active involvement of citizens and civil society.
-  Set specific, time-bound local-level targets, baselines, commitment and responsibilities.
-  Develop relevant DRR codes and standards (inclusive of informal sector) accompanied by appropriate compliance and enforcement mechanisms.
-  Establish and use transparent complaints mechanisms, which are accessible to the general public.

SEVEN

WHAT CAN I DO?

COMMITMENTS TO ACCELERATE LOCAL ACTION BY 2013

Calls for improved local risk governance are not new. It's not the first time recommendations have been made for local level action. Facts, figures, case studies and quotes emphasising the need for partnerships, accountability, transparency and investments in capacity and capability have been shared before...

So, how can VFL 2011 lead to change?

VFL points to a growing gap between national policy and local action. 56% of people feel disaster losses have increased over the last five years. Least progress is happening where the threat is greatest. Resources are not reaching the local level in sufficient speed or quantity to turn this tide. This questions the political will to really deliver on the HFA pledge of a substantial reduction in disaster losses by 2015.

The scale of the 'agenda for change' is daunting, but change takes place step by step, and the stories shared in Actions at the Frontline highlight the benefits for those most at risk.

All those involved in the Views from the Frontline programme call for commitments to be made at all levels to dramatically accelerate frontline action over the next two years:

'Guidelines and benchmarks are very, very important. Stakeholders involved in disaster management, especially disaster preparedness need to have mission and vision for their efforts, they need to formulate short term and long term plans with tangible outcome.'
Malaysia: VFL 2011

✓ International institutions

"I recognise the special opportunity my organisation has in facilitating a blending of local knowledge and outside specialist knowledge and in fostering South-South exchange of good experience among communities."

- My institution will set a target for direct investment in community level activities.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multi-stakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to effective local risk governance, in line with my institution's own expertise.
- Our investment will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**

✓ National Government

"I recognise the unique opportunity government has in breaking down the bureaucratic obstacles to an integrated approach to risk reduction and obtaining efficiencies through the cooperation of many ministries and departments."

- My government will set a target for direct investment in community level activities.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multi-stakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to effective local risk governance, in line with my institution's own expertise.
- Our investment will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**

✓ Community organisations

"I recognise the unique opportunity these actions offer for propelling my community into the mainstream of decision-making in my country and for building bridges of solidarity with other community organisations."

- My organisation will set a target for community level activities.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multi-stakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to effective local risk governance.
- Our activities will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**

✓ Civil Society Organisations

"I recognise the unique opportunity these efforts provide to raise the consciousness of people in the communities we collaborate with, so that they have a clearer understanding of their rights as human beings and citizens and are better able to make their voice heard by government."

- My organisation will set a target for direct investment in community level activities and partnerships.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multi-stakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to effective local risk governance, in line with my organisation's own expertise.
- Our actions will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**

✓ Private Enterprise

"I recognise the unique opportunity these actions provide for demonstrating my business' commitment to social responsibility and the welfare of the communities that surround it, provide labour, buy its products. Taking a medium and long view, this is certainly a win-win opportunity."

- My business will set a target for direct investment and action in community level activities.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multi-stakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to effective local risk governance, in line with my business's own expertise.
- Our investment and actions will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**

✓ Local Government

"I recognise the unique opportunity local government has in building trust and cooperation with communities and blending local knowledge with outside specialist knowledge as well as getting greater efficiency from government outreach and services by combining and cooperating among departments."

- My institution will set a target for programmes of action at community level.
- These may be concerned with community level knowledge building, promotion of multistakeholder collaborations, support for local level participation and monitoring, building of local level capacity, or other activities related to the Agenda for Change.
- Our programme of activities will be quantifiable at the local level and this activity will take place in the period 2011-2012 so that we can report on it at GPP-DRR 2013.
- **We will register our planned actions at www.globalnetwork-dr.org/frontlineaction2013**



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Views from the frontline brings the voices of those at the Frontline - those whose lives and livelihoods are impacted by disasters, into the heart of the debate, identifying key steps needed to achieve real progress. It is the work of the 511 organisations comprising GNDR (see Annex 1) who record grateful appreciation to the 20,990 people who participated in the survey and contributed insights and case studies.

- The work was coordinated by 11 Regional Coordinating Organisations, leading 69 National Coordinating Organisations. All of these devoted huge amounts of time and energy, as did the Participating Organisations working in each country.

- Plan International and the Huiarou Commission provided support for the Young peoples and childrens, and womens' aspects of the study.

- UNISDR provided formal space for presentation of VFL 2011 findings at GP-DRR 2011.

- GNDR gratefully acknowledges the financial support of : Cordaid
GFDRR
ICCO-Kirk in Actie
OFDA
SIDA
– in making VFL 2011 possible. Many of the national and international NGOs who were involved also provided helpful resources and support.

- Tearfund provided invaluable hosting support for the GNDR secretariat.

- The report editorial team included Andrew Bidnell, Terry Gibson, Marcus Oxley, and Ben Wisner

- Statistical analysis was by Nigel Scott

- Administrative support was provided by Regine Nagel

- The 'action at the frontline' case studies were edited by Jessica Faleiro

- Web content was developed by Al Marshall

- Graphic design and artwork was by Mike Thorpe www.design-chapel.com

- Photography produced by, and copyright © 2011 GNDR members. Cover photo ©2008 R.Gibson

- With grateful thanks to Lawrence Temfwe and 'Jubilee Centre' for the title and theme of the report. <http://www.jubileecentre.org/>

This work, including all annexes, is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License.

To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/> or send a letter to the Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 100 Church Road, Teddington, TW11 8QE United Kingdom.


We want to thank all those who have contributed to this research. It testifies to the simple truth that we can achieve more by working together. This report demonstrates that strong partnerships and inclusive governance are essential building blocks for change. We call for commitment to act together in a spirit of collaboration and cooperation to strengthen the resilience of nations and communities to disasters.

Marcus Oxley: Chair, GNDR

ANNEXES

I List of all participating Regional, National and Participating Organisations

Map of VFL coverage



Regional Coordinating Organisations

Region	Organisation
Central America	Concertación Regional para la Gestion de Riesgo, El Salvador
Central Asia/ Eastern Europe	World Vision International
Eastern Africa	Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations (DENIVA)
MENA	Arab Network for Environment and Development- (RAED)
Pacific Region	Foundation of the Peoples of the South Pacific International (FSPI)
South America	Soluciones Practicas Peru
South Asia	National Society for Earthquake Technology (NSET)
South Caucasus	The Regional Environmental Centre for the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia branches)/ Oxfam UK
South-East Asia	Save the Earth Cambodia
Southern Africa	African Centre for Disaster Studies
Western Africa	Shalom International

List of National Coordinating Organisations (NCOs) and Participating Organisations (POs)

Central America:

Costa Rica

NCO Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales (FLACSO) FundaOsa. Proyecto: "De la Recuperación al Desarrollo Local Sostenible: Más allá del Terremoto de Cinchona, 2009". Programa de Naciones Unidas para el Desarrollo- PNUD.

Dominican Republic

NCO República Dominicana del Servicio Social de Iglesias Dominicanas, Inc. (SSID)

El Salvador

NCO MESA PERMANENTE PARA LA GESTION DE RIESGOS

Guatemala

NCO Comunidades Cristianas de Apoyo CCApoyo. Asociación de Salud y Desarrollo Comunitario ASDENA. Coordinadora Nacional para la Reducción de Desastres –CONRED. Consorcio de ONG –Sololá. Fundación Guatemala

Haiti

NCO Action Secours Ambulance (A.S.A). Initiative Citoyenne du Nord'Ouest (ICINOD) / NorthWest Department

Honduras

NCO Asociación de Organismos no Gubernamentales(ASONOG) Comisión de Acción Social Menonita (CASM). Cuerpo de Bomberos de Honduras, Regional Choluteca. Federación de Tribus Xicaques de Honduras(FETRIXIH). Fundación Ayuda en Acción. Mancomunidad Mocalempa. Mesa Nacional de Incidencia para la Gestión de Riesgos. Micro Empresa de Turismo de Omoa. Oficina de la Mujer

Potreros/Cortes. Organismo Cristiano de Desarrollo (OCDIH). Programa de Desarrollo de Área, Visión Mundial, San Matías. Unidad Municipal Ambiental, San Antonio Cortes. Universidad Pedagógica Nacional(Regional Olancho)

Nicaragua

NCO MNGR - Humboldt. Acción Médica Cristiana. Asociación de Municipios de Estelí. Asociación de Municipios de Madriz. Asociación Municipios de Nueva Segovia. Asociación Municipios Norte de Chinandega. Catholic Relief Services. Centro de Derechos Humanos Ciudadanos y Autónomos del Atlántico. Centro de Educación para la Paz. Centro de Información y Servicios de Asesoría en Salud. Centro Humboldt. Centro Interescuelas de Estudios Teológicos y Sociales. Centro Investigaciones y Estudios de la Salud-Universidad Nacional Autónoma de Nicaragua. Centro para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de los Pueblos Indígenas. Centro por la Justicia y Derechos Humanos del Atlántico. Cooperativa "SEMILLA NUEVA" RAAN. Federación Luterana Mundial. Programa Centroamérica. Nicaragua. Fundación para la Autonomía y Desarrollo de la Costa Atlántica. Gobierno Territorial de la Región Autónoma del Atlántico Norte. Grupo civil de voluntariado (italiano). Iglesia Morava. Ingenieros Sin Fronteras. Plan International. Nicaragua. Unión de cooperativas de Mujeres Productoras Las Brumas/Comisión Huairou & Groots Internacional

Central Asia/ Eastern Europe:

Albania

NCO World Vision Albania. Kyrgyzstan- NCO ACTED Kyrgyzstan.

Romania

World Vision Romania. Association Iasi. CBO Cluj. CBO Constanta. CBO Dolj. CBO Ialomita. CBO Iasi. CBO Valcea. DGASPC. Emergency Situation Volunteers. Habitat for Humanity. ISU. Kindergarten 72. Orthodox Archbishop Timisoara. Residential Center for children with disabilities

Tajikistan

NCO- Mission East. ACTED. FOCUS Humanitarian Assistance. "Nur". "Amal". Red Crescent Society of Tajikistan.

Uzbekistan

NCO Tashkent Socio-Environmental Union "HAYOT". Institute of studying of a civil society. Fergana Regional Information and Analysis Centre. Kashkadarya region Information and Analysis Center. Local community Administrations of Tashkent city, Fergana region, Kashkadarya region. Local community administrations of Bostanlik district. Tashkent City and Region Information and Analysis Center.

East Africa:

Burundi

NCO Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction.

Uganda NCO

Development Network of Indigenous Voluntary Associations (DENIVA). Bugishu Civil Society Network (BUSINET). Bundibugyo Red Cross Society. Katakwi District Development Actors Network (KaDDAN). Pader NGO Forum (PNF). Platform for Citizenship and Accountability (PLACA).

Ethiopia

NCO Save the Children Sweden - Ethiopia. Centre for Development Initiative. Facilitators for Change. Gambella Children and Community Development Organization. Handicap National. Plan Ethiopia. Save the Children UK

Kenya

NCO Social Development Network (SODNET). Bunge la Mwananchi. Daraja. Habiba International. International Rescue Committee. Kenya Social Watch Forum. Kibera Slum Education Program. Mui Initiative Self Group. Transformative Empowerment and Action Movement (The Team). Youth Reconciliation and awareness Forum

Somalia

NCO CEPID Horn Africa.

Tanzania

NCO Environmental Protection and Management Services (EPMS). Galilaya Development Association. Kunduchi Sustainable Environmental Development. MVIWATA

MENA:

Algeria

NCO - ASSOCIATION ECOLOGIQUE DE BOUMERDES. AGS. ANPEP. APED. ASPEWIT. Association paroles et écritures. CROISSANT ROUGE (ONG). ENTREPRISE (OSC) – CTC. SONATRACH. Université (laboratoire).

Egypt

NCO- Arab Office for Youth and Environment "AOYE" / Arab Network for Environment and Development "RAED". Al Thanaa Association for Community Development and Environment Protection. Community Development Association. Environmental Pioneers Organization. Muslim Young Girls Association. The Organization of Environment

Preservation. Together Foundation for Development and Environment. Union Federation of Environment.

Jordan

NCO : Land and Human to Advocate Progress (LHAP). Tafileh Cultural Forum. Kora Friends of Archeology and Anthropology Society. Baytuna Society. Madaba Development Society. Badia Revival and Environment Protection Society

Lebanon

NCO World Vision Lebanon. Bekaa Local Emergency Response and Disaster Management Committee. Lebanese Red Cross. World Vision Volunteers

Morocco

NCO- Association Nour pour le Développement, l'Environnement et l'Alphabétisation. Association El Manal pour l'Animation Féminine, Al-Hoceima

Palestine

NCO: Palestine Wildlife Society. Alqodus Open University. The Civil Defense. The Environmental Equality Authority. Eqaba Agriculture Society-Jenin. The Governorate of Jericho and the Rift Valley. The Ministry of Agriculture. The Palestinian Society for the Herbs and the Natural Plants-Jericho.

Pacific:

Fiji

NCO FSPI.

Solomon Islands

NCO Solomon Islands Development Trust (SIDT).

Vanuatu

NCO Vanuatu Council of Churches (VCC).

South America

Bolivia

NCO Soluciones Practicas Bolivia. CARITAS Boliviana. FAO Bolivia. Fundación Apachita. HelpAge International. ISALP. ITDG Bolivia . Lutheran World Relief. MACOAS

(organización originaria). OMS – OPS. Plan Internacional. Proyecto ISA. VIDECL. VISION MUNDIAL

Brazil

NCO Habitat for Humanity Brazil. AGENDA 21 Brasil. APACC - Associação Paraense de Apoio às Comunidades Carentes . APAN - Associação Paraibana dos Amigos da Natureza. ARTCRECHE - Articulação de Creches e Pré-Escolas Comunitárias de São Gonçalo Associação Ateliê de Idéias. Associação dos Moradores do Vale das Flores. CARE Brasil. CDDH – Centro de Defesa dos Direitos Humanos de Petrópolis. IDEAS - Instituto de Empreendedores Ambientais e Sociais. IVA - Instituto Voluntários em Ação. GAPK - Grupo de Apoio aos Povos Kaiowá Guarani

Chile

NCO ACHNU. Agrupación Social y Cultural LA BATUTA de Cauquenes. Asociación Chilena de Municipalidades. Asociación Guías Scouts de Chile. ASONG- Asociación de Organismos No Gubernamentales. Cordillera Corporación Programa Caleta Sur. Cruz Roja Chilena. La Caleta. Organización Mapuche Lafquenche "Identidad Lafquenche"

Ecuador

NCO Plan Internacional Ecuador. AMJUPRE - Asociación de mujeres de las juntas parroquiales rurales del Ecuador. Cruz Roja Ecuatoriana. EIL Ecuador y Fincas Tropicales. FUDELA - Fundación de las Americas para el desarrollo. Funhabit. Fundacion ESPOIR. PNUD - Programa de las Naciones Unidas para el desarrollo Ecuador. Save the Children Ecuador

Paraguay

NCO: Global Infancia. ADRA Paraguay. Cruz Roja Paraguaya. Oxfam. Mingará. Organización Campesina

Región. Concepción – OCRC. Plan Paraguay

Peru

NCO Paz y Esperanza.

Uruguay

NCO: Amigos del Viento meteorología ambiente desarrollo. Agrupamiento Mburucuyá. Centro Aprendizajes y Cuidados Socio Ambientales Cuenca del Plata. Cruz Roja Carmelo. Ecopolis. Mov Scout del Uruguay. Re@l Alumni Uruguay - Programa InWEnt

Venezuela

NCO Centro al Servicio de la Acción Popular (CESAP A.C.). CaracasAsociación Civil El Paragüero. Estado Anzoátegui. Asociación Civil Nuevo Amanecer. Estado Zulia. Asociación Civil Concentroccidente. Estado Lara. Asociación Civil Portachuelo. Estado Aragua. Asociación Civil Uniandes. Estados Mérida y Táchira. Grupo de Reciclaje Everest (GARE). Estado Zulia. Centro de Animación Juvenil (CAJ). Estado Trujillo. Asociación Civil Warao A Ina. Estado Delta Amacuro.

South Asia

Afghanistan

NCO Church World Service Pakistan/Afghanistan. Coordination of Humanitarian Assistance. Solidarity for Afghan Families. Norwegian Project Office-RRAA. Afghan Aid. BRAC. Helvetas. Skill Training and Rehabilitation Society. Coordination for Afghan Relief. Afghan Red Cross Society. Cooperation Center for Afghanistan. Afghanistan Center for Training and Development

Bangladesh

NCO Participatory Research and Development Initiatives-PRDI. Action Aid Bangladesh. Free Word Society. Jago Nari. Oxfam GB. Participatory Development Action Program-PDAP. POPI. Shariatpur Development Society-SDS. Shyasta

Kallyan Sangstha. SKS Foundation. Young Power in Social Action.

India

NCO Seeds India. ABSK, West Bengal. Amrita, Bihar. Caritas India. Caritas India Bihar Partners. Caritas India North East Partners. Cordaid, India. DISA. ELURU CMDRR. Grameen Development Services (GDS), Uttar Pradesh. Gorakhpur Environmental Action Group (GEAG). Guntur Diocese Social Service & Welfare Society. Helpage India. Institute of Development Support, Uttarakhand. Knowledge Links Pvt. Ltd.. MSSS. National Dalit Watch. Rural Uplift Centre. SKC. SAHBHAGI SHIKSHAN KENDRA (SSK). Swayam Shikshan Prayaog, Tamilnadu. TMSSS. Unnati Trust. Urmul Trust. Visakhaptnam Diocesan social service society

Maldives

NCO Care Society (Maldives). Dhuvafaru CBO. EYDHA. Fuvahmulak Youth and Sports Development Association. Maldivian Red Crescent. Mathimaradhoo Zuvaanunge Jamiyya. Meemu Muli. Take Care Addu.

Nepal

NCO NSET. BudhaJyoti Bal Udhyan Lower Secondary School. Child Development and Youth Network (CDYN). Cooperative Womens Forum (CWF). Disaster Management Committee, Ward 12, Lalitpur. Disaster Management Committee Ward 18, Kathmandu. Disaster Management Committee Butwal. Disaster Preparedness Network (DPNet). EcoNepal. Himawanti-Nepal. Integrated Community Development Organization (ICDO). Kirtipur Volunteers Society. Nepal Mahila Ekta Samaj. Nepal Red Cross Society

Pakistan

NCO Participatory Development Initiatives (PDI). Balochistan Rural

Support Organization. Christian Social Uplift Organization. Community Development Foundation. Community Development Network Organization. Concern Worldwide. Doaba Foundation. Local Government of Districts. National Commission for Human Development. National Disaster Management Authority. Oxfam GB. Pirbhat Women's Development Organization. Provincial Disaster Management Authority. SAHIL Organization. Save the Children. Sindh Rural Support Organization. Social Action Forum. Youth Action Forum. Youth Action Pakistan

Sri Lanka

NCO Practical Action. DWDN and partner organisations (ADFA, DESMIO). FSLGA. HelpAge. Oxfam. Sarvodaya

South Caucasus

Armenia

NCO REC Caucasus.

Azerbaijan

NCO Fovgal Association.

Georgia

NCO REC Caucasus.

South East Asia

Cambodia

NCO Save the Earth Cambodia. Action Aid. Action For Development (AFD). Angkar Ponleu Akpuiwat (APA). ADIFE. Anakot Kumar (AK). Alliance Action for Rural Restoration (AARR). Cambodian Red Cross. CCD. Concern Worldwide. CHR. Christian Aid (CA). CARE. Danish Church Aid(DCA). Danish Red Cross. Environment Support and Social Development (ESSD). Environmental Protection and Development Organization (EPDO). French Red Cross. Human Resource and Rural Economic Development Organization (HURREDO). KAFDOC. Khmer Buddhist Association (KBA). Oxfam GB. Muslim Aid. Neary

Khmer (NK). Prom Vihear Thor (PVT). Ponleu Kumar (PK). Rural Economic and Agriculture Development Agency (READA). Support Association for Rural Farmers (SARF). Vulnerability & Illiteracy Reduction(VIR)

Indonesia

NCO YAKKUM Emergency Unit (YEU). CD Bethesda Hospital, Plan International Indonesia, Urban Poor Consortium, Siaga, Yayasan Peningkatan dan Pengembangan Sumberdaya Ummat (YP2SU), Rebana Indonesia, World Relief, Forniha, KOGAMI, People Crisis Center, WALHI Nusa Tenggara Timur, WALHI Sulawesi Utara, WALHI Sulawesi Selatan

Malaysia

NCO MERCY Malaysia. With support from the National Security Council

Philippines

NCO Centre for Disaster Preparedness. Action Against Hunger. Buklod Tao. Center for Agrarian Reform , Empowerment and Transformation (CARET). Caritas Manila. Central Bicol State University of Agriculture (CBSUA). Community and Family Services International (CFSI). Cordillera Disaster Relief and Development Services (CORDIS). Damayan Homeowners Association. Damayan ng Maralitang Pilipinong Api (DAMPA). Empowerment and Re-affirmation of Paternal Abilities (ERPAT). Ecosystems Work for Essential Benefits, Inc. (ECOWEB). GenTwoFifteen Development (GDFI). Marinduque Council for Environmental Concerns (MACEC). Media Group. Outreach Philippines. Philippine Partnership for the Development of Human Resources in Rural Areas (PhilDHRRA). Partnership of Philippine Support Service Agencies (PHILSSA). Philippine Rural Reconstruction Movement

(PRRM). Plan International-Philippines. Ranaw Disaster Response and Rehabilitation Assistance Center (RDRRAC). Save the Children in the Philippines. Tarabang Para sa Bicol (TABI). City Government of Dagupan

Thailand

NCO Sustainable Development Foundation (Central, North and Northeastern Offices). With support from Thai Sea Watch Association

Vietnam

NCO Development Workshop France (DWF). ADPC. CARE. OXFAM. PLAN. SCA Save the Children Alliance. VNRC Vietnamese Red Cross. WORLD VISION

Southern Africa:

Lesotho

NCO Environmental Care Lesotho Association (ECLA).

Madagascar

NCO CARE International Madagascar. ADRA (Adventist Development and Relief). CRS (Catholic Relief Service). MDM (Médecins du Monde). MEDAIR International Madagascar. SAFFJKM (Sampan'Asa momban'ny Fampanandrosoana/ Fianganon' i Jeso Kristy eto Madagascar)

Malawi

NCO Sustainable Rural Growth and Development Initiative (SRGDI).

Mozambique

NCO Christian Council of Mozambique. Associação Evangélica em Acção. Comité Ecuménico para o Desenvolvimento Social (CEDES). Conselho Cristão de Moçambique –Tete. Diocese do Niassa - Igreja Anglicana. KUBATSIRANA. Rede Cristã Contra o HIV/SIDA

Namibia

NCO- University of Namibia. Erunda Rural Water Supply (Northern Region)

South Africa

NCO African Centre for Disaster Studies.

Swaziland

NCO Christians International Swaziland. ACMI. Agriculture and Land use planning. Fire and Emergency Services. Meteorology Department. National Disaster Management Agency. Nhlngano Worship Centre. Regional Education offices. Siteki Town Council. Women and Development Organization

Zambia

NCO Mulungushi University. CARE International Zambia. Catholic Relief Services. Wildlife Conservation Society of Zambia (Kabwe). World Vision Zambia

Zimbabwe

NCO Action 24. CARE INTERNATIONAL. CARITUS ZIMBABWE. CASS(CENTRE FOR APPLIED SCIENTIFIC STUDIES). DRI(DEVELOPMENT REALITY INSTITUTE). IES (INSTITUTE OOF ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES). OXFAM. PRACTICAL ACTION. SWEDISH COOPERATION. ZERO REGIONAL ENVIRONMENT ORGANISATION.

West Africa

Benin

NCO WANEP-BENIN. ACTION 21 BENIN. ALHERI. ASSOCIATION FEMME et VIE. ATP . BOUSSOLE de la CIT. CERADID. DHPD. ESPACE et VIE. GADDAP. GLOBAL AID BENIN. NOUVEL ESSOR. OCSED-BENIN. OPADEB.

Burkina Faso

NCO Réseau MARP. ATAD. DIOBASS. Self Help Africa. SOS Sahel International. SOS Santé et Développement

Cameroon

NCO Geotechnology, Environmental Assessment and Disaster Risk Reduction (GEADIRR). Agriculture and Nature conservation Organisation (ANCO). Center for Development Research (CEDERES). Geo-environmental Management and Disaster Awareness Organization (GEMDA). L@ Une des Droits de l'Homme et des Libertés (L@ UDHL). Vital Actions for Sustainable Development (AVD)

Ivory Coast

NCO Jeunes Volontaires pour l'environnement (JVE). Association des Scouts Catholiques de Côte d'Ivoire (ASCCI). Club Unesco pour la lutte contre la drogue et les autres pandémies (CLUCOD). Ecole Instrument de Paix-Côte d'Ivoire (EIP-CI). GEO Planete. Jeunesse Estudiantine Catholique (JEC). Lac développement . Notre Grenier. Touba care

Niger

NCO Réseau de la Jeunesse Nigérienne sur les Changements climatiques section de African Youth Initiative on Climate Change RJNCC/AYICC-Niger. Agir pour Etre Niger. Association de Développement de Quartiers ADQ . Association des Jeunes Internautes du Niger AJIN . Association pour la Promotion de la Jeunesse SOS Jeunesse . Coalition Equité Qualité contre la Vie Chère au Niger CEQ/CVC . Collectif des Organisation de Défense de Droit de l'Homme et de la Démocratie CODDHD . Jeunes Volontaires pour l'Environnement Niger JVE-Niger . Leadership Challenge . Mouvement National pour la Promotion de la Démocratie MNPD . ONG Action et Développement ONG ACDEV . ONG Noma da Kiwo Niger . Organisation des Consommateurs du Niger ORCONI

Nigeria

NCO African Youth Movement Nigeria. Akwa Ibom Environmental Society. Akwa Ibom National Environmental Watch and Services. Community Research and Development Organization. Eminence Group. E-Plus Services. Girl Child Network. Global Water Partnership, Nigeria. Government of Benue State, Nigeria. Government of Enugu State, Nigeria. Grassroot Youth Initiative. Great Divine Glory of God Evangelical Ministries International. Hallmark Nigeria Services. Ikono-Ini Youth Consultative Assembly. Ikpa Network. ItuMbonuso Youth Multipurpose Cooperative Society. Itumbonuso Youth Society. Local Action Initiative. Movement for the Actualization of HYDAPEC. National Emergency Management Agency- NEMA. National Environmental Structure. Nigeria Water Partnership. Nigerian Environmental Society. Nigerian Greens Movement. Nigerian Integrated Water Resources Management Commission. Palmarol Group. Pan African Vision on the Environment. Society for Improvement of Rural People. Unemployed Nigerian Youth Support Group. Urthor Group. Volunteers Development Network

Senegal

NCO Shalom International. Amicale de Jeunes de Enampore. ANCS Senegal. APRAN Senegal . Bloc Scientifique Dakar . Chorale St Augustine . College Ouakam . Compassion sans Frontieres . Ecole Bassene . Ecole Mambouna Diatta Ziguinchor . FASTEF Senegal . IDEN Inspectorate of Education . MALAO Senegal . ONDH Senegal . ONG ASI . PACTE Senegal . Plan Senegal . Service Peche – Ziguincho. SWAA Senegal .

University of Dakar . World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF). YMCA Senegal

Sierra Leone

NCO Plan international.

The Gambia

NCO Children for Children Organization (CFCO). ActionAid International The Gambia. Children Advocacy Network (CAN). Children and Community Initiative for Development. Concern Universal- The Gambia. . Global Unification The Gambia. North Bank Youth Parliament. Redcross Gambia Society. Youth Alliance- The Gambia. Youth Ambassadors of Peace.

II Views from the Frontline 2011 Survey

Below is the VFL 2011 survey used to gather views on local risk governance from people living and working at the frontline of disasters in 69 countries.

Views from the Frontline 2011: Local Governance – Survey Indicators



Global Network
of Civil Society Organisations
for Disaster Reduction

See accompanying guidance notes which form part of this survey sheet.

Ranking:

For quantitative questions please use the following scores to respond:

- 1 No
- 2 To a very limited extent
- 3 Some activity but significant scope for improvement
- 4 Yes, but with some limitations in capacities and resources
- 5 Yes, with satisfactory, sustainable and effective measures in place
- X Don't know

PART 1:

KEY INFORMANT PROFILE Country: _____

1	Survey Date					
2	Survey Reference Number					
3	Participating Organisation					
4	Informant Age	<11	12-17	18-25	26-60	61 plus
5	Sex	Male			Female	
6	Informant Group and occupation	Local Government	Community	Civil Society	Others	
7	Location (Province)					
8	Geography	Urban			Rural	
9	Perception of the threat of disasters in your location	1 Minimal	2 Low	3 Medium	4 High	5 Very High
10	Changes in disasters losses (lives, livelihoods & assets) in your area since 2005 ?	1 Substantial increase in losses	2 Slight increase	3 No change	4 Slight decrease	5 Substantial decrease

PART 2: LOCAL GOVERNANCE

In your opinion what level of progress has been made towards the following indicators:

Ref No	Indicator Subject	Indicator Question	Ranking: 1-5 or X for don't know
1.1	Participation	Does the local government involve all people, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?	
1.2	Gender	Does the local government ensure women and men participate equally in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?	
1.3	Children and Youth	Do local government disaster prevention practices take into account the specific needs of children and young people?	
1.4	Volunteers	Does the local government support the participation of local volunteers in disaster prevention measures?	
1.5	Policies	Does the local government have regularly reviewed disaster prevention policies to protect vulnerable people from disasters (elderly, ethnic minorities, children & youth, disabled, migrants)?	
1.6	Indigenous Capacities	Does the local government disaster prevention practices take into account local (indigenous) knowledge, skills and resources?	
1.7	Planning	Does the local government have a plan of action to turn disaster prevention policies into practice?	
1.8	Financial Resources	Does the local government have an adequate budget for disaster prevention?	
1.9	Decentralisation	Do local government officials have clear roles and responsibilities to carry out disaster prevention?	
1.10	Expertise	Does the local government have sufficient expertise to carry out disaster prevention?	
1.11	Training	Does the local government provide disaster prevention training for government officials, the community and civil society leaders?	
1.12	Baselines	Has the local government established a reference point (baseline) from which to measure progress in implementing disaster prevention policies?	
1.13	Monitoring	Does the local government regularly monitor and report on progress on disaster prevention?	
1.14	Participatory Monitoring	Does the local government involve communities and civil society in the monitoring of disaster prevention?	
1.15	Complaints Procedures	Does the local government provide a way for vulnerable people to make complaints and get a response for lack of progress in disaster prevention measures ?	
1.16	Information Gathering	Does local government regularly collect, review and map information on disasters risks and climate change?	
1.17	Information Management	Does the local government connect traditional and scientific knowledge to inform local action planning?	
1.18	Information Dissemination	Does the local government provide vulnerable people with updated, easily understood information on disaster risks and disaster prevention measures?	
1.19	Governmental Coordination	Does the local government coordinate disaster prevention activities with other government officials and ministries?	
1.20	Partnership	Does the local government form partnerships to implement disaster prevention measures with community, private sector, civil society, academia and others?	

[Note: Disaster Prevention: Policy makers and practitioners often use the term “disaster risk reduction” which encompasses the various actions and approach taken to reduce disaster losses. For ease of translation the VFL 2011 questionnaire has used the simpler term “disaster prevention”]

III Shortened Views from the Frontline 2011 SMS Pilot Survey

VFL 2011 Web Survey questions

Text: This is a survey about disaster preparedness in your area. Your response will be submitted to the United Nations.

Text: You will be compensated in airtime for its completion.

Question # Question

Text: Before we begin, please respond to the following demographic questions. We take your privacy seriously. All answers will be submitted anonymously, without any personally identifiable information.

R1 What is your age?

R2 What is your sex?

P1.6 Are you a member of the local government?

P1.7 What is the name of the closest town or village to you?

P1.9 Do you live in an urban or rural area?

P1.10 What is your perception of the threat of disasters in your location?

P1.11 Since 2005, has there been any change in disasters losses in your location?

Text: Thank you - the survey will now begin.

Text: For each of these questions, what level of progress has been made toward the indicator?

Text: Please choose from 1 to 5, where 1 means "No Progress" and 5 means "Satisfactory and effective measures are in place". (If you do not know, please select "X Don't know")

P2.1.5 Does the local government have regularly reviewed disaster prevention policies to protect vulnerable people from disasters (elderly, ethnic minorities, children & youth, disabled, migrants)?

P2.1.7 Does the local government have a plan of action to turn disaster prevention policies into practice?

P2.1.1 Does the local government involve all people, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?

P2.1.2 Does the local government ensure women and men participate equally in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?

P2.1.3 Do local government disaster prevention practices take into account the specific needs of children and young people?

P2.1.4 Does the local government support the participation of local volunteers in disaster prevention measures?

P2.1.6 Does the local government disaster prevention practices take into account local (indigenous) knowledge, skills and resources?

P2.1.17 Does the local government connect traditional and scientific knowledge to inform local action planning?

P2.1.8 Does the local government have an adequate budget for disaster prevention?

P2.1.9 Do local government officials have clear roles and responsibilities to carry out disaster prevention?

P2.1.10 Does the local government have sufficient expertise to carry out disaster prevention?

P2.1.11 Does the local government provide disaster prevention training for government officials, the community and civil society leaders?

P2.1.12 Has the local government established a reference point (baseline) from which to measure progress in implementing disaster prevention policies?

P2.1.13 Does the local government regularly monitor and report on progress on disaster prevention?

P2.1.14 Does the local government involve communities and civil society in the monitoring of disaster prevention?

P2.1.15 Does the local government provide a way for vulnerable people to make complaints and get a response for lack of progress in disaster prevention measures?

P2.1.16 Does local government regularly collect, review and map information on disasters risks and climate change?

P2.1.18 Does the local government provide vulnerable people with updated, easily understood information on disaster risks and disaster prevention measures?

P2.1.19 Does the local government coordinate disaster prevention activities with other government officials and ministries?

P2.1.20 Does the local government form partnerships to implement disaster prevention measures with community, private sector, civil society, academia and others?

Education

How many years of formal schooling have you completed?



VFL 2011: Shortened UCMP Survey questions

Text "yes" to join a survey about disaster preparedness for the UN. You will receive [amount] added to your phone.

Messages are free. They will not save like ordinary messages. If you lose them dial free number XXXXX to continue.

Txt "yes" to join

Question

- Q.1 What is your age? Text the number.
- Q.2 What is your sex? Text "Male" or "Female."
- Q.3 How many years of education have you had? Text the number of years.
- Q.4 Are you a member of the local government? Text "Yes" or "No."

Reminder: messages are free. Messages will not save.

If you lose them dial free number XXXXX to continue.

Txt "y" to continue

- Q.5 Do you live in a rural area? Text "Yes" or "No."
- Q.6 What is your view of the threat of disasters in your location? 1 = Minimal, 5 = Very High. Text a number
- Q.7 Has there been any change in disasters losses in your location since 2005? 1 = Substantial increase, 5 = Substantial decrease. Txt a number

Reminder: messages are free. Messages will not save.

If you lose them dial free number XXXXX to continue.

Txt "y" to continue

- Q.8 Is local government involving local people in working to reduce the risk of disasters? Score from 1=very little to 5= a lot. Txt a number
- Q.9 Are there local people or organisations with experience and money to reduce risk of disasters? Score 1=very little to 5=a lot. txt a number
- Q.10 Are local people informed by local government what is needed to reduce the risk of disasters? Score from 1=very little to 5=a lot

Thank you for your help. You will receive [amount] added to your phone in call time.

Views from the Frontline brings the voices of those at the Frontline – those whose lives and livelihoods are impacted by disasters, into the heart of the debate, identifying key steps needed to achieve real progress. The VFL team of over 500 organisations around the world are grateful to the 50,000 people who participated in the face-to-face survey and pilot internet and mobile phone technology survey, and all who have supported the programme financially and otherwise.

www.globalnetwork-dr.org



Global Network
of Civil Society Organisations
for Disaster Reduction



Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported License.