Briefing Paper

MAKING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT *Inclusive*

WHY TALK ABOUT INCLUSIVE DRM?

Physical, economic and social vulnerability are closely linked. Poor countries and poor people suffer significantly more than the others from disasters. The hardest hit are the most vulnerable sections of the population such as women, children, persons with disabilities, elderly, ethnic and religious minorities and groups made with specific disadvantages related to their physical, economic or social status. Unequal power relations[1] are the driving force behind exclusion that lead to unequal access to resources, education, health care, employment, welfare schemes; lack of ability to build assets and reduce risks; and limited ability to access post disaster relief.

Unequal power relations are the driving force behind exclusion that lead to unequal access to resources, education, health care, employment, welfare schemes; lack of ability to build assets and reduce risks; and limited ability to access post disaster relief.

It is overwhelmingly acknowledged that women, persons with disabilities and socially excluded groups (e.g. on the basis of caste, religion, ethnicity) are at higher risk with regards to natural hazards. Yet so far, no harmonised, regionally-based, locally appropriate inclusive Disaster Risk Management approach exists in South Asia nor is recognised by relevant region-wide DRM actors. A field-tested evidence-based and inclusive model driven by proven effective methodologies and good practices needs to be developed and promoted at community, local, national and regional levels.

Inclusive Disaster Risk Management is about equality of rights and opportunities, dignity of the individual, acknowledging diversity, and contributing to resilience for everyone, not leaving aside members of a community based on age, gender, disability or other. Lessons from INCRISD and partner programmes highlight three areas of work for this:

A. Understanding the root causes of exclusion in disaster contexts, identifying excluded groups, and involving them meaningfully in reducing their disaster risks

B. Creating a conducive and enabling policy environment that recognizes the causes of exclusion and promotes inclusive strategies and allocation of resources

C. Creating an implementation architecture that involves all stakeholders and ensuring community resilience through accountable risk governance

Inclusive Community Resilience for Sustainable Disaster Risk Management (INCRISD)

Funded by the European Commission Humanitarian Aid Department (ECHO), under the 7th DIPECHO Action Plan for South Asia, INCRISD South Asia is implemented by Handicap International, ActionAid and Oxfam. INCRISD South Asia aims at building safer, more resilient communities in South Asia by evidence-based inclusive approaches to Disaster Risk Management (DRM) through multi-stakeholder engagement. INCRISD South Asia is rolled out in six countries of South Asia: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. It aims at developing, validating and promoting a regionally-based inclusive model on DRM by:

- Developing and consolidating an evidence-based, inclusive DRM framework starting with a focus on gender, disability and social exclusion.
- Disseminating, promoting and advocating for the inclusive DRM framework's use, adoption and replication at community, local, national, regional and international levels;
- Enhancing the capacities of stakeholders throughout the process (including through technical support and cross-fertilisation in South Asia region)

It takes a twin-tracked approach, with mainstreaming and capacity building as primary pillars.

INCRISD SOUTH ASIA Inclusive Resilience

1 | People's Action in Practice: ActionAid's Human Rights Based Approach 2.0. www.people-action.org. 2012.

INCLUSION IS CHALLENGING BECAUSE EXCLUSION CUTS ACROSS MULTIPLE GROUPS AND CONTEXTS, AND CURRENT POLICY INSTRUMENTS ADDRESS IT INADEQUATELY

The concept of vulnerability implies excluded and marginalised groups as those at higher risk from disasters. The concern is made worse by the fact that a large number of such groups are invisible.

SOCIAL EXCLUSION affects a large number of people and takes place on the basis of race, class, caste, gender, as well as many other factors, such as disability. Such exclusion is by design of the social construct. Exclusion is often most acute when people suffer multiple layers of discrimination. Excluded groups are denied their human rights because of their place within a system of unequal social relations of power. Social exclusion is often linked to attributes (of individuals, households or communities) which they are born into. Such attributes in turn interact in different spaces like access to natural resources, infrastructure services, education service, health service, employment, housing, financial services and access to markets. Disadvantaged groups such as these are seen to be exposed to higher levels of risk, and subsequently face the brunt of disasters harder than others.

Overlooked throughout the DRM cycle, inclusion concerns relate to limited social participation in DRR activities, poor access to information and services, poverty, invisibility during relief operations, response to basic needs not adapted and specific needs ignored.

GENDER refers to the social attributes and opportunities associated with being male and female and the relationships between women, men, girls and boys, as well as the relations between women and between men. These attributes, opportunities and relationships are socially constructed, learned, and changeable over time. In all excluded social groups (people living in poverty, lower castes, people with disabilities or people of alternative sexual orientations) women and girls are generally further marginalised because of gendered power relations that privilege men and subordinate women. Women's disadvantage – their unequal access to resources, legal protection, decision making and power, their reproductive burden and their vulnerability to violence – consistently render them more vulnerable than men to the impacts of disasters. Often women have little control over their fertility, sexuality or marital choices, and have limited mobility. This limits their participation in risk reduction or disaster response actions, and increases their vulnerability to disasters.

DISABILITY is a contextual and evolving concept. The UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD) states in its first article: "Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others". The Convention, in its articles 11 and 32, requires that persons with disabilities benefit from and participate in disaster relief, emergency response and disaster risk reduction strategies. It has been observed that persons with disabilities are often invisible and thus not only get excluded in risk reduction and disaster response measures but are also not recognised sufficiently. Overlooked throughout the DRM cycle, inclusions concerns relate to limited social participation in DRR activities, poor access to information and services, poverty, invisibility during relief operations, response to basic needs not adapted and specific needs ignored.

The economically marginalised, elderly, young, ethnic and religious minorities can all be at similar disadvantages in the disaster context as the groups discussed above.

Cross-linkages between multiple vulnerability issues

Multiple exclusion and vulnerability issues are often at play.

Understanding the link between gender, disability, social exclusion and disaster risk requires a crosscutting perspective that identifies the various causes of exclusion and its impact in terms of enhanced vulnerability. Likewise, the extent to which different individuals and groups are vulnerable to disaster risk depends on similar factors. Multiple exclusion and vulnerability issues are often at play, such as in the case of dalit women with disabilities.

Shocks and stresses, and differential risks

The fact that different populations are exposed to differential risk levels depending on their context adds further dimensions to the already multi-layered vulnerability.

Adverse impacts of exclusion during rapid onset, large scale and lower probability disaster events such as earthquakes, as well as in slow onset, low impact but high probability stresses such as health impacts of recurrent floods, waterlogging and poor sanitation need to be included in the agenda of taking a developmental approach to inclusion and disaster risk management. The fact that different populations are exposed to differential risk levels depending on their context adds further dimensions to the already multi-layered vulnerability.

Exclusion in getting assistance and in decision making

The most visible impacts of exclusion appear in the delivery of aid with the reach of aid being hampered by design and by default in the various kinds of exclusions observed[2]. The deeper implication that the inclusive approach aims to address is one related active participation in decision making related to all aspects of assessments, planning, action and monitoring of risk management interventions.

Finding space in the policy context

The most relevant current context is the development of the post-2015 Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) framework, also being referred to as HFA2 that will culminate in 3rd the World Conference on Disaster Reduction 2015 to be held in Sendai, Japan. There have been a series of preparatory events and consultation processes and the emerging reflections from these interventions are organised into twelve categories. This has been done in order to facilitate readability and to provide the reader with a coherent narrative[3]. They are:

1. The Importance of Community-level Involvement
2. Targeting and Including the Most Vulnerable Populations
3. Women as Leaders
4. Children and Youth: New Generation of Opportunity
5. Health
6. Integrating Climate Change Adaptation, Development and Disaster Risk Reduction
7. The Role of Science
8. Knowledge-Sharing and Education
9. Capacity-Building: Financing, Risk Assessment, Preparedness and Early Warning
10. Private Sector Involvement in Disaster Risk Reduction
11. Political Will and Leadership
12. Governance, Accountability, Transparency and Inclusiveness

It can be observed that though `inclusiveness' as a direct reference appears in the last of the points, the dimensions of making disaster risk management inclusive are covered in a number of categories such as women leadership, children and youth, community level involvement and political will.

In addition, a large number of organisations including UN agencies, INGOs, NGOs, and academic groups have worked in recent years to develop and try to institutionalise covenants, approaches and tools for inclusion in disaster management processes. Some of the prominent ones include: A Gender-Age Marker Toolkit introduced by DG ECHO to assess, promote and track gender and age sensitive humanitarian interventions[4] and a Social Audit tool, developed and deployed in the aftermath of the Indian Ocean Tsunami of 2004.

2 The post tsunami social audits in Tamil Nadu, India, highlighted this aspect to be very significant.

3 Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2), Report from 2013 Global Platform Consultations, October 2013, UNISDR.

4 http://ec.europa.eu/echo/poli- cies/sectoral/gender_en.htm accessed 15 April 2014

THE POLICY MOMENTUM NEEDS TO BE MORE EXPLICITLY INCLUSIVE

In 2005 the 168 countries that endorsed the Hyogo Framework for Action agreed to achieve by 2015 "the substantial reduction of disaster losses, in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets of communities and countries"[5]. After the second World Conference on Disaster Reduction in Kobe in 2005, an underlying concern of civil society representatives was that the high level policy statements of programmes developed under the HFA guidelines would not be translated into effective implementation and change at the 'frontline' – where communities vulnerable to disasters live and work. In expressing this concern they had history on their side, as the review of the preceding ten-year programmes, the 'Yokohama Strategy for Natural Disasters' had concluded that intentions still needed to be turned into actions. The midterm review of the HFA notes that while the HFA played a decisive role in promoting disaster risk reduction across international, regional and national agenda, the progress achieved in its implementation is uneven across countries. It identified gaps in 'systematic multi-hazards risk assessments and early warning systems factoring in social and economic vulnerabilities; the integration of disaster risk reduction into sustainable development policies and planning at national and international level, and the still insufficient level of implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action at the local level. It remains difficult to increase resilience to hazards, especially in the most vulnerable segments of society'[5].

With disasters worsening and the increasing severity of impact particularly on marginal groups in developing countries, civil society organisations have decided to step up the efforts to tackle the underlying risk factors as part of HFA2.

The 3rd World Conference on Disasters will be held in March 2015 and is expected to result in a concise, focused, forward-looking and action-oriented outcome document. It will have the following objectives:

- To complete assessment and review of the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action;
- To consider the experience gained through the regional and national strategies/ institutions and plans for disaster risk reduction and their recommendations as well as relevant regional agreements within the implementation of the Hyogo Framework of Action;
- To adopt a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction;
- To identify modalities of cooperation based on commitments to implement a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction;
- To determine modalities to periodically review the implementation of a post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction.

In the run up to the 2015 conference, preparatory consultative conferences are being facilitated by the UNISDR which includes 86 consultative events - international meetings, regional platforms, meetings of intergovernmental organisations, national dialogues, stakeholder forums and social networks.

To achieve the aim of influencing the emerging policy environment, a number of areas have been reviewed across the various existing frameworks, and how they relate to the considerations expressed by the consultations on the future framework to date[6]. These areas include: (i) integrating disaster and risk considerations in development planning; (ii) disaster management and risk management; (iii) exposure and vulnerability; (iv) multi-stakeholder participation; (v) natural hazards and manmade hazards; (vi) commitments and principles; (vii) financing for disaster risk reduction; (viii) integration of disaster risk reduction, climate variability and change, and environment and ecosystem preservation; (ix) private sector's engagement; and (x) the interface between conflict and disasters.

5 | UNISDR, Hyogo Framework FOR Action 2005-2015 Building the Resilience of Nations and Communities to Disasters, Mid-Term Review, 2010-2011

6 | Towards a post 2015 framework for DRR: a prospective retrospective, 2013, UNISDR.

The UNISDR[7] paper on indicators of success reviews the experience of three biennial cycles of monitoring the HFA against a set of 22 core indicators across its five priority areas in 2009, 2011 and 2013. Recognising some weaknesses, it proposes a new system of indicators for disaster risk management, which is intended to contribute to the discussions on HFA2 and to the Third World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction, thereby raising public and stakeholder awareness. For this purpose it introduces the structure of the indicator system, comprised of: (i) disaster loss and damage indicators; (ii) risk and resilience indicators; (iii) underlying risk drivers indicators; and (iv) disaster risk management policy indicators.

The Political Declaration

The political declaration of the World Conference is indispensable to give guidance on how the overall outcome of the Conference needs to be interpreted, and how its components are connected[8]. It is important that the Political Declaration build on the deliberations of the Regional Platforms, in order to ensure harmony between global and regional levels and specificities. Proposed substantive elements for consideration in the political declaration include the following and have means of encouraging inclusion:

- An appreciation of the anthropogenic nature of risk; the need to focus on risk drivers, including climate change, exposure, vulnerability and poverty.
- An appreciation of the progress made through the HFA to address human vulnerability to some hazards, and recognition of the redefinition of HFA elements as a necessary innovation to effectively manage risk for all.
- Welcoming the updating of the HFA Monitor into a HFA-2 Monitor, based on a new core system of targets, indicators and means of verification, now including issues of inclusion.
- Welcoming and appreciating the significance of the stakeholders "commitments", as an essential sign of leadership, goodwill, needed cooperation and concrete action to articulate and implement the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction. Stakeholder commitments to include inclusion of the disadvantaged, and also allow space for the marginalised groups to be seen as stakeholders.
- Stressing the importance of enhancing accountability at local, national and international levels, and welcoming the progressive development and codification of international law concerning the "Protection of persons in the event of disasters", thereby ensuring coverage to all.
- Calling for an integrated implementation of the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction, the post-2015 development agenda/goals and climate change agreement with an inclusive approach cutting across all its dimensions.
- Recognising the significance of regional strategies and national and local plans to manage risk and suggesting their review in line with the post-2015 framework for disaster risk reduction so that inclusion is seen as an agenda cutting across all such instruments.

The proposed indicator system:

i. disaster loss and damage indicators;
ii. risk and resilience indicators;
iii. underlying risk drivers indicators; and
iv. disaster risk management policy indicators.

7 | Indicators of success: a new system of indicators to measure progress in disaster risk management, UNISDR, 2013.

8 | Proposed Elements for Consideration in the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction by The UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction, 17 December 2013, UNISDR.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MAKING DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT INCLUSIVE

Lessons from INCRISD and partner programmes highlight three areas of work towards making disaster risk management inclusive, and offer ten recommendations within these:

A. Understand the root causes of exclusion in disaster contexts, define excluded groups, and involve them meaningfully in reducing their disaster risks

1. Exclusion is not an isolated process and excluded persons are not mere beneficiaries. Excluded persons need to be defined better from a change agent perspective, exclusion needs to be recognised as a driver of risk specifically in the South Asian context; and excluded persons need to be seen as proactive participants and leaders in the resilience process. The political perspective needs to be considered for this purpose, with in depth power analysis in the complete disaster risk management cycle.

2. Existing policies need to deliver better results. For this, policies need to be responsive to regional learning and disaggregated knowledge related to different kinds of excluded groups, for which creation of regional and national databases is required. Progress needs to be tracked based on inclusive indicators linked to this data and the HFA2 monitor needs to be inclusive and responsive to such progress.

3. Inclusion needs to go beyond explicit measures related to disaster management, and include specific areas that require customised solutions, such as appropriateness and safety of built environment, cross-cutting disaster mitigation measures for day to day stresses, and slow onset disasters and climate change. Detailing of requirements within each of these has to be carried out. For example, it needs to be ensured that universal design for disability is understood in a broader context than mere building of ramps.

B. Create a conducive and enabling policy environment that recognizes the causes of exclusion and promotes inclusive strategies and allocation of resources

4. It has been proven time and again how emergencies affect excluded people much more than others. Emergency response needs to trigger inclusive risk reduction in the post disaster context from day one. Aid has to reach the excluded people who cannot reach aid on their own and inclusive DRR has to be triggered from there on, moving on to subsequent phases of the disaster management cycle.

5. Meaningful participatory processes are needed to give voice to the concerns of the excluded groups and promote their leadership. Done with an understanding of economic and exclusionary contexts, this needs to be institutionalised for influencing policies and practices in an ongoing manner.

6. Implementation of inclusion provisions in existing policies, legal instruments and enshrined rights is a primary need. Gaps need to be identified and addressed through appropriate provisions. Policies need to be followed up with legislation, administrative apparatus, planning and allocation of financial and human resources.

C. Create an implementation architecture that involves all stakeholders and ensure community resilience through accountable risk governance

7. Programmes and projects need to coordinate and collaborate with each other closely and meaningfully, mainstreaming inclusiveness across themes. Experiences need to be brought on board using platforms and networks involving institutions and movements working on inclusion. The approach also needs to recognise prevailing social structures and target the strengthening of positive and enabling community based systems, practices and policies.

8. An accountability framework needs to be put in place to ensure inclusive service delivery for risk management, through instruments related to risk governance, building community resilience and sustainable development that also address climate change. Inclusive social audits need to be institutionalised, covering allocations, deployment and outcomes.

9. Academia needs to be engaged and efforts need to be made to include validated and replicable indigenous knowledge, local innovations and science as vehicles for strengthening inclusive DRR in research, training and education. Data sharing across stakeholders and sectors needs to be built using academic spaces. Long-term capacity building measures are needed towards this, with appropriate resource for research, dissemination and advocacy made for this purpose.

10. The private sector needs to be sensitive and responsive, fulfilling its responsibility and sharing its expertise towards inclusive DRR through playing a partnership role that includes imparting skills, supporting livelihoods, and developing assets through infrastructure and development. The business case for inclusive DRR needs to be recognised, acknowledging that excluded people have a role to play in the economy, and that DRR is an essential part of good business.

CONCLUSION

Since 2007, and over three successive periods of progress review, governments have reported steadily increasing progress in the implementation of the five priorities of the HFA[9]. It is however evident that the least performing priority has been priority number 4, dealing with underlying risks. While the risks associated with exclusion cut across all the five priorities, they are most notably anchored within this particular theme of underlying risks and will be key to the better performance of this area in HFA2.

Recognising that inclusion was not an explicit and adequately addressed theme in HFA, and building on the experiences and knowledge gained during the last ten years of work on disaster response and risk reduction with special vulnerable groups, it is clear that HFA2 needs to make concerted efforts for making disaster risk management inclusive.

While the HFA process has primarily served as a policy framework tool to guide regional and national approaches, the processes followed up by UNISDR during 2005-14 have gone much beyond the original mandate and have developed and helped push instruments such as platforms and tools for furtherance of the framework. A similar approach is required for advocating the importance of inclusiveness, and making available support systems and tools to help realise the goal in the coming years.

INCRISD's learning shared in this briefing paper, and captured in the various documents developed by and available through the partnership, emerges as clear evidence from the Asian region, and is hereby offered to the AMCDRR consultation process towards validation and support for inclusion in HFA2.

9 | Synthesis Report: Consultations on a Post-2015, Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (HFA2), April 2013, UNISDR.

Odisha Floods 2011

Homeless tribal people relocated on a nearby highroad, from Adhibasi Para, village Tartol, in the district of Jagatsingpur, Odisha, India. The flood in India's eastern state, precipitated by monsoon rains, damaged at least 1,18,719 houses and paddy fields over 2,89,115 hectares. A total of 30.97 lakh people in 19 of the 30 districts of the state were affected.

Photographer's Credit: Nilayan/ActionAid

Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection

This paper draws from the learning of ActionAid, Handicap International and Oxfam. It has been written by Anshu Sharma with inputs from Harjeet Singh and Chandrima Biswas (ActionAid International). Inputs were also received from Véronique Walbaum, Camille Gosselin (Handicap International), Orla Murphy, Farhana Hafiz (Oxfam). The author also acknowledges the inputs received from South Asia DIPECHO partners during the stakeholder workshop in April 2014 at Kathmandu, Nepal.

Content and opinions are solely those of the author on behalf of ActionAid International, Handicap International and Oxfam.

Feedback on the content and recommendations are appreciated and welcomed. Please contact Harjeet Singh – harjeet.singh@actionaid.org

This document covers humanitarian aid activities implemented with the financial assistance of the European Union. The views expressed herein should not be taken, in any way, to reflect the official opinion of the European Union, and the European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information it contains.