

INPUT PAPER

Prepared for the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk
Reduction

**RETROSPECTIVE ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS IN DISASTER RISK GOVERNANCE
AGAINST THE HFA**

**Prepared by:
Dewald van Niekerk**

(DRAFT)

Document Information	
Document Version Number	Version 0.2
Document Type	Desktop research report
Title	Retrospective Assessment of Progress in Disaster Risk Governance against the HFA – an Input Paper for the 2015 Global Assessment Report (Africa Chapter)
Applicability	UN
Status	draft
Main Contributors	UNDP/BCPR Dewald van Niekerk
Author(s)	Dewald van Niekerk
Date of this Compilation	3 March 2014
Client	UNDP/BCPR
Copyright	© 2014 UNDP
Notes	Not language edited yet!

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	6
1. Introduction	7
2. Orientation and problem statement.....	8
3. Key research questions and objectives.....	11
4. Methodology	12
5. Defining disaster risk governance	12
6. Framework for analysis	14
6.1 <i>The Hyogo Framework for Action</i>	15
6.2 <i>Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction</i>	19
6.3 <i>UNDP/BCPR's Global Mainstreaming Initiative</i>	20
6.4 <i>GNDR indicators</i>	21
6.5 <i>Global Assessment Report 2011: Build risk governance capacities</i>	29
6.6 <i>Renn's dimension of context affecting disaster risk governance</i>	29
6.7 <i>Analytical framework for disaster risk governance</i>	31
7. Achievements	33
7.1 <i>Political will</i>	33
7.2 <i>Centralised coordination</i>	34
7.3 <i>Decentralised implementation</i>	35
7.4 <i>Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement</i>	36
7.5 <i>Communication</i>	37
7.6 <i>Assets</i>	37
7.7 <i>Risk analysis and management</i>	38
8. Good practices	38
8.1 <i>Political will</i>	39
8.2 <i>Centralised coordination</i>	39

8.3 Decentralised implementation	39
8.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement	40
8.5 Communication	40
8.6 Assets	41
8.7 Risk analysis and management.....	42
9. Gaps	42
9.1 Political will.....	42
9.2 Centralised coordination.....	43
9.3 Decentralised implementation	43
9.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement	44
9.5 Communication	44
9.6 Assets	44
9.7 Risk analysis and management.....	45
10. Challenges	46
10.1 Political will.....	46
10.2 Centralised coordination.....	46
10.3 Decentralised implementation	46
10.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement	47
10.5 Communication	47
10.6 Assets	47
10.7 Risk analysis and management.....	48
11. Recommendations	49
12. Conclusion	53
References	54

List of Tables

Table 1: Core Indicators of Priority for Action 1 of the HFA.....	16
Table 2: Core Indicators of PFA 3, 4 and 5 of the HFA affecting PFA 1.....	17
Table 3: Scale-based assessment of core indicators.....	18
Table 4: ARSDRR Strategic areas and major activities for disaster risk governance.....	19
Table 5: GNDR VFL2011 Indicators.....	24
Table 6: GNDR VFL2013 Indicators and Questions.....	25
Table 7: Disaster risk governance indicator questions VFL2009–2013 and the HFA	26
Table 8: Disaster risk governance analytical framework.....	31

Executive Summary

(to be added)

1. Introduction

The disaster risk profile of Africa is rooted in its turmoil history and geographical features. Africa is the only continent where disasters have increased over the past 15 years (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013; van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014). Although the mortality rate due to disasters is decreasing, the number of people affected, and the economic impact of disasters on the continent, is increasing (United Nations, 2011). This can be largely ascribed to improvements in development (including urbanisation) and economic activities (McClellan, 2010). The major hazards effecting people and livelihoods in Africa are hydrometeorological in nature. Various types of floods, drought, wild fires, cyclones and epidemics rate highest of all hazards (van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014). Linked to volatile vulnerability conditions rooted in extreme poverty and under development, makes Africa one of the most at-risk environments on Earth (van Niekerk, n.d.).

However, since the turn of the century disasters and their consequence have increasingly come under scrutiny. Civil society, government and international actors moreover questioned the inevitability of destruction and setbacks in development which disasters bring (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2009; United Nations Development Programme, 2004; Wisner et al., 2004). Through a number of dialogues at international level (2002–2004) various UN agencies amalgamated their respective disaster risk reduction foci/frameworks which ultimately culminated in a global review of disaster risk reduction (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2004) and the drafting of the Hyogo Framework for Action (United Nations, 2005). The adoption of the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) in 2005 by over 160 countries emphasised a new and almost united focus on disaster risk reduction. The HFA and subsequently the African Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction and its Plan of Action (ARSDRR) (African Union Commission/United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2010) heralded a new era for many African states in the management of disasters and their risks. No more did governments assume helplessness of the threats of disasters or when they eventually strike (Bang, 2013). The HFA and ARSDRR provided a robust framework which empowered governments to address issues of disaster risk and disaster risk reduction in a holistic and multi-sectoral nature. The first and most fundamental underpinning of the HFA (Priority 1) is the need for political commitment to disaster risk reduction and the implementation of disaster risk governance measures.

Therefore, gains of institutionalising disaster risk reduction at national levels in Africa have progressed at a steady pace since 2005 (van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014). Actions to mainstreaming disaster risk reduction by a number of governments are heartening, especially when one consider the emphasis which many scholars and policy makers place on the need for sustained political will in order for disaster risk reduction to become a reality (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2004; van Niekerk, 2005; Wisner et al., 2004). Today, many Africa governments find themselves in the midst of a paradigm shift from traditional disaster management and preparedness and response towards disaster risk reduction in the context of development planning with an emphasis on sustainable recovery linked to development (van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014). This is evident in the number of new multi-sectoral policies, plans and legislation that have seen the light since 2000 (Pelling, Holloway, 2006; van Niekerk, Wisner, 2014) (Pelling & Holloway, 2006; van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014). Unfortunately it is also some of the countries most at risk of disaster such as Malawi, Sudan, Zimbabwe and the DRC that do not yet have comprehensive and binding legal instruments or well defined, developed and functioning institutional structures for disaster risk management.

This report aims to provide a thematic review on risk governance in Africa as a contribution to the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR 2015). This review will use a selected number of countries as its basis for review. For this thematic review, disaster risk governance shall refer to the way in which the public authorities, civil servants, media, private sector, and civil society coordinate at community, national and regional levels, manage and reduce disaster and climate related risks. This means ensuring that sufficient levels of capacity and resources are made available to prevent, prepare for, manage and recover from disasters. It also entails mechanisms, institutions and processes for citizens to articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations, and mediate their differences (UNDP, 2010). This retrospective assessment of progress achieved in disaster risk governance in Africa aims to identify achievements, good practices, gaps and challenges against selected HFA indicators (in particular Priority 1 and 5). Disaster recovery will also enjoy attention. A number of selected countries (Burundi, Kenya, Mozambique, Nigeria, Swaziland and South Africa) were assessed using a desktop study methodology. The study aims to identify opportunities for disaster risk governance beyond 2015.

2. Orientation and problem statement

Many African states find themselves in an acute state of disaster risk. However, African communities have always been resourceful and adaptable. This is evident in centuries of rich history often not well known to western societies. Africa is home to thousands of different cultures, groups and ethnic affiliations (Asante, 2007). Most of these were created and shaped by the harsh but also abundant African climate and landscape. The colonial history of Africa and its islands is well known and the impact thereof well documented. One could also question the validity of the geopolitical boundaries of modern Africa states considering the above. Nevertheless, Africa remains underdeveloped in comparison to its peers in other regions of the world. Poverty, food insecurity, poor governance, failed and weak state systems, unchecked urbanisation, unsustainable foreign aid, ill health and diseases, inappropriate state systems, unsustainable development practices, corruption, lack of accountability, and lack of vision and hope, remains immense stumbling block in the path towards a better Africa.

Disaster risks are thus one more aspect which hinders the ability of Africa nations to escape the vicious under development circle. Unlike low probability, sudden onset events so often reported in the global media, Africa's disaster risk profile is rooted in unaccepted levels of vulnerability and lack of resiliency. This vulnerability is easily exploited by all and any hazard, be it natural or anthropogenic in nature (Pelling & Wisner, 2012). Various reasons for the above exist and the fault is not only that of the leaders of Africa. The international community has a portion of blame to shoulder, as can be seen with the questioning of the application of development and humanitarian aid over the past decade (Moyo, 2009). Some goes so far as to argue that the perpetual state of under development in Africa is beneficial for the most developed countries (Gibson, 2012; Rodney, 2012). Linked to the visible and undeniable affect of a changing climate on African states, and the rise in hydrometeorological hazards, Africa is set to face a very perilous situation on this current tract. Africa's disaster risk profile is thus on the increase. Millions of people are (and will be) left destitute, hungry, and poor due to the continued and relentless impact of natural hazards on their livelihoods. Continued drought in the Horn of Africa, floods in the interior and diseases such as HIV/AIDS and malaria plague gains in development (IFRC, 2011; McClean, 2010). It is therefore clear that significant intervening is needed to stop and reverse the current situation.

It would, however, be incorrect to argue that African states are mere passive passengers within the global arena of disaster risk reduction. On the contrary, many African states are currently leaders in the field of community-based disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and mitigation of natural disasters. One should not mistakingly link

the successes to the above to a particular development profile, nor type of government. Rather, most of the successes in disaster risk reduction on the continent has been driven by strong and determined civil society actors (such as NGOs, INGOs, academia and community groups) (Botha et al., 2011; Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2009; IFRC, 2011). Similarly, much gains in legislating disaster risk reduction in governments can be ascribed to the direct and continued involvement of the above groups (for example, in Nigeria, South Africa, Zambia, Namibia, Ethiopia, Egypt, Senegal, Algeria and Madagascar) (Pelling, 2009). Some significant strides has been made in the establishment of national platforms, promulgating and approving disaster risk reduction laws, policies and plans (van Niekerk, 2014). Despite the development of such policies, plans and legislation, direct investments in disaster risk reduction in Africa remain low. Most African countries have limited resources to invest in disaster risk reduction and minimal fiscal space to fund relief and recovery efforts after a major disaster (Kellett & Sparks, 2012; Kellett & Sweeney, 2011). Governments often lack the capacity to disaggregate specific budgetary allocations to disaster risk reduction.

Research by the IFRC (, 2011; , 2012), Pelling and Holloway (, 2006), Pelling and Wisner (, 2012), Van Niekerk (, 2014) and Van Niekerk and Wisner (van Niekerk & Wisner, 2014), confirms the importance of disaster risk reduction and preparedness law, and emphasise the importance of adequate disaster risk governance and the decentralisation of disaster risk reduction implementation. Good rules, policies, laws and regulations is in many African states a necessity for collective action. The research of Botha et al (Botha et al., 2011) shows that even in a more developed Africa state such as South Africa, very little initiative for disaster risk reduction is present at local level. In many cases local administrators would rather follow national guidelines than using initiatives to translate national policy into the local context.

As we approach the end of the decade spanning the implementation of the ideals of the HFA (2005–2015) a critical assessment is needed to measure and determine the successes achieved and the challenges which we still face. It is thus the aim of this research paper to contribute to the ongoing dialogue on the post-HFA period and provide a critical input as a retrospective assessment of the of progress achieved in disaster risk governance in Africa to the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015. With the above in mind the problem under investigation is which successes, good practices, gaps and hinderances can be identified against Priority 1 of the HFA by applying measurable variables to selected African case studies. However, Priority 1 of the

HFA does not function in isolation and thus core indicators of other Priority Areas (such as those found in Priority 3, 4, and 5) will also enjoy attention.

3. Key research questions and objectives

This study will systematically address the problem statement by answering a number of key research questions which will drive the objectives of this study. The key research questions which this study aims to answer are:

- What is disaster risk governance?
- What is disaster risk governance in Africa?
- Which variables and measurable indicators can be identified through literature which constitute disaster risk governance?
- To what extent has the selected African countries addressed the indicators of disaster risk governance?
- Which achievements in disaster risk governance in Africa can be identified and described?
- Which good practices in disaster risk governance can be identified and described?
- Which gaps in implementing disaster risk governance exist?
- What are the major challenges for African states in implementing disaster risk governance?
- What are the main recommendations which can be made in terms of implementing disaster risk governance in Africa?

To answer the questions above the objectives of this study are as follows:

- Conduct a theoretical literature review to define and explain disaster risk governance.
- Assess current reports and research to determine disaster risk governance in Africa.
- Identify and describe variables and measurable indicators of disaster risk governance.
- Assess selected case studies from Africa to determine to what extent the indicators of disaster risk governance has been addressed.
- Identify achievements in disaster risk governance in Africa and described them.
- Explain good practices in disaster risk governance.
- Identify gaps in implementing disaster risk governance.

- Describe the major challenges for African states in implementing disaster risk governance.
- Make recommendations to implementing disaster risk governance in Africa.

4. Methodology

This study is rooted in the transdisciplinary paradigm which means it crosses disciplinary boundaries to ensure a holistic approach to the research aim (van Niekerk, 2012). It thus uses ideas and methods originally created in various disciplines. In this paradigm the aim is to relate scientific knowledge to real world problem solving. This study mainly followed a qualitative methodology although quantitative data was interpreted to achieve the research objectives. Available literature (scientific articles, research and technical reports) on disaster risk governance was used as primary research data.

By investigating literature on disaster risk governance an analytical framework was developed which guided the assessment of the achievements, good practices, gaps and challenges in implementing disaster risk governance on the African continent.

5. Defining disaster risk governance

Governance is the “rule of the rulers” (World Bank, 2013). It can be seen as the process by which authority is given to those making the rules and how these rules are executed. It is thus the art of steering societies and organisations. Governance occurs through interactions among structures, processes, role-players and traditions that determine how power is exercised, how decisions are taken, and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say (or not!), and cannot function in isolation (Renn, 2008). Governance is about power, relationships, and accountability: who has influence, who decides, and how decision-makers are held accountable (Schacter, 2000). Governance per se can have both positive and negative consequences. Not all governance is “good” governance (van Niekerk & Jonker, 2001). Good governance has rather been associated with democracy and the protection of the rule of law, basic human right and civil liberties, effective and efficient public administration and management, transparency, openness, accountability and participation by the electorate.

The term disaster risk refers to the potential (not actual and realised) disaster losses, in lives, health status, livelihoods, assets and services, which could occur to a particular

community or society over some specified future time period. Disaster risk is the product of the possible damage caused by a hazard due to the vulnerability within a community (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2009a).

“The definition of disaster risk reflects the concept of disasters as the outcome of continuously present conditions of risk. Disaster risk comprises different types of potential losses which are often difficult to quantify. Nevertheless, with knowledge of the prevailing hazards and the patterns of population and socio-economic development, disaster risks can be assessed and mapped, in broad terms at least” (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2009a).

The UNDP (UNDP, 2010) believe that governance is the umbrella under which disaster risk reduction takes place, and should be dictated by the principles of good governance which are: broad participation, transparency, accountability, equity, rule of law, consensus orientation, efficiency and responsiveness.

Renn (, 2008) believes that risk governance requires consideration of the legal, institutional, social and economic contexts in which risk is evaluated. It also involves various actors and stakeholders involved in interacting networks making choices about risk (van Asselt & Renn, 2011). It also looks at the complex “web of actors, rules, conventions, processes and mechanisms concerned, with how relevant risk information is collected, analysed and communicated, and how management decisions are taken” (Renn, 2008; van Asselt & Renn, 2011). Disaster risk governance has a normative element which informs these actors how to deal with possible risks (future perspective). He further argues that risk governance encompass the combined actions and decision by both public and private sector role-players. Risk government requires a collaboration of various sectors an actors and is thus multifaceted in nature.

For the purpose of this study, disaster risk governance shall refer to the way in which the public authorities, civil servants, media, private sector, and civil society exhibit political commitment and coordinate at community, national and regional levels, to manage and reduce disaster and climate related risks. This means ensuring that sufficient legal binding instruments, levels of capacity and resources are made available on a decentralised basis, to prevent, prepare for, manage and recover from disasters. It also entails mechanisms, institutions and processes for citizens to articulate their interests, exercise their legal rights and obligations, and mediate their differences (Bang, 2013;

BankNational Disaster Coordination Council (Republic of the Philippines), 2005; Renn, 2008; UNDP, 2010; van Asselt & Renn, 2011; van Niekerk, 2014).

6. Framework for analysis

To answer the research questions it is imperative to first create a framework for analysis against which the successes, best practices and challenges in disaster risk governance in selected African states can be measured. Such a framework has as its foundation the basis tenants as espoused in the definition of disaster risk governance according to the previous section.

From the above definition a number of key components of disaster risk governance can therefore be identified, such as:

- statutory and legal instruments;
- adequate structures (public administration and community-based);
- sufficient human and other resources;
- decentralisation of decision-making and implementation;
- political will;
- accountability;
- transparency;
- efficiency;
- responsiveness;
- predictability;
- participation;
- understanding disaster risks; and
- planning to eliminate, reduce, prepare for and recover from disasters.

Similarly a number of actors is present and needed in disaster risk governance, which are:

- public authorities;
- civil servants;
- politicians;
- media;
- the private sector;
- civil society; and
- citizens (Renn, 2008).

It would thus be true to argue that if all, or at least most, of these variables are present then one could argue for the presence of disaster risk governance. However, research has shown that the answer is unfortunately not so simple or straight forward. As the next sections will show, varied opinions of what constitute disaster risk governance is found. Fortunately most of the international reports, organisations and research show a fair amount of similarities of the core disaster risk governance indicators. For completeness sake, the section to follow will briefly highly the most salient indicators and variables found in a number of recent international reports, strategies, research projects and programmes. A combined list of variables or indicators will be constructed from which the remainder of the research questions will be answered.

6.1 The Hyogo Framework for Action

Besides having the theoretical definition of disaster risk governance as guidance, the HFA Priority 1 (and also certain core indicators of Priority 3, 4 and 5) provides valuable direction for disaster risk governance. Priority for Action 1 of the HFA: Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation (United Nations, 2005) highlights the following key activities:

- DRR institutional mechanisms (national platforms); designated responsibilities;
- DRR part of development policies and planning, sector wise and multisector;
- Legislation to support DRR;
- Decentralisation of responsibilities and resources;
- Assessment of human resources and capacities;
- Foster political commitment; and
- Community participation.

The “HFA Monitoring Template¹” (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2012), provides more tangible indicators which countries use to conduct self assessments and determine their level of compliance with the various HFA priorities for action. For Priority for Action 1 (“Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation”) it is argued that “countries that develop policy, legislative and institutional frameworks for disaster risk reduction and that are able to develop and track progress through specific and

¹ The HFA Monitoring Template is an online assessment tool to assist countries to monitor and review their progress and challenges in the implementation of disaster risk reduction and recovery actions undertaken at the national level, in accordance with the HFA’s priorities.

measurable indicators have greater capacity to manage risks and to achieve widespread consensus for, engagement in and compliance with disaster risk reduction measures across all sectors of society“ (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2012). The above is measured through four core indicators which are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Core Indicators of Priority for Action 1 of the HFA*

Core Indicator 1	National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.
Core Indicator 2	Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction activities at all administrative levels.
Core Indicator 3	Community participation and decentralisation are ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels.
Core Indicator 4	A national multi-sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.

(Source: (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2012)

(* Note that reference in subsequent sections will be made to PFAx-Cix, where x indicate the appropriate number of the PFA or Core Indicator)

The rationale behind Core Indicator (Ci) 1 is that a country's policies, constitution, laws and governmental system can provide the basis to develop plans and institutional arrangements for all areas of disaster risk reduction, across various sectors. Assessing such elements can reveal gaps in resources and capacities that were previously under-utilised or untapped. A comprehensive disaster risk reduction policy framework can also guide a government in its disaster risk reduction policies and strategies, as well as decentralised application and implementation. A means of verification of the above could be the presence of: national development plans, sector strategies and plans, climate change policy and strategy, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, CCA/UNDAF (Common Country Assessment/UN Development Assistance Framework), civil defence policy, strategy and contingency planning.

Ci2 indicate that dedicated resources are needed for successful disaster risk governance. This indicator thus refers to funds that are allocated specifically for disaster risk reduction actions within public investment. Resource allocation that embeds disaster risk reduction into an institution's day-to-day business is necessary. When risk is considered in development, investment decisions and in the design of projects, the cost of disaster risk reduction is lower. Means of verification can be the percentage of budget allocations

for disaster risk reduction and disaster recovery or the capacity development interventions (both human resources and institutional) at all government levels.

Ci3 emphasises community action and participation and looks at the promotion of community participation in disaster risk reduction through the adoption of policies relevant to the local level, promotion of knowledge networks, strategic management of volunteer resources, attribution of roles and responsibilities, and the delegation and provision of the authority and resources at local levels. This indicator can be verified by evidence of decentralised disaster risk reduction and community participation and decision making. Budget and resources allocation also play a major role in this instance.

To coordinate the above and to ensure that actions reaches the most at-risk communities, some form of centralised coordination system for disaster risk reduction is needed (not to be confused with decentralised implementation) (IFRC, 2011). Core indicator 4 emphasises the need for multi-sectoral platforms for disaster risk reduction. These can be defined as a multi-sectoral and multi-disciplinary nationally owned and led mechanism. This mechanism adopts the structure of a forum or committee that facilitates the interaction of key development players around the national disaster risk reduction and development agenda and serves as an advocate for disaster risk reduction measures at all levels. Such a platform may include or complement existing mechanisms for disaster management (that might exist primarily for emergency relief and recovery).

However, as can be expected with disaster risk governance as an overarching goal through PFA1, some linkages with other HFA PFAs and core indicators must also be considered and these are listed in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Core Indicators of PFA 3, 4 and 5 of the HFA affecting PFA 1

PFA 3: Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels.	Core Indicator 3	Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.
	Core Indicator 4	Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.
PFA 4: Reduce the underlying risk factors.	Core Indicator 1	Disaster risk reduction is an integral objective of environment related policies and plans, including for land use natural resource management and adaptation to climate change.

	Core Indicator 3	Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities.
	Core Indicator 4	Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.
	Core Indicator 5	Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes.
PFA 5: Strengthen disaster preparedness for effective response at all levels.	Core Indicator 1	Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.

Of particular interest in this study is PFA5–Ci1: “Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.” The disaster risk governance link in this context therefore not only relate to a pure disaster risk reduction perspective but also take cognisance of the need for disaster risk governance within disaster preparedness and response.

Each of the above core indicators is linked to a set of measuring instruments to determine compliance and level of progress (typically scale-based assessment). Table 3 below indicate the generic description of the levels of progress linked to examples of assessment criteria.

Table 3: Scale-based assessment of core indicators

Level	Generic description of level of progress	Examples of an assessment of the indicator “A strategy for data provision for disaster risk reduction is in place”
5	Comprehensive achievement has been attained, with the commitment and capacities to sustain efforts at all levels.	“Systematic, properly resourced processes for data collection and dissemination are in place, with evaluation, analysis and improvements being routinely undertaken. Plans and commitments are publicised and the work is well integrated into other programmes.”
4	Substantial achievement has been attained, but with some recognised deficiencies in commitment, financial resources or operational capacities.	“Processes for data collection and dissemination are in place for all hazards and most vulnerability factors, but there are shortcomings in dissemination and analysis that are being addressed.”

3	There is some institutional commitment and capacities to achieving DRR but progress is not comprehensive or substantial.	“There is a systematic commitment to collecting and archiving hazard data, but little awareness of data needs for determining vulnerability factors, and a lack of systematic planning and operational skills”.
2	Achievements have been made but are incomplete, and while improvements are planned, the commitment and capacities are limited.	“Some data collection and analysis has been done in the past, but in an ad hoc way. There are plans to improve data activities, but resources and capacities are very limited.”
1	Achievements are minor and there are few signs of planning or forward action to improve the situation.	“There is little awareness of the need to systematically collect and analyse data related to disaster events and climatic risks.”

(Source: (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2012)

6.2 Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction

The Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (ARSDRR), aligned with the HFA, identifies a number of strategic areas of intervention linked to activities and expected results (African Union Commission United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2010). Three of the five strategic areas related to disaster risk governance. Thee areas with the major areas of activities for disaster risk governance is shown in Table 3.

Table 4: ARSDRR Strategic areas and major activities for disaster risk governance

Strategic area of intervention	Major areas of activity
1. Increase political commitment to disaster risk reduction	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Enhancing and strengthening mobilisation for political commitment, responsibility and accountability. 2. Strengthening institutional frameworks and defining the structures of disaster risk reduction. 3. Incorporating disaster risk reduction into national legislation. 4. Increasing resource allocation for disaster risk reduction. 5. Strengthening capacities of the regional inter-government commission (AU Commission) / NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency and Regional Economic Communities (RECs) for implementation of this Strategy.

Strategic area of intervention	Major areas of activity
3. Increase public awareness of disaster risk reduction	2. Promoting integration of DRR in the formal and informal education systems and specifically the health sector. 4. Strengthening the role and experience in DRR of traditional and local authorities and other opinion leaders. 5. Strengthening the role of women, youth and other vulnerable groups in decision making in DRR issues.
4. Improve governance of disaster risk reduction institutions and reduce the underlying risk factors	1. Assessing the existing capacities, specifically in the health and education sector. 2. Harmonising DRR policies & strategies at regional and national levels. 3. Developing and strengthening national platforms for DRR at required level. 4. Strengthening decentralisation of DRR interventions. 5. Promoting public/private partnerships to advance DRR in practice 6. Increasing gender sensitivity of DRR policies, legislation and programmes. 7. Operationalising guidelines for mainstreaming DRR into sector and cross-sector development policies and programmes, particularly in agriculture, health and climate change adaptation, and drought and desertification control. 8. Including DRR concerns in public regulation on land use, physical development and infrastructure development, emphasising the importance of safe schools and hospitals. 9. Strengthening and expanding social protection mechanisms.

6.3 UNDP/BCPR's Global Mainstreaming Initiative

The UNDP, and particular its Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP/BCPR) has been instrumental in the development field for a number of decades. It helps countries prevent armed conflict, alleviate the risk and effects of disasters from natural hazards and build back better and stronger when crises happen. Currently the disaster risk reduction, governance and mainstreaming work of the UNDP is coordinated under the Global Mainstreaming Initiative (GMI) – launched in 2006. The initiative's long term goal is to strengthen the capacity of governments to include DRR in national development planning and programmes. The UNDP's DRR mainstreaming framework (draft) comprises of five interconnected spheres of engagement (UNDP, 2010). They are:

- Policy;

- Citizen,
- Advocacy and knowledge;
- Organisation; and
- Implementation.

The UNDP's (UNDP, 2010) activities to enhance disaster risk governance include:

- Supporting disaster risk reduction and recovery policy, legal and regulatory framework development and reform;
- Integrating decentralised disaster risk reduction and recovery into local-level development;
- Conducting disaster risk reduction and recovery assessments;
- Disaster risk reduction and recovery advocacy, awareness and education; and
- Establish disaster risk reduction and recovery partnerships and networks.

The above activities now mostly forms part of all UNDP development work and is integrated into sectors such as energy and the environment, poverty reduction and democratic governance (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2009b).

6.4 GNDR indicators

The Global Network 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. The GNDR has been active since 2005 and in 2009 launched the first of its biennial action research and learning programme called "Views from the Frontline" (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2009). The aim of the "Views from the Frontline" (VFL) is to gather, investigate, disseminate and advocate successes in the implementation of the HFA through the eyes of communities and institutions working at the local level.

The main objectives of the 2009 VFL review were to:

- provide an overview of progress at the local level within participating countries;
- strengthen public accountability for disaster risk reduction (DRR) policy execution by establishing a local level monitoring system and relevant baselines;
- enhance civil society monitoring, research, analytical and advocacy capabilities; and

- increase dialogue and understanding between different groups responsible for reducing risk (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2009).

The 2009 VFL review targeted local government representatives, civil society organisations and community representatives as key informants. The indicator matrix were modelled on the HFA and its five PFAs, with some cross cutting issues which included the following:

(i) Governance

- Frameworks and structures
- Planning
- Financial resources
- Financial resources (for partnerships)
- Human resources

(ii) Risk assessment, monitoring and warning

- Disaster risk assessments
- Early warning systems
- Risk management systems

(iii) Knowledge and education

- Information management & exchange
- Formal education (curriculum)
- Formal education (training of teachers and materials)
- Community training
- Public awareness

(iv) Underlying risk factors

- Environmental and natural resource management
- Adaptation to climate change
- Food security
- Social protection
- Economic protection
- Poverty alleviation
- Land use
- Urban planning
- Overall planning
- Building codes and standards
- Building codes and standards (enforcement)

- Protection of critical public facilities
- Public–Private Partnerships

(v) Disaster preparedness and response

- Disaster preparedness capacities (future risks)
- Disaster response
- Disaster preparedness and response planning
- Disaster response and recovery
- Evacuation
- Training drills and rehearsals
- Financial reserves and aid
- Coordination and information exchange

(vi) Cross cutting issues

- Community participation and information
- Actual and fair participation
- Encouraging volunteers
- Training activities
- Gender
- Gender (resources)
- Cultural sensitivity (diversity)
- Cultural sensitivity (traditional knowledge)
- Cultural sensitivity (languages)

This first global assessment took place in 48 countries, involving 400 civil society organisations, collecting close to 7 000 responses.

In 2011 the focus of the VFL was “local risk governance” (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2011). Twenty indicators were developed by the GNDR following an intensive and global consulting process, and building on the success of VFL 2009. These indicators were measured in 69 countries with the involvement of over 500 civil society organisations. Over 20 000 “views” were collected.

The indicators of the VFL2011 are all very relevant to this study due to its direct focus on local risk governance. The indicators of the VFL2011 were:

Table 5: GNDR VFL2011 Indicators

No.	Indicator subject	Indicator question
1	Participation	Does the local government involve all people, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?
2	Gender	Does the local government ensure women and men participate equally in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?
3	Children and Youth	Do local government disaster prevention practices take into account the specific needs of children and young people?
4	Volunteers	Does the local government support the participation of local volunteers in disaster prevention measures?
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)?
6	Indigenous Capacities	Does the local government disaster prevention practices take into account local (indigenous) knowledge, skills and resources?
7	Planning	Does the local government have a plan of action to turn disaster prevention policies into practice?
8	Financial Resources	Does the local government have an adequate budget for disaster prevention?
9	Decentralisation	Do local government officials have clear roles and responsibilities to carry out disaster prevention?
10	Expertise	Does the local government have sufficient expertise to carry out disaster prevention?
11	Training	Does the local government provide disaster prevention training for government officials, the community and civil society leaders?
12	Baselines	Has the local government established a reference point (baseline) from which to measure progress in implementing disaster prevention policies?
13	Monitoring	Does the local government regularly monitor and report on progress on disaster prevention?
14	Participatory Monitoring	Does the local government involve communities and civil society in the monitoring of disaster prevention?
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 ?
16	Information Gathering	Does local government regularly collect, review and map information on disasters risks and climate change?
17	Information Management	Does the local government connect traditional and scientific knowledge to inform local action planning?
18	Information Dissemination	Does the local government provide vulnerable people with updated, easily understood information on disaster risks and disaster prevention measures?
19	Governmental Coordination	Does the local government coordinate disaster prevention activities with other government officials and ministries?
20	Partnership	Does the local government form partnerships to implement disaster prevention measures with community, private sector, civil society, academia and others?

(Source: (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2011)

VFL2013 highlights the underlying themes of everyday disasters, multi-risk resilience and underlying causes. In the consultative process in developing the research tools, some members also suggested that making clear links to previous VFL surveys and the HFA monitor was important. The indicators for VFL2013 is displayed in Table 6 below.

Table 6: GNDR VFL2013 Indicators and Questions

Context: Everyday disasters, multi-risk resilience and underlying causes
1. Everyday disasters: When everyday disasters, for example seasonal floods, regular droughts, pest attacks, fires strike does government (local or national) provide resources for response?
2. Multi-risk Resilience: Does the community tackle different factors leading to disasters separately? * *(do they distinguish between their response to natural disasters, disasters of human origin and disasters resulting from climate change)
3. Underlying Causes: Does the community find its progress is restricted by factors beyond their control? * *(for example government decisions about financial resources, environmental management, agricultural development, building and planning)
Observation / Reflection:
4. Risk Assessment: Does the local government involve representatives of all sections of the local community in risk assessments?
5. Early Warning: Are there effective local early warning systems in place? * *(Systems which alert all sections of the community)
6. Monitoring: Does the local government regularly monitor progress to reduce disaster risk ?
7. Communications / Public Awareness : To what extent does the local government ensure information on local risk trends and risk reduction measures is regularly communicated to communities
Knowledge and Learning:
8. Connecting: To what extent does the local government use both traditional and scientific knowledge in decision-making?
9. Learning: To what extent do local leaders (state / non-state) discuss, share and analyse disaster risk information ?
10.Negotiation: To what extent are local authorities and community representatives able to work together in decisionmaking about risk reduction?
11.Conflict Resolution: To what extent are local authorities and community representatives able to resolve conflicts * *(For example by applying sanctions against those who break rules and agreements)
Organising and Action:
12.Self -Organising: To what extent are the local authorities and community representatives able organise themselves to work together? * *(For example by setting priorities and planning actions to reduce risks)
13.Building Partnerships: Do local leaders form partnerships to reduce disaster risk ? * *(For example with local, regional and national government and organisations (public, private and civil society)

14.Resources: To what extent can financial resources and other assistance to carry out risk reduction activities be obtained? *

*(for example by local authorities and community representatives)

15.Local Actions: Is there adequate capacity to prepare for and mitigate disaster risk ? *

*(For example accessed by local authorities and community representatives)

(Source: (Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction, 2013)

In the VFL2013, 21 500 "views" from 57 countries, involving over 450 organisations were collected. In comparison, Table 7 below contains a comparison between the VFL2009–2013 and local HFA Monitoring indicators (2013).

Table 7: Disaster risk governance indicator questions VFL2009–2013 and the HFA

Views from Frontline 2013	Views from the Frontline 2011	Views from the Frontline 2009	Local HFA Indicator Questions (Resilient Cities) 2013
Context: Everyday disasters, multi-risk resilience and underlying causes			
Everyday disasters: When everyday disasters, for example seasonal floods, regular droughts, pest attacks, fires strike does government (local or national) provide resources for response?	Does the local government have an adequate budget for disaster prevention?	Does your community have access to financial or material resources provided by local government to reduce the impact of disasters or to help recover from disasters?	To what degree does the local government allocate sufficient financial resources to carry out DRR activities, including effective disaster response and recovery? [1.2]
Multi-risk Resilience: Does the community tackle different factors leading to disasters separately? (do they distinguish between their response to natural disasters, disasters of human origin and disasters resulting from climate change)		Is your community trying to adapt to future changes in climate and weather?	

<p>Underlying Causes: Does the community find its progress is restricted by factors beyond their control? (for example government decisions about financial resources, environmental management, agricultural development, building and planning)</p>	Does the local government involve all people, especially vulnerable and marginalised groups in disaster prevention decision-making and implementation?	Is your community involved in local development planning (including how land must be used)?	How much does the local government support vulnerable local communities (particularly women, elderly, infirmed, children) to actively participate in risk reduction decision making, policy making, planning and implementation processes? [1.3]
Observation / Reflection:			
<p>Risk Assessment: Does the local government involve representatives of all sections of the local community in risk assessments?</p>	Does the local government regularly collect, review and map information on disaster risks and climate change ?	Does the local government conduct regular risk assessments involving representatives of the local community ?	Does the local government conduct disaster risk assessments for key development sectors ?
<p>Early Warning: Are there effective local early warning systems in place? (Systems which alert all sections of the community)</p>		Are there local early warning systems in place to alert all sections of the community ?	To what extent does the local government have early warning centres and emergency communications system ?
<p>Monitoring: Does the local government regularly monitor progress to reduce disaster risk ?</p>	Does the local government regularly monitor progress to reduce disaster risk?	Does the local government regularly monitor progress to reduce the risk of disasters ?	Systems are in place to monitor and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities
<p>Communications / Public Awareness : To what extent does the local government ensure information on local risk trends and risk reduction measures is regularly communicated to communities</p>	Does the local government provide people with regular information on disaster risks and risk reduction measures ?	Is information on risk and risk reduction measures readily available and accessible to all sections of the affected community	Does the local authority regularly communicate to the community information on local hazards trends and risk reduction measures ?
Knowledge and Learning:			
<p>Connecting: To what extent does the local government use both traditional and scientific knowledge in decision-making?</p>	To what extent does the local government connect traditional and scientific knowledge to inform local decision-making processes ?		

Learning: To what extent do local leaders (state / non-state) discuss, share and analyse disaster risk information ?	Does the local government take into account local (indigenous) knowledge, skills and resources ?		
Negotiation: To what extent are local authorities and community representatives able to work together in decision-making about risk reduction?	Does the local government involve all sections of the community in disaster prevention decision-making, planning and implementation ?	Are all sections of the affected communities involved in disaster prevention decision-making, planning and implementation?	To what extent does the local government support local communities to actively participate in DRR decision-making, policy making and implementation processes?
Conflict Resolution: To what extent are local authorities and community representatives able to resolve conflicts (For example by applying sanctions against those who break rules and agreements)	Complaints Procedures; Does the local government provide affected communities with a means of redress / remedy for complaints and non-compliance ?		
Organising and Action:			
Self -Organising: To what extent are the local authorities and community representatives able to organise themselves to work together? (For example by setting priorities and planning actions to reduce risks)	Do local government officials have decentralised roles and responsibilities to carry out disaster prevention ?	Are there adequate institutional capacities for leading on disaster risk reduction at the local level ?	How well are local organisations equipped with capacities (knowledge, experience, official mandate) to disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation ?
Building Partnerships: Do local leaders form partnerships to reduce disaster risk ? (For example with local, regional and national government and organisations (public, private and civil society)	Does the local government form partnerships to implement disaster prevention measures with community, private, civil society, academia & others?	Does the local government initiate public-private partnerships to support disaster risk reduction-related activities ?	To what extent do partnerships exist between communities, private sector and local authorities to reduce risk ?

<p>Resources: To what extent can financial resources and other assistance to carry out risk reduction activities be obtained? (for example by local authorities and community representatives)</p>	<p>Does the local government have an adequate budget for disaster prevention ?</p>	<p>Is an adequate budget allocated to local government and other local institutions to enable disaster risk reduction to be incorporated into planning and actual activities ?</p>	<p>To what extent does the local government have access to adequate financial resources to carry out risk reduction activities ?</p>
<p>Local Actions: Is there adequate capacity to prepare for and mitigate disaster risk? (For example accessed by local authorities and community representatives)</p>		<p>Are there adequate institutional capacities for implementing disaster risk reduction measures at the local level ?</p>	<p>How well are local organisations (including local government) equipped with capacities for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation ?</p>

6.5 Global Assessment Report 2011: Build risk governance capacities

The 2011 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (GAR2011) of the UNISDR were developed from the country self assessments for over 130 governments (United Nations, 2011). Chapter 7 of this report addresses “Reforming risk governance” and identifies a number of elements which it feels are necessary for disaster risk governance, which are:

- Show political will - Place policy responsibility for DRM and climate change adaptation in a ministry with political authority over national development planning and investment;
- Share power – Develop decentralised, layered functions; use principle of subsidiarity and appropriate levels of devolution including budgets and to civil society;
- Foster partnerships – Adopt a new culture of public administration supportive of local initiatives and based on partnerships between government and civil society; and
- Be accountable – Ensure social accountability through increased public information and transparency; use performance-based budgeting and rewards.

6.6 Renn’s dimension of context affecting disaster risk governance

From a pure theoretical perspective, one of the most well known scholars of risk governance is arguable Ortwin Renn. In his 2008 publication “Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World” he considers various elements of risk governance which is worth mentioning. Renn believes that risk governance can be divided into five “domains” which can be applied to either “vertical governance” (i.e. top-down) or “horizontal governance” (i.e. inter/multi-sectoral). These risk “domains” and their components are:

- **Core risk governance process;**

- Pre-assessment
- Risk appraisal
 - Risk assessment
 - Concern assessment
- Evaluation: tolerability/acceptability judgement
- Risk management
- Communication

- **Organisational capacity;**

- Assets
 - Rules, norms and regulations
 - Resources
 - Competence and knowledge
- Skills
- Capabilities
 - Relations
 - Networks
 - Regimes

- **Actor network;**

- Politicians
- Regulators
- Industry/business
- NGOs
- Media
- Public at large

- **Social climate; and**

- Trust in regulatory institutions
- Perceived authority of science
- Degree of civil society involvement

- **Political and regulatory culture.**

- Different regulatory styles

Renn is of the opinion that risk governance goes beyond the conventional understanding of risk analysis (risk assessment, risk management and risk communication) but should also include matters of institutional design, technical methodology, administrative consultation, legislative procedures, political accountability (public sector), and social and corporate responsibility (private sector) (Renn, 2008).

6.7 Analytical framework for disaster risk governance

From the above literature assessment a combined list of indicators can be compiled as they relate to disaster risk reduction and recovery. This list is not at all exhaustive but fairly comprehensive and valuable in addressing the last six research questions of this study. Table 7 below shows the combined indicators as identified out of the literature study above, linked to relevant HFA PFAs and its core indicators (Ci).

Table 8: Disaster risk governance analytical framework

Element	Indicator	Measurement
Political will (PFA1-Ci1)	Political commitment (PFA1-Ci1) Good governance and decision-making	Legislation (PFA1-Ci1) Policies (PFA1-Ci1) Plans (PFA1-Ci1; PFA4-Ci1) Frameworks (PFA1-Ci1) Accountability Transparency Efficiency Responsiveness Predictability Trust
Centralised coordination (PFA1- Ci2)	Multi-sectoral centralised structures (PFA1-Ci2) Development integration (PFA4-Ci1; Ci4 and Ci5) Participation (PFA1-Ci3; PFA3-Ci4) Understanding disaster risks (PFA4) Planning to eliminate, reduce, prepare for, and recover from disasters (PFA5-Ci1)	National disaster risk reduction platform (PFA1-Ci4) NDRMC/NDMO (PFA1-Ci2) Other committees (e.g. climate change adaptation, food security, water and catchment management) Plans (PFA1-Ci2; PFA4-Ci1)

Element	Indicator	Measurement
Decentralised implementation (PFA1-Ci2 and Ci3)	Local ownership and decision-making (PFA1-Ci3; PFA3-Ci4) Development integration (PFA4-Ci1; Ci4 and Ci5) Delegation and provision of authority (PFA1-Ci2 and Ci3) Clear role and responsibility division (PFA1-Ci2 and Ci3) Local inter-sectoral coordination (PFA1-Ci2 and Ci3)	Localised policies, plans, bylaws, frameworks (PFA1-Ci1; PFA4- Ci1) Participation (PFA1-Ci3) Networks (PFA1-Ci4; PFA5-Ci1) Volunteers (PFA1-Ci3) Involvement of at-risk groups (PFA1-Ci3) Budget (PFA1-Ci2) Community-based disaster risk management (PFA1-Ci3)
Various horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement (PFA1-Ci1 and Ci3)	Civil society (PFA1-Ci3) Community/citizens (PFA1-Ci3) Public authorities (PFA1-Ci1) Civil servants (PFA1-Ci1) Politicians (PFA1-Ci1) Media (PFA1-Ci3) Private sector Gender (PFA1-Ci3) Youth (PFA1-Ci3)	Public private partnerships Private sector initiatives Corporate (social) responsibility Community engagement and structures (PFA1-Ci3) Local disaster risk ownership (PFA1-Ci2 and Ci3) Local plans (PFA1-Ci2; PFA4-Ci1) Development integration (PFA4-Ci1; Ci4 and Ci5)
Communication (PFA3-Ci4)	Various horizontal and vertical communication channels (PFA3-Ci4) Advocacy (PFA3-Ci4) Right to information (PFA3-Ci4)	Information flow and application (PFA3-Ci4) Public awareness (PFA3-Ci4) Networks (PFA1-Ci1 and Ci2) Culture of risk avoidance/safety (PFA1-Ci3 and PFA3-Ci3) Appropriate decision-making
Assets	Human resources (PFA1-Ci2) Financial resources (PFA1-Ci2) Capacities (PFA1-Ci2; PFA 5-Ci1) Indigenous knowledge	Skilled and knowledge staff and community members (PFA1-Ci2; PFA 5-Ci1) Budget allocations (PFA1-Ci2; PFA4-Ci3) Formal and non-formal education and training (PFA1-Ci2; PFA 5-Ci1) Research (PFA3-Ci3) DRR/development integration into project design (PFA4-Ci1; Ci4 and Ci5) Social protection mechanisms (PFA4-Ci3) Application of indigenous knowledge systems
Risk analysis and management (PFA4)	Disaster risk profiles and mapping (PFA4)	Evidence of disaster risk reduction Risk maps Risk communication

With the above analytical framework in mind, the sections to follow will assess the various disaster risk governance reports (HFA progress reports and VFL reports) to determine achievements, good practices, gaps and challenges in disaster risk governance on the African continent.

7. Achievements

The research shows that the selected African countries have made significant progress in implementing the various PFAs of the HFA. As can be expected, in some better headway has been made in some countries than in others, but in all cases mentionable achievements can be identified despite a number of challenges in governance and government structures. The achievements are also diverse across the various case studies. There are, however certain common elements which repeats itself across all countries. This suggests that these elements of disaster risk governance are easier to achieve than others. The sections to follow will use the broad elements identified in the theoretical framework (see section 6) to highlight identified achievements across all case studies.

7.1 Political will

One of the elements which seems to be present in all countries is political will. For example, despite the precarious situation in which **Burundi** finds itself after years of conflict and civil strife, it must be commented for the progress made in improving overall governance (International Monetary Fund, 2009) and disaster risk reduction since 2004 (Republic of Burundi, 2004). On perusal of the documents submitted as part of a self-assessment process to the UNISDR, it is evident that political will for disaster risk reduction in Burundi exists (Republic of Burundi, 2011). **Nigeria** like many African countries had disaster risk reduction legislative reform since 2000. Nigeria was one of the early adopters of disaster risk reduction in Africa and this is shown through political commitment and the establishment of the National Emergency Management Agency (NEMA) in 1999. Most notably is Nigeria's recent membership of the GFDRR's Consultative Group as a recipient country and non-traditional donor in 2011. As a member of the Consultative Group, Nigeria will help define long-term policies and strategies of the GFDRR. "As an integral part of the Consultative Group of the GFDRR, Nigeria will have the opportunity to share its experience and knowledge in disaster risk reduction and recovery; to learn from other major international disaster risk management actors; as well as to provide financial support in order to help other high-risk countries

throughout the world, particularly in Africa” (GFDRR:2011un; Dia et al., 2012). Nigeria also developed a national Plan of Action for DRR (2006–2015) and has participated in all HFA assessments as well as VFL interventions. Given Nigeria’s track record over the past decade it is safe to argue that she is leading Africa in political commitment for disaster risk reduction. **South Africa**, like Nigeria had early policy and legislation reform starting in 1998 with the Green and White Papers on Disaster Management (South Africa, 1998a; , 1998b). This lead to the Disaster Management Act of 2002 (South Africa, 2003) followed by the National Disaster Management Policy Framework in 2005 (South Africa, 2005). **Kenya** has also undergone some significant policy and legislative reform pertaining to disaster risk reduction. Kenya published its new Policy on Disaster Management in 2009 (Kenya, 2009), and its new Constitution (The Republic of Kenya, 2010) emphasises disaster risk reduction as a core developmental concern. In the development of its Disaster Management Policy, Kenya followed a rigorous consulting process in which a number of actors were involved such as academia, INGOs, NGOs, CSOs and research institutes which shows a level of responsiveness in their governance system. **Mozambique** has been one of the Southern Africa countries most affected by floods, cyclones and droughts in the past 15 years (Mozambique, 2011). Coming from years of civil conflict (similar to Burundi), Mozambique has made significant progress in the mitigation and prevention of disasters. Legislative reform and new disaster risk reduction structures are some of their successes in showing political will as part of disaster risk governance. In terms of national planning, the Mozambican Government has ensured disaster risk reduction/development integration in their five year Government plan (2010–2014). A Master Plan for Disaster Prevention and Mitigation has been in place since 2006, and is updated on a regular basis. Since 2004 the **Kingdom of Swaziland** embraced the need for a paradigm shift from emergency response and relief to the more broader concepts of disaster risk reduction in the context of climate change adaptation. Disaster risk management was identified as a priority area in sectors such as agriculture, food security, water resources and water quality. Swaziland is, however, still in the process of legislative reform (see Challenges section below), linked to decentralised implementation of disaster risk reduction. Swaziland does, however, have a national Disaster Risk Reduction Action Plan (2005) and Disaster Management Act since 2006 (UNDPKingdom of Swaziland, 2008) which makes it one of the first African countries to start to implement legislative reforms in disaster risk reduction.

7.2 Centralised coordination

Burundi has implemented a national disaster risk reduction platform (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013) which brings together a number of ministries and stakeholders (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011), as well as developed a national disaster risk reduction policy (Republic of Burundi, 2011; Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). There are, however, doubt within CSOs whether the national platform is performing as it should. **Mozambique** was one of the first SADC countries to formalise their disaster risk reduction structures at national and local level through the Instituto Nacional de Gestão de Calamidades (INGC) or National Institute for Disaster Management (Abreu, 2013). Similarly, **South Africa, Nigeria and Swaziland and Kenya**, all have established national platforms for disaster risk reduction. The establishment of these platforms remains an achievement in its own right and provides each country with a foundation to build multi-sectoral and role-player involvement in disaster risk reduction and recovery.

7.3 Decentralised implementation

Since 2010 the **Burundi** government has been focussing on decentralising disaster risk reduction to their provincial government sphere, with mixed success, due to lack of mandate and accountability (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). Burundi has furthermore ratified a number of conventions relating to achieving the objectives of the HFA such as the RAMSAR Convention for the Protection of Wetlands, Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, Montreal Protocol for the Reduction of Substances that Depletes the Ozone Layer, and the Convention on Decertification (Republic of Burundi, 2004; , 2007). To realise some of the objectives of these international treaties, Burundi had to consider a decentralised approach in project implementation. With the assistance of international donors, Burundi has shown some achievements in addressing some of the root causes of vulnerability. Other successes for Burundi include the development of some contingency plans at provincial level. Although these are disaster response oriented, they provided a crucial step towards advocating for disaster risk reduction interventions, and networking of relevant role-players. To this end, Burundi has seen more direct involvement of civil society at national level and representation on disaster risk reduction structures, such as the National Platform (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). In the case of **Kenya**, their 2010 Constitution as well as the Disaster Management Policy enshrines the decentralisation of disaster risk reduction to county level (see Schedule 4, Part 2 of the Constitution). Similarly, a decentralised approach to disaster risk reduction and the legislative requirement of disaster risk reduction and development integration occurs though a number of policies and acts in

South Africa (South Africa, 1983; , 1998c; , 2000; van Niekerk, 2014). Research by Botha et al (, 2011) and Botha and Van Niekerk (, 2013), however, indicates that although the decentralisation is legislated, its implementation remains problematic and limited.

7.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement

Through its newly established structures, **Burundi** has achieved some multi-sectoral involvement in disaster risk reduction in particular in relation to its Meteorological Office and its Department of Agriculture (Republic of Burundi, 2009; , 2011). Attention in integrating disaster risk reduction and development has also occurred at communal level, although to a fairly limited degree (Republic of Burundi, 2009; Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). The VFL reporting on **Kenya** indicates a growth in the civil society involvement in disaster risk reduction at national level, with specific emphasis on the involvement of women's groups (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011). Kenya also recognises the importance of integrating disaster risk reduction into development and poverty reduction activities (International Monetary Fund, 2005). Some progress in this regard is reported on. At national level the Kenyan Government has implemented a National Disaster Trust Fund and at local government level, District Contingency Funds (The Republic of Kenya, 2007). Furthermore, in **Mozambique** disaster risk reduction is addressed in their National Adaptation Programme for Action (NAPA) (Government of Mozambique, 2007). Mainstreaming disaster risk reduction at local level through development plans is also underway. Some progress in **Nigeria** in terms of development/disaster risk reduction integration is evident. Through continued advocacy by various civil society groups and government departments such as NEMA and the State Emergency Management Agencies (SEMAs) (where they exist and are functional), capacity development for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation is present. Nigeria has engaged its education and research sector, frequently consulting with the scientific community on issues of disaster risk reduction, response and recovery. In **Swaziland** disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation integration into policies and legislation is slowly occurring. Swaziland is also one of the first SADC countries to include both a gender and disaster risk reduction focus into their development plans and projects (Mazingira Consultants, 2010). A National Vulnerability Assessment Committee has been established and is showing evidence of progress. One of the major achievements in **South Africa** has been the continued and direct involvement of civil society in disaster risk reduction (Pelling & Holloway, 2006). This can be seen in the legislative drafting and promulgation process as well as the various fora which facilitates inter-sectoral and inter-disciplinary engagement

(such as the Disaster Management Institute of South Africa and the Southern Africa Society for Disaster Reduction – to be discussed in subsequent sections).

7.5 Communication

Although communication remains a crucial element to disaster risk governance, it is alarming that not much is reported on this element by countries and through other research. With the assistance of a number of INGOs and NGOs, **Burundi** has a working early warning system for food security in place, which requires the inputs of a number of sectors. Similarly, Mozambique the existence of early warning systems and the use of community radio are some of their successes (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011)

7.6 Assets

In a 2004 report on the prevention of disasters in **Burundi** (Republic of Burundi, 2004), the government highlighted the need of appropriate skills and competencies. In subsequent self-assessments and national reports up until 2011, it is evident that some successes in decentralised training has taken place, although there is a severe lack of funding to sustain such training interventions, which are also mostly humanitarian-actor driven. The **Kenyan** Government has shown political commitment to disaster risk reduction through budget allocations at all levels of government (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011) although some feel it is still limited in terms of its effectiveness (Action fo Sustainable Change, 2013). Kenya has furthermore achieved successes in implementing capacity development projects and programmes. A number of formal and non-formal courses has seen the light since 2005, and the continued involvement of the research and academic community in disaster risk reduction is mentionable. **Nigeria** has conducted a disaster risk reduction capacity assessment in April 2012. The aim of the assessment was to “identify gaps and challenges the country is currently facing and to fully engage in preventing, mitigating and reducing natural disaster risks” (Dia et al., 2012). The assessment focussed on PFA1–4 of the HFA and it is hoped that the assessment will lead to the development of a National Plan of Action for DRR Capacity Building. Nigeria has further implemented Masters level qualifications in six of its national universities. Disaster Risk Reduction is also included in school curriculum although advocacy and training of teachers at local level (although more can be done in this regard) (Africa Youth Movement, 2011; Dia et al., 2012). In the case of **South Africa** a number of capacity building initiatives and

decentralises budget allocations to local government level is evident (van Niekerk et al., 2011). Local level budget allocations means that significant disaster risk reduction assets are present at a local level, although more can be done to enhance skills and human resource capacities (Botha et al., 2011). Similar to Nigeria, in 2009, the National Disaster Management Centre of South Africa conducted an extensive National Education, Training and Research Needs and Resources Analysis.

7.7 Risk analysis and management

Burundi has shown some progress in the integration of disaster risk reduction and climate change into development, albeit limited (Republic of Burundi, 2009; , 2011). Some achievements in integrated risk management is noticeable, for example the integration of environmental concerns into the planning of Ministries such as Agriculture and Livestock, Energy and Minerals, Public Health and Trade and Industry, as well as infrastructure (e.g. urban flood management). From the HFA self assessments it is clear that the major risk concern in Burundi remains peace and stability. It is thus safe to argue this focus will permeate most disaster risk reduction foci. **Kenya** boast a number of building regulations and by-laws aimed at risk reduction. The country have been enforcing certain mandatory regulations in the construction industry for a number of years at local level. **Mozambique** also has a number of policy, regulatory and legal mechanisms in place which contributes to better disaster risk governance in terms of risk analysis and management. For example, the country has regulations in place of the management of ecosystems and protected areas, payment for ecosystem services (PES) occurs in such areas and integrated planning in coastal zones occurs. Mozambique has also been a leader in the integration of the climate change agenda and disaster risk reduction, thus contributing to a common risk profile for the country. Similarly **Kenya** has sectoral risk management practices in place for the protection of infrastructure, the management of protected areas and risk transfer mechanisms like insurance (Action fo Sustainable Change, 2013).

8. Good practices

Beside the achievements identified in the selected African countries. Some good practices has also been reported on. The following will highlight some of these.

8.1 Political will

The most notable and unique good practice to mention in the case of **Kenya** has been the alignment of new disaster risk reduction policy with the new Constitution. The development of the new Constitution provided Kenya with an opportunity to include disaster risk reduction. Linked to the above, the country has a number of laws addressing disaster risk reduction issues, although synergising all of these acts might be difficult to achieve. In **South Africa**, the Disaster Management Act and National Policy Framework is widely cited as one of the best examples of disaster risk reduction legislative reform globally (Botha et al., 2011; Pelling & Holloway, 2006; van Niekerk, 2014). Developed in the same era as the HFA the South African policy reform process informed much of the HFA discussions and visa versa (van Niekerk, 2010).

8.2 Centralised coordination

In terms of good practices for centralised coordination, the **Nigeria** government include disaster risk reduction in their National Development Plan (2010). **South Africa** followed a similar process where the integration of disaster risk management into development planning at provincial and local level is enforced through the national law: Local Government: Municipal Systems Act (South Africa, 2000). Furthermore, through the National Disaster Management Centre, the country aims to facilitate national coordination of training, education and research through the Capacity Building and Research Technical Task Team. This task team consists of a number of universities and research institutions involved in disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation and was also responsible for the drafting of a National Education, Training and Research Policy Framework. Lastly, in the case of South Africa the emphasis on centralised information systems and data and public information sharing in its Disaster Management legislation and policy, is commendable.

8.3 Decentralised implementation

Despite the immense governance constraints in the case of **Burundi**, the country has developed a youth strategy for disaster risk reduction aimed at inclusiveness of the younger population (Republic of Burundi, 2009; , 2011). A best practice to mention in the case of **Kenya**, is the fact that the new constitution addresses general decentralisation of public governance, which assist decentralisation of disaster risk reduction. Through the

reform process, sectoral budgets for disaster risk reduction has been implemented (e.g. agriculture, transport, roads, water, health, and housing) (Action for Sustainable Change, 2013; Kenya, 2009; The Republic of Kenya, 2007). **Nigeria** have made good progress in supporting sub-national (state) level disaster risk reduction integration by facilitating the establishment of 22 State Emergency Management Agencies. The Local State Bodies Law (8/2003) empowers the local governments to lead all the local development processes, including disaster risk reduction activities and establish the right for the local communities to participate in the decision making process through consultative mechanisms. At a regional level, the **Mozambique** national disaster risk reduction policy is only one of three (including Botswana and South Africa) which encourages regional (SADC) cooperation (GIZ, 2011). In **South Africa**, decentralised disaster risk reduction and the incorporation of development and disaster risk reduction is enforced by law, which gives local government a clear disaster risk reduction mandate. Numerous community-based disaster risk reduction intervention has occurred throughout the country (Coetzee & Fourie, 2014) which helped facilitate local understanding, knowledge and ownership of disaster risk reduction (van Niekerk & Annandale, 2013; van Riet, 2009; van Riet & van Niekerk, 2012).

8.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement

Good practices in horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement in **South Africa** has been the establishment of Disaster Risk Management Centres at national, all provincial and all district level administration, with accompanying budgets. Similarly, the Disaster Management Act and Policy Framework calls for the identification of disaster risk reduction focal points in all ministries. To ensure that disaster risk reduction is taken seriously it is envisaged that activities relating to obtaining the objectives of the Policy Framework be included in the job description and performance contracts of the relevant public servants (van Niekerk, 2014). Both the Disaster Management Act and Policy Framework contains certain enforcement principles to ensure compliance.

8.5 Communication

Communicating disaster risk reduction to the masses remains elusive to many states (Wiggill, 2013). Good practice in **Burundi** involved focussed training of journalists in disaster risk reduction to ensure accurate and fair communication and transfer of knowledge (Republic of Burundi, 2009; , 2011). **Mozambique** has been quite successful

in utilising community radio stations for bring the disaster risk reduction message to the people. Mozambique has also developed a robust yet simple early warning system for cyclones, which uses the community radio infrastructure as communication mechanism. The INGC, through its decentralised structures, has made considerable progress in implementing and creating an understanding of the early warning system. Good practices in **Nigeria** includes the implementation of grassroots awareness campaigns and utilising local and traditional knowledge for disaster risk reduction and mitigation purposes (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011). **Swaziland** has also focused on incorporating disaster risk reduction into schools awareness campaigns and addressed making health facilities safer through the various UNISDR campaigns. They have implemented and strengthened local resilience projects, building on their earlier gains achieved through UNDP funded projects.

8.6 Assets

In **Nigeria**, mention must be made of the numerous disaster risk reduction training and learning interventions present in the country. Another best practice is the significant political support and will by ministers and the Vice-President. Nigeria allocates 1% of its national budget to mitigation of ecological problems under which disaster risk reduction falls (NEMA receives 20% of this fund) (Dia et al., 2012). In **Swaziland**, with the assistance of the UNDP, the government implemented a multi-year (2008–2010) capacity enhancement project aimed at:

- Developing institutional and legal systems, including policy implementation. This outcome includes advocacy activities for climate change adaptation and the link between climate change and disasters.
- Climate and disaster risk assessment/identification and early warning. This will include use of risk outcomes in development plans.
- Integrating disaster risk reduction in development initiatives/development organisations at national and community level.
- Strengthening national and community level preparedness for response (Mazingira Consultants, 2010).

Research, training and education remains high on the **South African** disaster risk reduction agenda and specialised working groups (called Technical Task Teams) of the national platform (called the National Disaster Management Advisory Forum) regularly informs policy decisions and practical implementation.

8.7 Risk analysis and management

On perusal of the self assessment of **Kenya** since 2009 it becomes apparent that integration of risk analysis and management has progressed steadily within the environmental and conservation sector. The country has a number of regulated protected areas and regular environmental impact assessments are carried out by the National Environmental Management Authority, linked to new developments, are carried out (Andanje, 2011; The Republic of Kenya, 2007). A good practice in risk analysis and management in terms of disaster risk governance in **Mozambique** is the level of risk assessments which has taken place since 2000. The country boasts risk profiles almost up to community level. In this endeavour they followed a community involvement process. The country has invested significantly in the retrofitting and making schools and public spaces safer. Interestingly 7–10% of the reconstruction and recovery funding in Mozambique is allocated to disaster risk reduction aimed at resilience building.

9. Gaps

Unfortunately most African states still struggle to reduce their high disaster risk profiles. Many countries being aid dependent, experience immense difficulties in implementing disaster risk reduction. Disaster risk reduction is still a fairly abstract term for many government and disaster response and relief remains high on the agendas. Therefore the research has identified the following gaps in disaster risk governance in the selected countries as they relate to the elements of the analytical framework.

9.1 Political will

The absence of a national disaster risk reduction platform in **Swaziland** is one of its major gaps in disaster risk governance. There seems to be a significant divide between policy development to draft phase and the ability to finalise such policies (UNDP Kingdom of Swaziland, 2008). The 2011 Views from the Frontline report on Swaziland (Associate Christians International, 2011) highlights the fact the disaster risk reduction is not a government driven process but rather dominated by INGOs, NGOs and CSOs. The emphasis should thus fall on strengthening local governance. In all case studies no redress mechanism between communities and local government exist and more support

at local and national level is needed for core disaster risk governance issues (such as accountability, transparency, efficiency, predictability, trust etc).

9.2 Centralised coordination

The literature suggests that success of the various national platforms of the countries surveyed, vary due to a number of gaps, some being:

- Lack of buy-in from multiple sectors;
- No legislative enforcing;
- Limited cross-sectoral understanding of disaster risk reduction;
- A development/disaster risk reduction divide;
- Absence of sectoral disaster risk reduction focal points;
- Similar fora dealing with disaster risk reduction issues (such as climate change, agriculture and/or environmental management) – although this should be viewed as a positive contribution to multi-layered governance;
- Junior public sector representatives/officials are send to attend platform meetings;
- Competing interests across government departments (e.g. between climate change and disaster risk reduction);
- No broad-base representation (e.g. some excluding CSOs, academics and the private sector);
- No precise defined agenda; and
- No funding mechanism to support the national platform.

9.3 Decentralised implementation

Although **Kenya** is one of the leading African nations in terms of its legislative and statutory progress in disaster risk reduction, the translation of political commitment into decentralised action is a challenge (Andanje, 2011). Similarly in **Mozambique**, decentralisation remains limited by financial constrains. **Nigeria** has made good progress in decentralising disaster risk reduction, however limited decentralised legislation exists. Although the country has policies and plans in place Dia et al (, 2012) reports that it is not being implemented as it should be. Despite the budgetary allocations to NEMA, it remains inadequate considering the size and disaster risk profile of Nigeria, with no direct budget allocations to SEMAs. Other gaps identified is the fact that there are no formal relationship between Local Government Authorities and SEMAs.

9.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement

In Burundi, community involvement in disaster risk reduction is limited and in many cases non-responsive. The government has weak accountability mechanisms and the national platform is seen as being ineffective and response oriented (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). A gap identified in Mozambique is the equal involvement of men and women in disaster risk reduction decision making. Research found that many politicians at local level in **South Africa** do not understand disaster risk reduction and mostly enforces a response mentality onto civil servants. Inclusiveness in decision-making is absent as well as the incorporation of indigenous knowledge into decision-making processes (Botha & van Niekerk, 2013).

9.5 Communication

A major gap in disaster risk governance in **Swaziland** is that capacity development and research is very limited to non-existing and communication and information sharing mechanisms at local level are absent. Similarly, research by Wiggill (, 2013) shows that mechanisms for local level disaster risk communication are missing in **South Africa**. In **Mozambique** not enough is being done to teach the next generation about disaster risk reduction through school awareness programmes (Mozambique, 2011).

9.6 Assets

The major stumbling block to successful disaster risk reduction in **Burundi**, and all other surveyed countries, is funding. Burundi rely heavily on international aid and development support and therefore finds it difficult to adequately budget for disaster risk reduction. Although plans for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation are in place (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011), implementation at the local level remains problematic (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). The weak financial sector also means little to no insurance industry exists for possible risk transfer or risk sharing mechanisms. **Kenya** experiences budgetary constraints especially in terms of no specific allocations for disaster risk reduction. There is a major skills and resources shortage at all government levels, which also translates into constraints in intersectoral understanding and action for disaster risk reduction (Action fo Sustainable

Change, 2013). Although a Master Plan for Disaster Prevention and Mitigation has been in place in **Mozambique** since 2006, there is still a lack of a legal framework to bind sectors and local government to disaster risk reduction budget allocations. Disaster risk reduction sectoral goals and targets are still not well defined (United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2011). Consequently, sectors and local governments continue to implement disaster risk reduction activities according to availability of human and financial resources which remains inadequate for all institutions, at all levels. There seems to be a general agreement that the lack of disaster risk reduction costing in government constrains estimation of the resources needed for disaster risk reduction and the additional financial requirements to integrate climate change impacts into disaster risk reduction (Göhl, 2008). As is the case with most African states disaster risk reduction in Mozambique requires more funding and support. Capacity development is limited with minimal use of local institutions. In **Nigeria** limited human resources capacities at state and local level, is exacerbated by limited budget allocations to state level governments. Therefore, 14 of the 36 state governments still remain without appropriate disaster risk reduction structures and mechanisms. Many of these state governments are reactionary towards disaster risks, and limited to no sectoral planning is evident. Similarly in **Swaziland**, one of the biggest constraints is the absence of skills capacities which can effect policy implementation and monitoring. The literature suggests that Swaziland aimed to implement a significant number of differing and diverse projects in the period 2004–2013. However, it seems that these varied projects overwhelmed the internal capacities of government staff and communities alike (Mazingira Consultants, 2010; UNDP Kingdom of Swaziland, 2008). From these project reports it becomes clear that the ambitious projects did not reach their objectives due to the fact that internal ownership could not be assured because of severe financial and skill shortages, especially at community/local level. Although **South Africa** is widely cited as an international best practice in disaster risk governance, numerous research reports identified gaps in disaster risk reduction implementation. These gaps include the lack of appropriate local skills and capacities (Botha et al., 2011; Coetzee & Fourie, 2014), many local governments exhibit an alarming staff turn around, with political appoints being made into the disaster risk management structures.

9.7 Risk analysis and management

Almost all countries has certain gaps relating to the compiling of disaster risk profiles, risk mapping and risk communication. This can be ascribed to the lack of depth of

knowledge present in government institutions on disaster risk reduction as has been explained in previous sections.

10. Challenges

Despite all of the good practices and gains in disaster risk reduction mentioned in previous sections, disaster risk reduction implementation in Africa has more challenges than evidence of success.

10.1 Political will

As with South Africa, corruption and graft are some of **Nigeria's** major challenges in disaster risk governance. Corruption in the **South African** government system in many cases hamper local service delivery (Rogerson, 2010) of which disaster risk reduction is one of the victims. Political interference in the disaster risk reduction process is a significant challenge where local politics limits mandate and implementation by the decentralised disaster risk management centres (Botha et al., 2011).

10.2 Centralised coordination

A challenge to disaster risk governance in **Burundi** and **Swaziland** is the implementation of its disaster risk reduction plan and projects. Linked to assets, Burundi does not have the internal capacities to implement and monitor its disaster risk reduction statutory and regulatory requirements.

10.3 Decentralised implementation

In **Burundi**, structural reform (from civil protection to disaster risk reduction) is needed to facilitate a paradigm shift. Some challenges in Burundi and **Kenya** include limited local implementation or motivation towards disaster risk reduction, fuelled by a lack of decentralised structures (Action fo Sustainable Change, 2013; Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). In **Mozambique**, timely implementation of local disaster mitigation projects is absent and there is an identified need for regular local disaster risk assessments (Mozambique, 2011). Similarly, in **Swaziland**, decentralisation of disaster risk reduction activities is needed with involvement of communities and volunteers. One

of the major challenges in **South Africa** in terms of decentralised implementation is the translation of plans and policies into local action, and cross sectoral disaster risk reduction integration into development plans. In South Africa there is also an over emphasis on top-down implementation. This limits the involvement of civil society groups, which in turn limits accountability and transparency.

10.4 Horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement

There is also a lack of mechanisms to integrate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation in **Burundi**. It is evident that this country needs to focus on “everyday risks”. Local risk governance is weak and communities feel that the administration deliberately does not consult as to limit criticism and opinions (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013) (which has a direct bearing on effective disaster risk governance). This is fuelled by a sense of mistrust among role-players which limits cooperation and long term planning. The **Mozambican** government needs to ensure the participation of marginalised and minority groups in disaster risk reduction with an emphasis on the incorporation and use of indigenous knowledge systems. **Swaziland**, as with many other African states are struggling with the climate change/disaster risk reduction linkages. There is a gap in the establish of participatory mechanisms for disaster risk reduction policy updating. In the case of **South Africa**, minority groups such as the elderly, women and the youth needs to be empowered for disaster risk reduction, which is currently an ad hoc activity (van der Gaag, 2013).

10.5 Communication

In **Burundi**, there is also a lack of information sharing and communication between sectors and role-players are absent. This in turn leads to the lack of community mobilisation. Challenges in **Mozambique** in terms of disaster risk governance is the need to improve information basis, real time information management, communications systems, and decentralised capacity to collect appropriate information, analyse, and operationalise the needed actions. In **Swaziland**, community based early warning systems need attention backed by adequate financial support.

10.6 Assets

One of the biggest challenges for **Burundi** is the post-war period of development (peace keeping). Burundi is faced with severe lack of resources and operational capabilities, experience and skills (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). No local budgets for disaster risk reduction exist with a very limited disaster risk reduction focus on a decentralised basis. No specific budget allocations for disaster risk reduction is made and in general the government remains very disaster response oriented. Disaster risk reduction in Burundi remains NGO driven. Furthermore there is limited synergies between scientific research and traditional knowledge, with an ever present threat of local conflict. In general there is a challenge of disaster risk reduction and development integration. It is felt that the national disaster risk reduction budget is only there to support the administration and not disaster risk reduction actions (Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction, 2013). One of the major challenges for **Kenya** is the significant reliance on overseas money for disaster risk reduction. Although sectoral budgets incorporating disaster risk reduction is present, these budgets has limited integration with other sectors. There is a feeling of lack of understanding by the National Treasury in terms of disaster risk reduction. The government still has a very reactionary focus, and follows a “wait and see” approach before funds are released for disaster response and recovery. (Action fo Sustainable Change, 2013). Although **Swaziland** has made early progress in adopting a disaster risk reduction agenda, further implementation progress has been very slow. This can mainly be ascribed to the lack of capacities, political will and economic backing (UNDPKingdom of Swaziland, 2008). There seems to be a willingness from the international community (e.g. UNDP/BCPR, UNISDR, GFDRR etc.) to assist the country in their disaster risk reduction efforts, however definite government action is limited. One of the major challenges which Swaziland faces in disaster risk governance is inadequate skills and capacities. Similarly in South Africa, appropriate skills at local level is needed with an emphasis on skills retainment.

10.7 Risk analysis and management

The major overall challenge to many African countries is appropriate skills and funding to conduct risk analysis and compile risk maps. It is evident in the various VFL reports that risks are not assessed and mapped and that risk communication is almost non-existent (Action fo Sustainable Change, 2013; Africa Youth Movement, 2011; , 2013; Associate Christians International, 2011; van Riet, 2009). Local institutions are either not used, supported or are non-existent in this endeavour. **Kenya**, despite it growing urban centres reported very little in terms of urban planning safeguards and risk management measures. Some progress has been made in urban flood management but little evidence

exists to support such claims. On perusal of the various self assessments of Kenya since 2007 it is apparent that the lack of skills and budget allocations for risk assessments remains a major challenge. This is echoed by the self assessments of **Swaziland, Burundi** and **Mozambique**.

11. Recommendations

In the light of the discussion and research findings above certain recommendation can be made towards better and more effective disaster risk governance for disaster risk reduction and recovery.

In terms of **political will**:

- The research indicates that effective disaster risk governance hinges on adequate high-level political support. For disaster risk reduction to become a reality, national political support is needed (which mostly drives a legislative reform process).
- National commitment and involvement by African governments in international (global, regional, and sub-regional) disaster risk reduction processes should be sought, with an emphasis on cross-border disaster risk reduction through appropriate protocols.
- Disaster risk governance of Regional Economic Communities must be strengthened through country participation and capacity enhancement of regional disaster risk reduction units.
- Laws, policies, frameworks and plans has proven to be an effective disaster risk governance mechanism. Countries should be supported in the development of such regulatory and statutory mechanisms where they are absent.
- Disaster risk governance and development governance must be viewed through the lenses of social justice and equality. Disaster risk reduction as human right needs more debate and understanding, in line with citizen obligation and duties.
- Institutional myopia must be addressed through long-term planning and cross-sectoral involvement of various stakeholders and role-players.
- Open and accountable mechanisms must be put in place to curb graft and corruption in the public sector.
- Voluntary regionally based peer-review mechanism for disaster risk reduction should be considered to augment self- and CSOs' disaster risk governance assessments.

- Governments must become more transparent in their disaster risk reduction duties which assumes timely, accurate and quality communication with citizens which will lead to more responsiveness.
- The forensic analysis of risks and disasters must become part of normal disaster risk reduction and recovery processes.
- The convergence and integration of the development (sustainable development goals), climate change adaptation, ecosystem assessment and disaster risk reduction must be sought to ensure effectiveness and efficiency in disaster risk governance.
- Disaster risk governance outputs and not only inputs must become a measuring instruments (i.e. what has been achieved by the implementation of policies and not only the presence of such policy).

In terms of **centralised coordination**:

- Governance structures for disaster risk reduction (i.e. national disaster management office/centre) must be refined. Currently many remain disaster response and external oriented, instead of community and risk profile focussed.
- Weakly defined sectoral structures must be addressed to ensure adequate central coordination can take place though enabling decentralised implementation (e.g. the identification of sectoral focal points for disaster risk reduction and the inclusion of disaster risk reduction in job descriptions for accountability).
- Central coordinating mechanisms (e.g. national disaster risk reduction platforms) needs fully capacitated government structures and staff, with cross-sectoral commitment and involvement.
- Traditional silos in the government sector must be addresses to find a more equitable task distribution for disaster risk reduction and recovery. This is particularly true where various committees address common issues, such as the climate change, food security, environmental management, water management and related sectors.
- The full system of disaster risk governance in implementing projects must be considered (e.g. the case of Swaziland where the capacities to implement were constrained and projects did not reach their full objectives. This is also true for too ambitious projects linked to unreasonable timeframes driven by international budgets).
- Centralised and integrated planning must be facilitated.

In terms of **decentralised implementation**:

- Disaster risk reduction is mostly treated as an independent function of government and not an integrated activity of all sectors on a decentralised basis.
- The gaps between discourse and practice must be fully addressed (e.g. disaster risk reduction, development and climate change adaptation).
- Efforts should be made to facilitate the disaster risk reduction discourse at local and even household level, with a realisation that tacit knowledge on disaster risk reduction is existent and important.
- For disaster risk reduction to be successful, it must be properly funded up to local level with clear and measurable mandates and authority.
- Emphasis should fall on strengthening local governance first (e.g. good governance), which in turn will strengthen local disaster risk governance.
- Recognise the impact of everyday risks and disasters on communities and plan accordingly through development interventions.
- In urban settings local bylaws and regulations for strengthening urban risk management must be put in place (e.g. adherence to building codes or ISO standards).
- Civil society networks and learning must be encouraged and understood by government entities. These networks are local resources which must be tapped into.
- Community-based disaster risk management with local ownership must be encouraged.

In terms of **horizontal and vertical stakeholder involvement**:

- Forming of partnerships between various actors should be facilitated and encouraged (e.g. between CSOs, private sector, government and communities).
- Establish participatory mechanisms for community engagement in disaster risk reduction such as community volunteers, faith-based organisations, women's groups and the youth.
- Linkages in sectoral legislations must be made to address the multi-faceted nature of disaster risk reduction and recovery.
- The involvement and training of the media in disaster risk reduction should occur as an effective communication and capacity building tool towards disaster risk reduction.
- The importance of disaster risk reduction (in development) must be communicated to local level politicians.

- Internationalisation of disaster risk governance on regional basis (regional protocols governing aspects such as risk assessments, response and recovery) must be strengthened through RECs.
- The direct involvement of the private sector must enjoy serious and urgent attention for their risk transfer and risk financing abilities.

In terms of **communication**:

- The right to information should be enhanced through the establishment/enhancement of communication channels on various levels.
- Communicating disaster risks is imperative and countries should use existing community communication mechanisms (such as community radio) to reach the masses.
- Multi-hazard early warning systems should be developed and implemented leading to early actions.
- Public awareness campaigns should be implemented on annual basis taking the unique local circumstances into consideration. A translation of international campaigns must be made locally relevant through partnerships.
- Disaster risk reduction must aim at creating a culture of risk avoidance and safety. It should therefore be enshrined in school curriculum.

In terms of **assets**:

- Roles, mandates and responsibilities for disaster risk reduction funding/budgeting should be clarified at regional, national, sub-national and local level.
- Minimal fiscal space limits corrective action to existing risks and should thus be addressed at national scale.
- Predictable finance for disaster risk reduction is needed through a vertical and horizontal approach.
- Portion of development, climate change, humanitarian, disaster response and recovery budgets must be allocated for disaster risk reduction.
- Human capacity development should be addressed through national assessments and policies/plans aimed at addressing skills shortages at all levels.
- A clear research agenda for disaster risk reduction should be agreed on by institutions of research and academia, and funding made available.
- Social protection mechanisms for the most at risk communities must be ensured.

- Limited inclusion of indigenous knowledge systems is present and this should be used as a resource for local relevant disaster risk reduction.

In terms of **risk analysis and management** :

- Risk management remains reactive, where risks are assessed as threats not as opportunities.
- Underlying risk drivers are still not fully understood and addressed through disaster risk governance.
- Sectoral legislation incorporating disaster risk reduction is needed which holds the key to long-term reduction of underlying risk factors.
- Prioritisation and mapping of the most at-risk and vulnerability communities should be undertaken.
- Evidence of disaster risk reduction must be communicated.

12. Conclusion

The aim of this report was to provide a thematic review of disaster risk governance in Africa as an input to the 2015 Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. Through a desktop study of literature, country self-assessments and a number of research reports, an analytical framework for disaster risk governance was created. Six case study countries were used against which the various elements of the analytical framework was assessed.

The research found that African countries has been making steady progress in implementing disaster risk governance. The continent contains a few international best practices which other nations can learn from. Certain gaps and challenges are, however, still hampering better progress in the reduction of disaster risks. The research aimed to make certain recommendations linked to the analytical framework and findings. Most notable in all recommendations is the need for multi-layered ownership and understanding of disaster risks and their cross-sectoral nature, with a strong community engagement.

References

Abreu, C. 2013. National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2011–2013). INGC: Maputo.

Action for Sustainable Change. 2013. Views from the Frontline 2013. GNDR: Nairobi.

Africa Youth Movement. 2011. Nigerian VFL 2011 Country Report. GNDR: Ikot Ekpene.

Africa Youth Movement. 2013. Nigeria VFL 2013 Country Report. GNDR: Abuja.

African Union Commission/United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2010. Extended Programme of Action for the Implementation of the Africa Regional Strategy for Disaster Risk Reduction (2006 – 2015) and the Declaration of the 2nd African Ministerial Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction 2010

Andanje, A. 2011. Statement by the Republic of Kenya at the 3rd session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk reduction. UNISDR: Geneva.

Asante, M.K. 2007. The history of Africa: The quest for eternal harmony. Routledge: New York.

Associate Christians International. 2011. Views from the Frontline Southern Africa – Country Report from Swaziland. ACDS: Potchefstroom.

Bang, H.N. 2013. Governance of disaster risk reduction in Cameroon: The need to empower local government. *Jàmá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*. 5(2).

Bank, W. National Disaster Coordination Council (Republic of the Philippines). 2005. Natural Disaster Risk Management in the Philippines: Enhancing Poverty Alleviation Through Disaster Reduction. :1-69.

Botha, D. & van Niekerk, D. 2013. Views from the Frontline: A critical assessment of local risk governance in South Africa. *Jàmá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*. 5:1-10.

Botha, D., van Niekerk, D., Wentink, G., Coetzee, C., Forbes, K., Maartens, Y., Annandale, E., Tshona, T., & Raju, E. 2011. Disaster Risk Management Status Assessment at Municipalities in South Africa. South African Local Government Association (SALGA): Pretoria.

- Coetzee, C. & Fourie, K. 2014. Skills and capacity shortages in South African Disaster Risk Management entities. *Journal of Public Administration*.
- Dia, A., Wernerman, J., Grigoryan, A., Becchi, G., & Jung, C. 2012. National Capacity Assessment Report – Federal Republic of Nigeria. NEMA: Abuja.
- Gibson, J.R. 2012. How Europe and America Are Still Underdeveloping Africa: Neocolonialism and the Scramble for Strategic Resources in 21st Century Africa. Kitabu Publishing LLC: USA.
- GIZ, D.G.F.I.Z. 2011. Mozambique: Disaster Risk Reduction as the Basis for Climate Change Adaptation. GIZ: Eschborn.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2009. “Clouds but little rain...” Global Network for Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction: Teddington.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2011. If we do not join hands. Global Network for Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction: Teddington.
- Global Network of Civil Society Organisations for Disaster Reduction. 2013. Views from the Frontline: Beyond 2015. GNDR: Teddington.
- Government of Mozambique. 2007. National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA). Government Printer: Maputo.
- Göhl, S.E. 2008. Local Governance and Disaster Risk Management in Mozambique. University of the Western Cape.
- IFRC. 2011. Disasters in Africa. IFRC: Geneva.
- IFRC. 2012. Disaster risk reduction: a global advocacy guide. IFRC: Geneva.
- International Monetary Fund. 2005. Kenya: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (No. IMF Country Report No. 05/11). IMF: Washington DC.
- International Monetary Fund. 2009. Burundi: Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper—Annual Progress Report (No. IMF Country Report No. 09/90). IMF: Washington DC.
- Kellett, J. & Sparks, D. 2012. Disaster risk reduction: Spending where it should count. Global Humanitarian Assistance: Somerset.

- Kellett, J. & Sweeney, H. 2011. Analysis of financing mechanisms and funding streams to enhance emergency preparedness. Development Initiatives: Somerset.
- Kenya, Government of. 2009. National Policy for Disaster Management in Kenya. Government Gazette: Nairobi.
- Mazingira Consultants. 2010. Strengthening National and Community Resilience to Disaster Risks in Swaziland – End of project evaluation report. UNDP: Mbabane.
- McClellan, D. 2010. World Disasters Report 2010. IFRC: Geneva.
- Moyo, D. 2009. Dead aid : why aid is not working and how there is a better way for Africa. Farrar, Straus and Giroux: New York.
- Mozambique, C.C.O. 2011. Views from the Frontline 2011: Country report for Mozambique. ACDS: Potchefstroom.
- Pelling, M. 2009. Disaster Risk reduction: Cases from urban Africa.
- Pelling, M. & Holloway, A.J. 2006. Legislation for mainstreaming disaster risk reduction. Tearfund: Teddington.
- Pelling, M. & Wisner, B. 2012. Disaster risk reduction: Cases from urban Africa. Earthscan: London.
- Renn, O. 2008. Risk Governance: Coping with Uncertainty in a Complex World. Earthscan: London.
- Republic of Burundi. 2004. Plan général de Soumission d'information et de rapports nationaux sur la Prévention des catastrophes. Ministère de l'Intérieur et de la Sécurité Publique: Bujumbura.
- Republic of Burundi. 2007. National Adaptation Plan of Action to climate change "NAPA." Government Printer: Bujumbura.
- Republic of Burundi. 2009. Rapport national de suivi sur la mise en œuvre du Cadre d'action de Hyogo. Min de l'Intérieur et de la Sécurité Publique: Bujumbura.
- Republic of Burundi. 2011. Rapport national de suivi sur la mise en œuvre du Cadre d'action de Hyogo (2009–2011). Ministère de l'Intérieur et de la Sécurité Publique: Bujumbura.

Rodney, W. 2012. How Europe Underdeveloped Africa . Pambazuka Press. Cape Town. URL http://books.google.co.za/books/about/How_Europe_Underdeveloped_Africa.html?id=AuKujQETDL0C&redir_esc=y.

Rogerson, C.M. 2010. Local economic development in South Africa: Strategic challenges. *Development Southern Africa*. 27(4):481–495.

Schacter, M. 2000. Monitoring and Evaluation Capacity Development in Sub-Saharan Africa. World Bank: Washington DC.

South Africa. 1983. Conservation of Agricultural Resources Act No. 43 of 1983. Government Printer: Pretoria.

South Africa. 1998a. White Paper on Disaster Management. Government Printers: Pretoria.

South Africa. 1998b. Green Paper on Disaster Management. Government Printers: Pretoria.

South Africa. 1998c. National Veld and Forest Fire Act No. 101 of 1998. Government Printer: Pretoria.

South Africa. 2000. Local Government: Municipal Systems Act. Government Gazette: Pretoria.

South Africa. 2003. Disaster Management Act. Government Gazette: Pretoria.

South Africa. 2005. National Disaster Management Policy Framework. Government Gazette: Pretoria.

The Republic of Kenya. 2007. Progress on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action. Ministry of State for Special Programmes: Nairobi.

The Republic of Kenya. 2010. The Constitution of Kenya. National Council for Law Reporting: Nairobi.

UNDP. 2010. Disaster Risk Reduction, Governance & Mainstreaming. UNDP: New York.

UNDP Kingdom of Swaziland. 2008. Strengthening National and Local Resilience to Disaster Risks in Swaziland. Kingdom of Swaziland: Mbabane.

United Nations. 2005. Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015: Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. Geneva.

- United Nations. 2011. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. Information Press: Oxford.
- United Nations Development Programme. 2004. Reducing Disaster Risk. United Nations: New York.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2004. Living with Risk. United Nations Publications.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2009a. Terminology for Disaster Risk Reduction. UN: Geneva.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2009b. Disaster Risk Reduction in the United Nations. United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction: Geneva.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2011. Compilation of National Progress Reports on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009–2011). UNISDR: Geneva.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2012. HFA monitoring and review through a multi stakeholder engagement process. UN: Geneva.
- United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2013. Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction. United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction: Geneva.
- van Asselt, M.B.A. & Renn, O. 2011. Risk governance. *Journal of Risk Research*. 14(4): 431–449.
- van der Gaag, N. 2013. *Because I am a Girl – The state of the World's Girls 2013*. Plan International: Italy.
- van Niekerk, D. 2005. A comprehensive framework for multi-sphere disaster risk reduction in South Africa. Unpublished PhD thesis. North-West University: Potchefstroom.
- van Niekerk, D. 2010. A framework for multi-sphere disaster risk reduction: The case of South Africa. Lambert Academic Publishing: Saarbrücken.
- van Niekerk, D. 2012. Transdisciplinarity: The binding paradigm for disaster risk reduction. *dspace.nwu.ac.za*: Potchefstroom.
- van Niekerk, D. 2014. A critical analysis of the South African Disaster Risk Management policy and legislation. *Disasters*. 38. 4.

van Niekerk, D. & Annandale, E. 2013. Utilising Participatory Research Techniques For Community-Based Disaster Risk Assessment. *International Journal of Mass Emergencies and Disasters*. 31(2):160–177.

van Niekerk, D. & Jonker, A. 2001. *Governance, politics, and policy in South Africa*. Oxford Univ Pr.

van Niekerk, D. & Wisner, B. 2014. Integrating disaster risk management and development planning: Experiences from Africa., in: Lopez-Carresi, A., Fordham, M., Wisner, B., Kelman, I., Gaillard, J.C. (Eds.), *Disaster Management: International Lessons in Risk Reduction, Response and Recovery*. Routledge: New York. Routledge: New York, p. 330.

van Niekerk, D., Madubula, N., Van Zyl, K., Visser, R., Coetzee, C., Fourie, K., Wentink, G., & Maartens, Y. 2011. *An Alternative Financing Model for Disaster Risk Reduction in South Africa*. Financial and Fiscal Commission: Pretoria.

van Riet, G. 2009. Disaster risk assessment in South Africa: some current challenges. *South African Review of Sociology*. 40(2):194–208.

van Riet, G. & van Niekerk, D. 2012. Capacity development for participatory disaster risk assessment. *Environmental Hazards*. 11(3):213–225.

Wiggill, M.N. 2013. Communication management during the veld fires of 23 August 2011 in the Tlokwe Local Municipality: A cautionary tale. *Jàmbá: Journal of Disaster Risk Studies*. 5(2).

Wisner, B., Blaikie, P.M., Cannon, T., & Davis, I. 2004. *At risk*. Routledge: London.

World Bank. 2013. What is Governance? [WWW Document]. web.worldbank.org. URL <http://go.worldbank.org/G2CHLXX0Q0>.

Youth Strategy for Disaster Reduction. 2013. *Views from the Frontline 2013*. GNDR: Bujumbura.