



INPUT PAPER

Prepared for the Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction 2015

ABILITY OF AWARENESS CAMPAIGNS TO EFFECT CHANGE IN DRR

Fadi Hamdan

Disaster Risk Management Centre

Table of Contents

1	Background.....	3
2	Selection of Countries and Key Characteristics.....	3
3	Methodology.....	4
4	Analysis.....	5
5	Recommendations for Future Work.....	6
6	Bibliography.....	7
Table 1	Human Development Statistics for selected countries.....	4
Table 2	HFA Core Indicators and Corresponding Key Questions and Means of verifications.....	4
Table 3	Summary of international media reporting on major disasters.....	5

1 Background

The Global Assessment Report for 2011 (GAR, 2011) included several background papers which stressed the importance of governance in effecting change in DRM practices. For example, a thorough discussion was provided on the effect of political economy considerations on effecting change in DRM (Williams, 2011). In addition, the International Risk Governance Council produced a seminal White Paper on risk governance (IRGC), which proposed a risk governance framework that distinguishes between analyzing and understanding a risk (Technical and Social Assessment Stage) – for which risk appraisal is the essential procedure; and deciding what to do about a risk, where risk management is the key activity (IRGC, 2005). A more detailed review of work carried out by various authors on the importance of governance and accountability in effecting DRM change was presented in a background paper to GAR 2013 (Hamdan 2013 a & b). The latter paper combined the political economy framework for analyzing change (Williams 2013) with the risk governance framework (IRGC, 2005) in order to arrive at a framework for analyzing incentives and resistance to change during different stages in the risk governance framework (i.e. the five stages in the risk governance framework as developed by the IRGC, namely Risk Pre-Assessment Stage, Risk Appraisal Stage, Risk Evaluation Stage and Risk management Stage, all of which centred around the Risk Communication Stage).

In this paper, the above methodology will be used to assess existing public information on awareness building programs.

2 Selection of Countries and Key Characteristics

A group of countries, with different governance and development characteristics, is selected for analyzing their awareness raising campaigns, as reported by the HFA national reporting template, and demonstrated by newspaper reporting. The countries range from industrialized countries with very high development indicators, to developing countries with high, medium and low development indicators.

Table 1 below shows the Human Development Index for 2012 (UNDP, 2013), together with Inequality adjusted figures, for the selected countries.

Country	Human Development Index (HDI)	IHDI (accounting for Inequality)	Loss (%) in potential human development due to inequality
USA	0.937	0.821	12.4
Germany	0.920	0.856	6.9
France	0.893	0.812	9
Italy	0.881	0.776	11.9
UK	0.875	0.802	8.3
Chile	0.819	0.664	19
Lebanon	0.745	0.575	22.8
Sri Lanka	0.715	0.607	15.1
Algeria	0.713	Not Available	Not Available
Dominican Republic	0.702	0.510	27.3

Country	Human Development Index (HDI)	IHDI (accounting for Inequality)	Loss (%) in potential human development due to inequality
Jordan	0.7	0.568	19.0
Thailand	0.69	0.543	21.3
Egypt	0.662	0.503	24.1
Philippines	0.654	0.524	19.9
Morocco	0.591	0.415	29.7
Pakistan	0.515	0.356	30.9
Yemen	0.458	0.31	32.3
Haiti	0.456	0.273	40.2
Djibouti	0.445	0.285	36.0
Comoros	0.429	Not Available	Not Available

Table 1 Human Development Statistics for selected countries

An important issue is the losses in the human development index due to inequality, as indeed measured by the original UNDP study (UNDP, 2013). This is particularly important since there is a trend to adopt a holistic approach post 2015 with closer integration of sustainable development and growth, disaster risk management and climate change adaptation initiatives. In this context, it becomes important to be able to raise awareness and measure the aggregate effect of inequality (including all aspects related to DRM with emphasis on the distribution of disaster risk losses) on the development process and corresponding achievements.

3 Methodology

Table 2 summarizes the salient features in the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) Monitoring Template (UNISDR, 2013), according to Priority for Action 3 (PoA 3), Core Indicator 4 (CI 4), Key Questions (KQ) and corresponding Means of verification (MoV).

HFA PoA	Core Indicators (CI)	Key Questions (KQ)	Means of Verification (MoV)
HFA PoA 3: Use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of safety and resilience at all levels	CI 4: Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities	KQ 1: Do public education campaigns for risk-prone communities and local authorities include disaster risk?	Public education campaigns for enhanced awareness of risk
			Training of local government
			Disaster management (preparedness and emergency response)
			Preventative risk management (risk and vulnerability)
			Guidance for risk reduction
			Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level

Table 2 HFA Core Indicators and Corresponding Key Questions and Means of verifications

Notwithstanding the importance of the indicators and questions in the national monitoring template, examination of the core indicators in Table 2 shows that most of these refer to inputs (e.g. policies and strategies in place). However, recent evidence as discussed by several papers in the GAR 2011 report and background papers, suggest that effecting change can in the field of DRR can only be achieved by adopting a holistic approach that promotes good risk

governance, including accountability, transparency and participation in the decision making process. This is relevant to public awareness programs in two aspects:

- The principles of good risk governance should be adopted in the design and development of awareness raising campaigns, for both generic and issue specific programs.
- Both generic and issue specific awareness raising programs (at the national, local, community and sectoral levels) must raise awareness on the importance of good risk governance and on adopting a risk governance framework as the most suitable tool for

Examining answers provided in HFA national reports does not provide insight on the degree of accounting for the above aspects. In particular, the following questions should be addressed

- Are awareness raising programs designed based on risk governance principles?
- Do awareness raising programs / media reports differentiate between the different risk governance stages?
- Do awareness raising programs / media reports address the political economic framework for effecting change (in terms of modes of influence, oppositions, supports, withdrawals, demands, lobbyists, gatekeepers, etc)?
- Do awareness raising programs / media reports address risk governance stages within a political economy framework for analyzing change?
- Do awareness raising programs / media reports identify the linkages between the use, production and distribution of resources on the one hand, with the distribution of exposure, vulnerability and disaster risk losses on the other hand?

To demonstrate the importance of the above questions, reporting on the BBC website for the Chile 27 February 2010 earthquake and the Haiti January 12 2010 earthquake was reviewed.

4 Analysis

Table 3 summarizes the salient features reported in the various website on the causes of the damage in the two earthquakes.

Haiti Earthquake	Chile Earthquake
Reasons ¹ include 1. Severity and depth of earthquake, 2. Proximity to urban areas and population density, 3. Poverty, 4. Presence of shanty towns and poorly constructed buildings, 5. Corruption and weak governance.	Reasons ² include 1. Depth of earthquake, 2. Economic prosperity and quality of buildings, 3. Recent strong earthquakes and subsequent strengthening / development of seismic codes, 4. Preparedness of population on behavior in earthquake aftermath.

Table 3 Summary of international media reporting on major disasters

The BBC website had clear and easily accessible / searchable information on the causes of the comparative performance of both countries in the above earthquakes. Interestingly, it

¹ <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8510900.stm>

² <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/americas/8543324.stm>

identified corruption and weak governance as a major factor. However, it fell short of identifying the important question:

- *Were the risks identified before hand?*
- *Were there any risk reduction measures, with special emphasis on corrective risk reduction strategies proposed by national stakeholders or international and national UN consultants?*
- *If not, then why not?*
- *If such measures and strategies were indeed identified why were they rejected?*

Ignoring the above question is by no means limited to the BBC website; rather it is indicative that even well established and reputable media organizations are not receiving or disseminating some of the salient features of best practice guidelines related to disaster risk management in general and to risk governance in particular.

The above questions can be asked at several, if not all, of the risk governance stages within the risk governance framework. The fact that they have not been asked is an indication that there is a need for more effective dissemination on the best practices and lessons learnt from previous disasters, as developed by various international organizations including the UNISDR and the IRGC.

5 Recommendations for Future Work

Effort must be directed at the following areas to contribute to effecting DRR change:

Performance Indicators

- There is a need to develop performance indicators to assess the content of public awareness programs at the national, local, sectoral and community level. In particular, the following issues must be assessed:
 - Is the program based on a participatory approach?
 - Has the program been developed in a manner consistent with the risk governance framework and concepts therein?
 - Does the program raise awareness on the importance of risk governance, using specific examples of direct relevance to the various stakeholders at their respective levels?
 - Does the program aim at influencing the decision making process, through developing specific messages for different stakeholders within the policy making framework to be used at different stages within the risk governance framework?
 - Do media outlets report on the root causes of disaster?
 - Do media outlets differentiate between the decisions and processes that must take place in different stages within the risk governance framework?
 - Do media outlets analyze the decision making process with a political economy framework for effecting change?

- Does the available guidance for media outlets identify the importance of analyzing the decision making process related to risk management at different stages of the risk governance framework using a political economy framework for analyzing the dynamics of effecting change?
- Does the available guidance for national and local authorities mandated with developing awareness raising programs identify the importance of analyzing the decision making process related to risk management at different stages of the risk governance framework using a political economy framework for analyzing the dynamics of effecting change?
- Are various media stakeholders being trained on the above in their own native languages, with examples which are relevant at the local, national and sectoral levels within their respective countries and regions?
- Are various national and local authorities mandated with developing awareness raising programs being trained on the above in their own native languages, with examples which are relevant at the local, national and sectoral levels within their respective countries and regions?

Answers to the above questions would help direct efforts where they are most needed in terms of developing guidance and training for media and local and national authorities working on awareness raising programs.

6 Bibliography

Hamdan F., 2013a. Intensive and Extensive Disaster Risk Drivers and Incentives for Disaster Risk Management in the MENA region, The Effect of the Political Economy of the Countries in the MENA region on DRR Policies, Background Paper to GAR 2013, Disaster Risk Management Centre (DRMC), 2013.

Hamdan F., 2013b. Intensive and Extensive Disaster Risk Drivers and Interactions with Recent trends in the Global Political Economy - with Special Emphasis on Rentier States, Paper Submitted to the Special Issue of the International Journal for Disaster Risk Reduction (IJDRR). Disaster Risk Management Centre (DRMC), 2013.

IRGC, 2005. White Paper on Risk Governance: Towards an Integrative Approach, International Risk Governance Council, 2005.

UNDP, 2013, Human Development Report 2013. The Rise of the South: Human Progress in a Diverse World, New York.

UNISDR, 2011. The Global Assessment Report, GAR 2011, UN, 2011.

UNISDR, 2013. HFA Monitor Template, HFA monitoring and review through a multi stakeholder engagement process, UNISDR.

Williams G., 2011. Study on Disaster Risk Reduction, Decentralization and Political Economy – The political Economy of Disaster Risk Reduction, The Policy Practice and Oxford Policy Management, Background Document to GAR2011.