

# Turks and Caicos Islands

## National progress report on the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action (2009-2011)

---

Name of focal point : Jamell Robinson

Organization : Department of Disaster Management and Emergencies

Title/Position : Director

E-mail address : jrobinson@gov.tc

Telephone : 649-946-2177

Fax : 649-946-1230

---

Reporting period : 2009-2011

Last updated on : 29 Sep 2010

Print date : 08 Aug 2011

Reporting language : English

---

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/americas/tca/>



# Strategic goals

---

## Area 1

*The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.*

### **Strategic Goal Statement 2011-2013:**

The integration of Disaster Risk Management policies into development plans at the local and national level is slowly being done, as evidence by it's introduction to the physical planning processes

## Area 2

*The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.*

### **Strategic Goal Statement 2011-2013:**

With the proposed adaptation of Results Based Management as a Monitoring framework for DRR in the TCI, potential risks at all levels can be monitored

## Area 3

*The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.*

### **Strategic Goal Statement 2011-2013:**

The reduction of vulnerabilities through the strengthening of DRR programming

## Priority for action 1

*Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.*

---

### Priority for action 1: Core indicator 1

*National policy and legal framework for disaster risk reduction exists with decentralised responsibilities and capacities at all levels.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

#### Means of verification:

- \* Is DRR included in development plans and strategies? No
- \* Yes: National development plan
- \* No: Sector strategies and plans
- \* Yes: Climate change policy and strategy
- \* No: Poverty reduction strategy papers
- \* No: Common Country Assessments (CCA)/ UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

#### Description:

The TCI would fall in the level 2 category as drafts of the climate change policy and strategy are currently being developed, in addition to only a limited mention of DRR in the National Development plan. Overall capacity for DRR implementation is limited in light of the workload by other sections.

#### Context & Constraints:

Given the limited financial resources available within the TCI a shift toward implementing DRR policy will be delayed given the immediate cost implications, though Political will seems to be present. Policies that are currently being drafted to address DRR issued must be completed and portions that can be implemented with minimal financial costs should be at its earliest. If the case can be via a cost benefit analysis as to the direct saving that can be made long-term with investments in DRR, the tough decision made by TCI official can be justified. Additionally, the TCI must utilize all external assistance and expertise that is made available.

### Priority for action 1: Core indicator 2

*Dedicated and adequate resources are available to implement disaster risk reduction plans and activities at all administrative levels*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

#### Means of verification:

- \* Is there a specific allocation of budget for DRR in the national budget?

- \* 0.7 % allocated from national budget
- \* 0 USD allocated from overseas development assistance fund
- \* 0 USD allocated to hazard proofing sectoral development investments (e.g transport, agriculture, infrastructure)
- \* 0 USD allocated to stand alone DRR investments (e.g. DRR institutions, risk assessments, early warning systems)
- \* 0 USD allocated to disaster proofing post disaster reconstruction

**Description:**

Funds are not allocated specifically to DRR activities but are allocated to the Department of Disaster Management and Emergencies which has primary responsibility for DRR in the TCI. Some progress has been made via external assistance through the donor community where some training has been conducted in Results Based Management and DRR implementation at the National Level. Work that has been conducted thus far must be streamlined within all sectors within the TCI.

**Context & Constraints:**

Human and Financial Resources are limited. With the possibility of a Cadri Regional DRR Implementation at the National Level workshop, persons within varying sectors will have the opportunity to understand how DRR can improve their functioning in the short and long term.

**Priority for action 1: Core indicator 3**

*Community Participation and decentralisation is ensured through the delegation of authority and resources to local levels*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

**Means of verification:**

- \* Do local governments have legal responsibility and budget allocations for DRR? No
- \* No: Legislation
- \* No: Budget allocations for DRR to local government

**Description:**

There is currently no legislation with in the TCI that speaks to DRR and any subsequent budget allocation. The TCI is in the process of adapting the Regional Model Disaster Management Legislation (MDML), which will have DRR budget implications.

**Context & Constraints:**

With the passage of Comprehensive Disaster Management Legislation in the TCI comes the legal framework for the implementation of DRR in the TCI.

## **Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4**

*A national multi sectoral platform for disaster risk reduction is functioning.*

### **Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

### **Means of verification:**

\* Are civil society organisations , national planning institutions, key economic and development sector organisations represented in the national platform? Yes

\* 5 civil society members (specify absolute number)

\* 7 sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)

\* 0 women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)

### **Description:**

Wide representation is achieved on the national committees within the TCI but the move towards taking up DRR as a part of it's mandate has been slow to develop.

### **Context & Constraints:**

Wide representation is achieved on the national committees within the TCI but the move towards taking up DRR as a part of it's mandate has been slow to develop.

## Priority for action 2

*Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.*

---

### Priority for action 2: Core indicator 1

*National and local risk assessments based on hazard data and vulnerability information are available and include risk assessments for key sectors.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

#### Means of verification:

\* Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment available to inform planning and development decisions? Yes

\* Yes: Multi-hazard risk assessment

\* 80-85 % of schools and hospitals assessed

\* 25 schools not safe from disasters (specify absolute number)

\* No: Gender disaggregated vulnerability and capacity assessments

\* No: Agreed national standards for multi hazard risk assessments

#### Description:

The 2008 Hazard and Vulnerability Assessment (HVA) that was conducted in the TCI did not focus in any great deal on Schools hence the uncertainty of the exact amount of school that were assessed. Only portions of the HVA have been adopted in the national framework, with specific to the use of rain fall flood maps to inform the Physical Planning Board. The majority of schools are located in flood prone areas, but recent refurbishments works have reduced susceptibility to wind and earthquake hazards.

#### Context & Constraints:

Available data from the HVA is not readily useable in practical applications. Future studying that are to be conducted should take into consideration the user friendliness of the end product.

### Priority for action 2: Core indicator 2

*Systems are in place to monitor, archive and disseminate data on key hazards and vulnerabilities*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

1: Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy

#### Means of verification:

\* Are disaster losses systematically reported, monitored and analysed? No

\* No: Disaster loss database

\* No: Reports generated and used in planning

**Description:**

There is a disconnect with any reports that are produced and their implications for various agencies, often resulting in reports not being fully utilized in the planning process

**Context & Constraints:**

Given the resources limitations in comparison the agency workloads, follow through on various aspects of any report can prove difficult. Any changes that are to be made must be taken over time to allow for institutional absorption of the information.

**Priority for action 2: Core indicator 3**

*Early warning systems are in place for all major hazards, with outreach to communities.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

**Means of verification:**

\* Do risk prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of impending hazard events?  
Yes

\* Yes: Early warnings acted on effectively

\* Yes: Local level preparedness

\* No: Communication systems and protocols

\* Yes: Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination

**Description:**

In relation the Slow onset hazards the TCI has a very good early warning system as we relay information from the Bahamas Meteorological Office to the General Public. Regarding rapid onset hazards such as Tsunamis, though information can be received very rapidly it dissemination is very challenging using the same method of information dissemination for slow onset hazards.

**Context & Constraints:**

Means of information dissemination is primarily done via radio, television, email, and other forms of media. Current information dissemination infrastructure is inadequate for rapid onset hazards. Funding is currently being sort for a low cost alerting

Means of information dissemination is primarily done via radio, television, email, and other forms of media. Current information dissemination infrastructure is inadequate for rapid onset hazards. Funding is currently being sort for a low cost alerting system that can be built upon once the skeleton infrastructure is in place, allowing for the instance relaying of information once received by relevant authorities.

**Priority for action 2: Core indicator 4**

*National and local risk assessments take account of regional / trans boundary risks, with a view to regional cooperation on risk reduction.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

**Means of verification:**

- \* Does your country participate in regional or sub-regional DRR programmes or projects? Yes
- \* No: Programmes and projects addressing trans-boundary issues
- \* Yes: Regional and sub-regional strategies and frameworks
- \* Yes: Regional or sub-regional monitoring and reporting mechanisms
- \* No: Action plans addressing trans-boundary issues

**Description:**

The TCI through CDEMA is a part of the 5 year Comprehensive Disaster Management Framework for the regions participating states. The TCI receives support through the varying program but has limited absorptive capacity for the sustainability of the program at the national level

**Context & Constraints:**

See above.

## Priority for action 3

*Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.*

---

### Priority for action 3: Core indicator 1

*Relevant information on disasters is available and accessible at all levels, to all stakeholders (through networks, development of information sharing systems etc)*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

#### Means of verification:

- \* Is there a national disaster information system publicly available? No
- \* No: Web page of national disaster information system
- \* No: Established mechanisms for accessing DRR information

#### Description:

Information is available on a request basis, in addition to a website which is under construction that will house DRR information. On occasion the website is use by some persons to  
Information is available on a request basis, in addition to a website which is under construction that will house DRR information. On occasion the website is use by some persons to gather information though it has not been officially launched. The logging of available information in DRR or Disaster Management within the DDME is a process set to begin in January, 2011.

#### Context & Constraints:

Limited personnel within the DDME to log available information from sketch can prove a very tedious task. The exercise will be carried out over a number of months and assistance will be sort by persons within the Computer unit to help with the development and maintenance of a information database

### Priority for action 3: Core indicator 2

*School curricula , education material and relevant trainings include disaster risk reduction and recovery concepts and practices.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

#### Means of verification:

- \* Is DRR included in the national educational curriculum? Yes
- \* No: Primary school curriculum
- \* Yes: Secondary school curriculum
- \* No: University curriculum

- \* No: Professional DRR education programmes

**Description:**

The full understanding of DRR is lacking in general within the education sector which presents an issue for stakeholder buy in. Attempts have been made for its integration into the curriculum but external factors sidetracked those efforts

**Context & Constraints:**

Given the full Curriculum administered within the TCI, the case has to be made to those within the Education sector that DRR integration is not an additional task to teach but can be smoothly incorporated within the existing curriculum.

**Priority for action 3: Core indicator 3**

*Research methods and tools for multi-risk assessments and cost benefit analysis are developed and strengthened.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

1: Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy

**Means of verification:**

- \* Is DRR included in the national scientific applied-research agenda/budget? No
- \* No: Research outputs, products or studies
- \* No: Research programmes and projects
- \* No: Studies on the economic costs and benefits of DRR

**Description:**

There is currently no budget allocation for DRR research related activities within the TCI

**Context & Constraints:**

At a minimal a cost benefit analysis should be conducted to highlight DRR activities

**Priority for action 3: Core indicator 4**

*Countrywide public awareness strategy exists to stimulate a culture of disaster resilience, with outreach to urban and rural communities.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

**Means of verification:**

- \* Do public education campaigns on DRR reach risk-prone communities? Yes
- \* Yes: Public education campaigns.

\* Yes: Training of local government

\* No: Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level

**Description:**

The public education campaigns conducted are on a national level and are not targeted at specific communities, though community specific information can be found within them. In the TCI there is not what one might traditional call 'local government', persons that can be considered its equivalent are trained within national level authorities and plans are being carry out to conduct island specific training.

**Context & Constraints:**

Funding is a challenge on the Public Education and Training Fronts. Donor funding which is made available to the TCI has been used for training workshops. Additionally, the case has to be continued for the increased budget allocation for Public Education and Training, because offer donor funding are project specific and not necessarily link to the specific needs of the Country at the time it in being conducted.

## Priority for action 4

*Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.*

---

### Priority for action 4: 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.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

#### Means of verification:

\* Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) Yes

\* Yes: Protected areas legislation

\* No: Payment for ecosystem services (PES)

\* Yes: Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)

\* Yes: Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)

\* Yes: Climate change adaptation projects and programmes

#### Description:

While DRR may not be the terminology formally used when referring to the environment in the TCI, a number markers are conducted here in the TCI

#### Context & Constraints:

Climate Change Adaptation which is in its infancy in the TCI, will be challenging because you will be asking persons to make long term decisions over addressing short term needs. The solution, as with DRR, is the conducting of a cost benefit analysis

### Priority for action 4: Core indicator 2

*Social development policies and plans are being implemented to reduce the vulnerability of populations most at risk.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

1: Minor progress with few signs of forward action in plans or policy

#### Means of verification:

\* Do social safety nets exist to increase the resilience of risk prone households and communities? No

\* No: Crop and property insurance

- \* No: Employment guarantee schemes
- \* No: Conditional cash transfers
- \* No: DRR aligned poverty reduction, welfare policy and programmes
- \* No: Microfinance
- \* No: Micro insurance

**Description:**

Stakeholder engagement and buy-in is difficult to attain as resources both human and financial are limited.

**Context & Constraints:**

N/A

**Priority for action 4: Core indicator 3**

*Economic and productive sectorial policies and plans have been implemented to reduce the vulnerability of economic activities*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

**Means of verification:**

- \* Are the costs and benefits of DRR incorporated into the planning of public investment? Yes
- \* No: National and sectoral public investment systems incorporating DRR.
- \* Yes: Investments in retrofitting infrastructures including schools and hospitals

**Description:**

Following the passage of Hurricane Ike, infrastructural projects were retrofitted to include those relating to Education, Health, and Disaster Management. The program was primarily based on funding provided by the UK Government

**Context & Constraints:**

The sustainability of the program framework that was adapted will be key going forward, and it implementation in none recovery efforts much become a priority

**Priority for action 4: Core indicator 4**

*Planning and management of human settlements incorporate disaster risk reduction elements, including enforcement of building codes.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

**Means of verification:**

- \* Is there investment to reduce the risk of vulnerable urban settlements? Yes
- \* Yes: Investment in drainage infrastructure in flood prone areas
- \* No: Slope stabilisation in landslide prone areas
- \* Yes: Training of masons on safe construction technology
- \* No: Provision of safe land for low income households and communities

**Description:**

While some of the key indications are being met, they are only done on occasion or as the need arise

**Context & Constraints:**

With limited land resource left in the TCI it is a challenge to provide persons with safe land for low income households. What can be done is that the technology used in building homes must take into consideration the location where they are being built

**Priority for action 4: Core indicator 5**

*Disaster risk reduction measures are integrated into post disaster recovery and rehabilitation processes*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

5: Comprehensive achievement with sustained commitment and capacities at all levels

**Means of verification:**

- \* Do post-disaster recovery programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR? Yes
- \* 100 % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR
- \* Yes: Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

**Description:**

All funds that were utilized by the TCI following the Passage of Hurricane Ike had some DRR component to it. Gender specific issues were addressed by the recovery process in the TCI when setting the criteria for persons who would be eligible for housing assistance.

**Context & Constraints:**

N/A

**Priority for action 4: Core indicator 6**

*Procedures are in place to assess the disaster risk impacts of major development projects, especially infrastructure.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

**Means of verification:**

- \* Are the impacts of major development projects on disaster risk assessed? Yes
- \* Yes: Assessments of impact of projects such as dams, irrigation schemes, highways, mining, tourist developments etc on disaster risk
- \* No: Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

**Description:**

With the inclusion of the Department Disaster Management and Emergencies (DDME) on the Physical Planning Board within the last year Some aspects of DRR are taken into account when deliberating on planning applications

**Context & Constraints:**

With the introduction of more user friendly data the integration of DRR in the Physical Planning Process

## Priority for action 5

*Ensure that disaster risk reduction is a national and a local priority with a strong institutional basis for implementation.*

---

### Priority for action 5: Core indicator 1

*Strong policy, technical and institutional capacities and mechanisms for disaster risk management, with a disaster risk reduction perspective are in place.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

2: Some progress, but without systematic policy and/ or institutional commitment

#### Means of verification:

- \* Are there national programmes or policies to make schools and health facilities safe in emergencies? No
- \* No: Policies and programmes for school and hospital safety
- \* No: Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

#### Description:

Exercises are conducted annually for hospitals but not schools.

#### Context & Constraints:

Future DRR program development must take the indicators into account and provide the adequate funding

### Priority for action 5: Core indicator 2

*Disaster preparedness plans and contingency plans are in place at all administrative levels, and regular training drills and rehearsals are held to test and develop disaster response programmes.*

#### Level of Progress achieved:

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

#### Means of verification:

- \* Are the contingency plans, procedures and resources in place to deal with a major disaster? Yes
- \* No: Contingency plans with gender sensitivities
- \* Yes: Operations and communications centre
- \* Yes: Search and rescue teams
- \* Yes: Stockpiles of relief supplies
- \* Yes: Shelters
- \* Yes: Secure medical facilities

\* Yes: Dedicated provision for women in relief, shelter and emergency medical facilities

**Description:**

A number of the indicators are addressed in the TCI, but gender specific issues need to be worked in a more comprehensive manner.

**Context & Constraints:**

Engage of the Gender Affairs Unit within the DRR process will be key to ensure needs based on gender are addressed

**Priority for action 5: Core indicator 3**

*Financial reserves and contingency mechanisms are in place to support effective response and recovery when required.*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

3: Institutional commitment attained, but achievements are neither comprehensive nor substantial

**Means of verification:**

\* Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? Yes

\* No: National contingency funds

\* Yes: Catastrophe insurance facilities

\* No: Catastrophe bonds

**Description:**

The need for a contingency fund is widely recognized but only a risk insurance policy has been taken out in the interim. Once the DM Legislation is passed in the coming year, the contingency fund aspect will be addressed

**Context & Constraints:**

See Above

**Priority for action 5: Core indicator 4**

*Procedures are in place to exchange relevant information during hazard events and disasters, and to undertake post-event reviews*

**Level of Progress achieved:**

4: Substantial achievement attained but with recognized limitations in key aspects, such as financial resources and/ or operational capacities

**Means of verification:**

\* Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? Yes

- \* Yes: Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available
- \* Yes: Post disaster need assessment methodologies
- \* No: Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects
- \* Yes: Identified and trained human resources

**Description:**

Persons have been trained in Initial Damage Assessment, in addition to the ECLAC Methodologies.

**Context & Constraints:**

Practical Experience is needed for persons trained and there is a need for continuous training because of the high turn over rate within the DRR field.

## Drivers of Progress

---

### **a) Multi-hazard integrated approach to disaster risk reduction and development**

#### **Levels of Reliance:**

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

**Do studies/ reports/ atlases on multi-hazard analyses exist in the country/ for the sub region?:**

Yes

**If yes, are these being applied to development planning/ informing policy?:**

Yes

#### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

Hazard analysis for the TCI has been conducted and will be updated in short order, the recognition of its usefulness in the development process is noted but stakeholder buy-in is slow. Some integration is taking place specifically in the Physical Planning Sector.

### **b) Gender perspectives on risk reduction and recovery adopted and institutionalized**

#### **Levels of Reliance:**

No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

#### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

The engagement of the Gender Affairs Unit within the DRR process is required to effectively address this issue. Training opportunity in DRR once they become available must include their personnel to ensure a full understanding of DRR and how it may effect gender related issues

### **c) Capacities for risk reduction and recovery identified and strengthened**

#### **Levels of Reliance:**

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

#### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

Recognition of the needs for communities is there and training is Planned within the resource limitation. With the enactment of the DM Legislation a review of the DDME institutional capacity to carry out its new mandate will be conducted. The results from this review will inform the resources need for the DDME.

### **d) Human security and social equity approaches integrated into disaster risk reduction and recovery activities**

#### **Levels of Reliance:**

No/ little reliance: no acknowledgement of the issue in policy or practice; or, there is some acknowledgement but nothing/ little done to address it

#### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

Different portions of legislation ha been developed to address some of the most vulnerable groups but

has slow to be enacted. Also most legislation that were developed has not taken DRR issues into consideration.

#### **e) Engagement and partnerships with non-governmental actors; civil society, private sector, amongst others, have been fostered at all levels**

##### **Levels of Reliance:**

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

##### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

The National Disaster Management Committees and Sub-Committees are representative of a wide cross section of Key stakeholders that provide the DDME with information on occasion. Complete buy-in for the overall DRR process is still needed as stakeholder interest is primarily on preparedness and response. The move to consider all phases of Disaster Management has been slow.

#### **f) Contextual Drivers of Progress**

##### **Levels of Reliance:**

Partial/ some reliance: Full acknowledgement of the issue; strategy/ framework for action developed to address it; application still not fully implemented across policy and practice; complete buy in not achieved from key stakeholders.

##### **Description (Please provide evidence of where, how and who):**

Mitigation practices need a greater emphasis because Historically the TCI focused of Preparedness and Response, but has had an opportunity to develop it' s recovery processes following the passage of Hurricane Ike. This can be achieved by the continue present of the DDME on the Physical Planning Board, in addition to the allocation of funding needed to educate the General Public and or Private Sector entities on the mitigation activities that they can undertake.

# Future outlook

---

## Area 1

*The more effective integration of disaster risk considerations into sustainable development policies, planning and programming at all levels, with a special emphasis on disaster prevention, mitigation, preparedness and vulnerability reduction.*

### **Overall Challenges:**

With the updating of the Hazard and Vulnerability Assessment an opportunity is here for finding practical ways in using the information provided to better guide program needs

### **Future Outlook Statement:**

Progress is being made with integration of DRR within government policies, but more needs to be done with the education of key stakeholders to ensure a full understanding of DRR

## Area 2

*The development and strengthening of institutions, mechanisms and capacities at all levels, in particular at the community level, that can systematically contribute to building resilience to hazards.*

### **Overall Challenges:**

The development of Community Disaster Groups has been done on the Major Tourism island in the TCI but the subsequent training has been delayed. External and budgetary funding must continue to be sort to improve the sustainability of these groups.

### **Future Outlook Statement:**

With the initial development of Community Disaster Groups in the TCI, the framework is being created to build capacity at the community level

## Area 3

*The systematic incorporation of risk reduction approaches into the design and implementation of emergency preparedness, response and recovery programmes in the reconstruction of affected communities.*

### **Overall Challenges:**

Based on the Experiences of the Recovery from Hurricane Ike, The TCI is well positioned to continue to improving of it mechanisms within their resource limitation. As resources become available incremental steps can be taken

### **Future Outlook Statement:**

See Above

## Stakeholders

---

### Departments/organizations that have contributed to the report

\* Department Disaster Management and Emergencies (Gov) - Jamell Robinson, Director