

Solomon Islands

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

Name of focal point : Mr Loti Yates

Organization : National Disaster Management Office, Ministry of Home Affairs

Title/Position : Director

E-mail address : directorndc@solomon.com.sb

Telephone : +677 27 936

Fax : +677 27 937

Reporting period : 2009-2011

Last updated on : 14 Feb 2011

Print date : 10 May 2011

Reporting language : English

An HFA Monitor update published by PreventionWeb

<http://www.preventionweb.net/english/countries/oceania/slb/>

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 National DRM Plan 2010, recently adopted by Cabinet creates a governance framework for coordinating DR activity across sectors and at the national, provincial and village levels. The National Disaster Council is establishing a Risk Reduction Committee to overview the preparation of a National Risk Reduction Plan (including for climate change) and coordinate national considerations. For the first time there is collective commitment from Cabinet and Permanent Secretaries to this activity.

To manage this work a DRR Unit will be established within the NDMO, now part of the Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management & Meteorology. This unit will develop a DRR policy in partnership with the Climate Change Office for consideration by sectors and government through the NDC by June 2011. With the Climate Change Office, the World Bank and other partners we will initiate GFDRR and GEF funded activities.

It is planned that all sectors will be addressing DRR in development plans by 2012. In support of this work; mechanisms will be established with the Ministry of Development Planning and Aid Co-ordination for addressing DRR within national and sectoral planning. In addition, a risk reduction framework with the NDC's Risk Reduction Committee is to be developed, a DRR planning guidance manual will be created and a sectoral training programme in DRR planning will commence.

It is intended that the development of material and programmes for promoting risk reduction for hazards and climate change as a 5-year development programme will commence delivery in 2012. Discussions with the Provincial Disaster Officer's and the Climate Change Office to develop a strategy for promoting risk reduction, including Climate Change Adaptation will be required in order to develop programmes and materials and to implement these with other relevant agencies.

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:

It is intended that the DRM legislation will be adopted by parliament imminently. All efforts will be made to ensure implementation and provide ongoing support to the NDC including facilitation of TOR's for the Council and its Committees. With ongoing NDMO support to Committees, it is intended that by 2013 we will meet obligations under the new DRM arrangements. To this end, the Risk Reduction Committee will develop a plan for reducing disaster and climate change risks, the Hazards Committee will develop a policy and five-year work programme. The DM Arrangements Committee will implement Section 72 and the Recovery and Rehabilitation Committee will implement Section 112 of the N-DRM Plan respectively (see document attached to Priority for Action 1 details).

Development and extension of provincial and engagement programmes for raising disaster awareness will continue. The NDMO will work with PDO's to produce a programme for implementation, to develop material and extend programmes throughout the Provinces. Efforts will include continuation of village DRM programmes, support of the PCIDRR programme and identifying mechanisms that will facilitate

village DRM planning in all communities. Engagement with partners and identification of 'champions' to promote these activities is crucial.

The PCIDRR and CBDRM programmes have been reviewed and a standard profile for village DRM Plans has been developed to be used by all agencies undertaking village level planning. The purpose of this is to create an expanding network of villages with capacity in a common framework. A feature of this village planning is to address livelihood practices alongside hazards. Our purpose is to engage NGO's, as the primary deliverers for CBDRM, in working to this standard.

Training needs analysis will be undertaken for NDMO staff to address work skills and professional development needs. Submissions to SIG and donor agencies will be made based on this analysis.

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:

Development of the National DRM Plan and hazard specific contingency plans will continue over the next 5 years (commencing Jan/Feb'10). NEOC SOP's will be completed by end of 2010. Implementation of NEOC arrangements, allocation of roles and development of templates for warnings, sitreps etc is ongoing. Establishment of the N-DOC and N-DOC clusters with sector partners in an operational mode has commenced in 2010 and will be tested in a full simulation exercise in November '10. Development of TORs and SOPs for N-DOC and N-DOC Clusters will follow this exercise with support from NDMO.

Monthly meetings with stakeholders to promote their role in DM operational arrangements will continue alongside reinforcement of communication arrangements (hardware and content) from the NEOC with key responders. Communication needs across all levels will be reviewed and preparation of a 5-year development plan will follow.

In order to improve engagement with Provincial Disaster Committees (PDC) and development and preparation of DM Arrangements and Recovery subcommittees, a programme has been established throughout the Provinces. In addition, establishing and developing the P-DOC and PEOC clusters in the Provinces and outlining arrangements and SOPs for Provincial engagement with NDMO support is required. Implementation of P-DOC and PEOC arrangements in the Provinces has commenced alongside the development of provincial profile information. Preparation of Provincial DRM and hazard specific response plans will progressively follow. It is expected that these provincial level operational arrangements will develop over the next 4 years, commencing in May 2010.

To provide a systematic approach the Committees for Risk Reduction, Hazards and Recovery and Rehabilitation are each part of the NDC and will work to a common set of policies. This connection did not exist in the past.

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:

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

Means of verification:

- * Is DRR included in development plans and strategies? No
- * Yes: National development plan > Mid Term Development Strategy
http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_mtds.pdf [PDF]
- * No: Sector strategies and plans
- * Yes: Climate change policy and strategy
- * No: Poverty reduction strategy papers
- * Yes: Common Country Assessments (CCA)/ UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF)

Description:

New National DRM Arrangements and Plan exists that includes the establishment of a 'risk reduction committee'. Responsibilities of this body include; establishing policies and mechanisms at the Government and national planning levels for assessing and addressing vulnerabilities, development of a Risk Reduction Plan for Disaster and Climate Change Risk, setting out the scope and application of disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation and allocating and overseeing programmes for risk reduction initiatives. The plan is endorsed, but not yet fully implemented. The National DRM Act of 1989 is also currently under review. The National Development Strategy does have reference to DRR. The education sector strategy requires standards for the construction of education facilities that strengthen their disaster resilience; to ensure implementation of this an infrastructure unit was established within the Ministry of Education. The National Women's Policy (GEWD) does not currently integrate DRR, and the UNDAF integrates DM at the outcome level. The National Climate Change Adaptation Plan establishes strong linkages with DRR. Communities are generally found to be very interested in risk identification and reduction, but more resources are required in order to build capacity at local levels. Thus, institutional commitment to DRR exists yet progress in terms of decentralisation of responsibilities is not substantial. Capacities at all levels require strengthening.

Context & Constraints:

In general, sectoral and institutional strategies and plans need stronger focus on mainstreaming DRR. The new health sector strategy currently refers to DM only. The agriculture sector plan does not explicitly refer to DRR but some activities could be classified as such e.g. promoting flood/drought resistant crops. This could be documented, reported and possibly costed for the next round of DRM review. The education sector strategy has established an 'Infrastructure Unit' to promote resilient school building

construction, but building standards and development of a manual have yet to be formalised. Creation and enforcement of building codes is an issue that requires integration of DRR and urgent consideration.

A legal authority has been given to the provincial government for DRM as per the NDC Act, however this is not specifically mentioned in the Provincial Government Act. This disconnect has compounded challenges in terms of knowledge of DRR and awareness of local government and communities on their DRM roles and authorities. Whilst there are efforts to engage at the provincial level from a range of stakeholders, particularly through NDMO & NGO's, the lack of resources allocated to implement the National DRM Plan at the provincial and community level makes this challenging. Community participation is very strongly promoted in the new National DRM Arrangements, NAPA and NGO plans. Despite this, legislative constraints are compounded by high costs for transportation of people and supplies to communities living in remote areas. Establishing a national DRR platform could provide opportunities for stakeholders to realise partnerships that encourage transportation cost sharing and ensures that communities that are more difficult to reach are not excluded from DRR projects and processes.

Reference document:

> NDRM Arrangements (2010)

http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_ndrmpsolomonsfinaliseddraftff271109.pdf [PDF]

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

* 0 % 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:

There are no specific allocations for DRR expenditure in the national budget. International development assistance is predominantly available for response and recovery, alignment of donor assistance for DRR is not well established. The new DRM arrangements advocate for consideration of risk reduction in development planning but there are currently no funds identified to enable this. Responsibility for

incorporating DRM into development planning currently rests with implementing organisations. The Ministry for Development Planning and Aid Co-ordination does not have the mandate to impede a project/programme that fails to consider DRM implications.

The Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Agriculture allocate some funds for measures that reduce risk (e.g. establishment of resilient school facilities, crop diversification, and promotion of disaster resilient crops) but these allocations are not referred to, or budgeted, as DRR activities. Oxfam, SIDT and Red Cross do have budget allocations for DRR/DRM identified in their programmes.

Limited dedicated resources allocated for DRR/DRM and minimal evidence of DRM considerations in development planning indicates minor progress achieved with few signs of forward action in plans or policy. Some NGO's have dedicated budget for incorporating DRM into their programme plans.

Context & Constraints:

There are insufficient funds in the national budget to implement the National DRM Plan as such there are currently no allocations for an emergency fund, a recovery budget or for DRR integration. The NDMO has a recurrent budget primarily for office operations and logistics. Emergency resources are currently reallocated from line Ministries' development budgets to respond post-disaster. Consideration should be given to setting aside a percentage of development budgets for mitigation funds to support priority hazard-resistant or vulnerability reducing projects within ongoing development projects. The political will of decision-makers with the authority to authorise this is required. National planners need to fully internalize the importance and need for mainstreaming DRM into development strategies.

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? -- not complete --

* Yes: Legislation > NDRM Arrangements (2010)

[http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_ndrmpsolomonsfinaliseddraftff271109\[1\].pdf](http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_ndrmpsolomonsfinaliseddraftff271109[1].pdf) [PDF]

* No: Budget allocations for DRR to local government

Description:

Legal authority has been given to provincial government for DRM as per the NDC Act however this is not specifically mentioned in the Provincial Government Act, this makes implementation of DRR at the provincial level very challenging. However, there is no budget allocation for DRR to local government. The NDMO carries out its DRM responsibilities at the local level through village committees and the recently appointed Provincial Disaster Officers (PDO's). Communities in rural areas have good local knowledge on DRR and livelihoods, but provincial disaster committees are predominantly reactive focusing on response and rehabilitation. There are some technical capacities available at the local government level although there is room for improvement. Community participation is recognized as very important, but there is little institutional structure in place to facilitate effective outreach although opportunities for improvement exist through the new DRM arrangements and the ongoing engagement between NGO's and communities. Gender implications are rarely considered in terms of DRR roles, but again this is highlighted as a priority under the new DRM arrangements. Current issues regarding legal

responsibility of local governments in terms of DRR and lack of dedicated budget allocation for this indicates that progress is being made but that commitment and capacities are limited.

Context & Constraints:

Misalignment of policies in terms of responsibility for DRR at the provincial level is problematic and efforts should be made to rectify this. There is currently insufficient knowledge and awareness in local governments and some communities in regard to their DRR roles and responsibilities. No resources are allocated to implement the National Plan at the provincial and community level. The technical skills and knowledge of communities in terms of reducing risk varies depending on the type of hazard e.g. regular experience coping with cyclones versus rare exposure to other events. Planning institutions and sectoral ministries need to fully internalize the need for DRR at the national level in order for commitment to feed through to provincial and local levels. Training, awareness raising and implementation of the new DRM arrangements at the provincial level need to be priorities for all sectors. Provincial level sector staff may be called upon to fulfill a response role in the event of a disaster and should be encouraged to integrate disaster reduction measures into their everyday work.

Priority for action 1: Core indicator 4

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Are civil society organisations , national planning institutions, key economic and development sector organisations represented in the national platform? No
- * 0 civil society members (specify absolute number)
- * 0 sectoral organisations (specify absolute number)
- * 0 women's organisations participating in national platform (specify absolute number)

Description:

A range of groups meet to discuss disaster preparedness, disaster risk reduction and disaster management, but no comprehensive national platform currently exists. The groups that do exist generally comprise of NGO's, NDMO and donor organizations. Sectoral ministries and women's groups are not well represented. Since January 2010, the NDMO has been very proactive in terms of attempting to coordinate with various stakeholders and bring them together. It is hoped that the new DRM arrangements will lead to greater involvement and co-ordination of multiple stakeholders in DRR related work. Due to the fact that currently no National Platform exists, but that efforts have been made to involve multiple stakeholders in DRR based discussions, it can be stated that some progress has been made.

Context & Constraints:

Information sharing and communication on DRR work between sectoral ministries, NGO's, INGO's and with the NDMO needs strengthening. This could be achieved through a commitment to establish a multi-stakeholder National Platform in order to foster discussion and co-ordination in the area of DRR. Special efforts should be made to involve representatives of women's groups and faith based groups due to their particular areas of knowledge and the level of community outreach that would be available through their

involvement.

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:

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

Means of verification:

* Is there a national multi-hazard risk assessment available to inform planning and development decisions? No

* No: Multi-hazard risk assessment

* 0 % of schools and hospitals assessed

* 0 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:

National risk assessments exist for some specific hazards. Key sectors/infrastructure in urban areas undergoes hazard risk assessments but this is not replicated in rural areas. No national standards for multi-hazard risk assessment exists, however there is commitment to rectify this. Some donor organisations conduct hazard risk assessments as part of their regular programming activities prior to embarking on projects. NGO's conduct vulnerability and capacity assessments in some sectors and vulnerability assessments are an integral part of the NAPA process. Red Cross has conducted DRM capacity assessments for specific hazards.

Gender issues are often overlooked in terms of planning implications based on hazard risks, however 'gender in emergencies' training was conducted by UNDP in 2010 in an effort to raise in-country awareness. The NDMO and NGO's are also making a concerted effort to include women's organizations in their DRM work. Provincial disaster officers are compiling provincial hazard risk profiles. Currently, the PCIDRR project and the Pacific Conference of Churches pilot DRM project are working with communities to identify hazard risks. Some commitment and progress exists in terms of this indicator, but this is still at the early stages and not uniform in terms of all hazards and/or sectors.

Context & Constraints:

The Solomon Islands is highly susceptible to a large variety of natural hazards (volcanoes, earthquakes, tsunami, cyclones, flood events, land slides etc) but in-country capacity to monitor and assess them is limited due to financial, technological and human resource constraints. Similarly, in terms of epidemics, the Ministry of Health has established 5 sentinel sites for monitoring and testing specimens however resources would be stretched if an outbreak was to affect several provinces simultaneously. Maintaining trained and skilled staff is a challenge when more lucrative opportunities are available. It was suggested

that perhaps the SI government could consider offering incentives to staff to retain their services (e.g. tax exemptions).

Another challenge is a lack of knowledge in terms of the importance and usefulness of hazard data for all sectors in terms of planning. Again, the issue of political will to incorporate DRM into financial and development decision-making is relevant in this context. It was highlighted during the multi-stakeholder workshop that even if hazard assessment data were to be available, budget constraints may limit consideration of the findings if implementation of recommendations based on the information would lead to increased project costs. Promoting cost benefit analysis is necessary in order to counteract this. A policy framework supporting the development of integrated multi-hazard risk assessments is a requirement.

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

* No: Disaster loss database

* No: Reports generated and used in planning

Description:

Disaster losses are not currently systematically reported, monitored and analysed. There is a joint project proposed by Red Cross and NDMO to enable consolidation of data in regards to losses and impacts. Some disaster loss information exists but normally different sectoral Ministries have their own reports/assessments made eg. Health, Education, Infrastructure. Information is currently spread throughout different institutions and no centrally collected information exists. The NDMO plans to begin work soon, with support from SOPAC, to establish a DesInventar database to allow for the analysis of disaster impacts and identification of high-risk areas. The NDMO has recently recruited a Disaster Information Officer who will be responsible for managing and collating information for the system.

Information on exposure to hazards is made available to the public via various forms of media (newspapers, radios, TV, internet, posters), through public awareness campaigns and workshops. During the cyclone season information is disseminated on exposure to storm risk. There does not appear to be many options for communities to proactively acquire information on hazard risks in their area. Contacting the NDMO or Provincial Disaster Officers directly appears to be the only option.

There is currently no systematic policy in terms of monitoring, archiving and disseminating data on key hazards and vulnerabilities, however commitment does exist and concerted efforts are being made to improve progress in terms of this indicator.

Context & Constraints:

A major challenge is to gather and share existing information between different actors. Some institutions are inclined to keep information to themselves or share it only with donors that provide funding for its collection. Information gathered from joint assessments is distributed through the NDMO and NGOs. It is

recommended that systematic, structured information on hazards and vulnerabilities be centrally located and made available in formats that are applicable for use by decision-makers.

There are several challenges in terms of making information on exposure to hazards available to the public. These include; limited ownership of HF-radios & televisions in communities; very limited access to internet throughout the country except for some residents in urban areas; lack of availability of pamphlets in Pidgin and provincial dialects, which is compounded by low levels of literacy. Providing greater opportunities for communities to access appropriate information on hazard risk is required.

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

* No: Early warnings acted on effectively

* Yes: Local level preparedness

* Yes: Communication systems and protocols

* Yes: Active involvement of media in early warning dissemination

Description:

There are a number of inconsistencies in terms of this indicator.

EWS related to cyclones are received in a timely manner whereas tsunami warnings are generally not. A major reason for this is the fact that out of 19 tsunami events in 80 years, only one had a long lead-time in terms of being generated at a significant distance away all others were generated 'near shore'. After a cyclone has been confirmed, it takes approximately 15 minutes to issue the warning via radio.

Some risk-prone communities receive timely and understandable warnings of possible events, but not all communities, and effective communication mechanisms to warn people of potential disasters are not in place for all hazards. Authorities try to disseminate warnings and church bells/conch shells are used to alert communities in some places. 48 villages have been trained on proper use of alarms, warnings etc. A framework/flowchart for EWS information flow is in place. NDMO has a set of protocols for who contacts whom after a warning is received. This system will be tested during a drill scheduled to take place in November '10.

In general, warnings seem to be acted upon appropriately when received, but not always. For instance concerns about economic survival have been known to affect how people act after receiving warnings. The media is actively involved and plays a big part in early warning and is often the only available medium for message dissemination.

No appropriate procedures for end-to-end EWS are in place. Challenges remain in terms of getting

warnings from Honiara to remote communities in a timely and appropriate manner. People use and often rely on traditional EW information and local knowledge related to hazards and preparedness based on past experience (running to the hills, observing animal behaviour, changes in flora and fauna etc). However, current changes in weather patterns may challenge the use and effectiveness of some traditional knowledge. Some community-based DRR programmes do discuss and document traditional knowledge and signs of hazard warnings.

Context & Constraints:

There are insufficient radios in communities for them to receive warnings adequately throughout the country and availability of batteries affects this issue too. It has been suggested that provision of clockwork radios to communities could be useful, but government funding to facilitate this is currently not available. Radio broadcasting time (6am-11pm) is problematic if warnings are needed at other times. If a cyclone is imminent, radio companies keep broadcasting but this is not useful for tsunamis, earthquakes and other events that cannot be predicted.

The location of remote communities limits access in order to reduce challenges relating to warning dissemination. Time and funding constraints in terms of logistics (sea travel only to many areas, high costs of boat hire, fuel etc) affect the ability of all organisations to do outreach.

There is an issue in urban areas of people getting inaccurate information from unofficial sources and this causing panic amongst the population. Awareness raising on processes, information and access to official sources could be useful. With the improvement of telecommunication technology, dissemination of warnings via mobile phones is becoming an option. The NDMO is exploring opportunities in relation to this.

More accurate forecasts on rainfall and their dissemination are needed to improve warning of potential flood risks.

Awareness raising on warnings/warning signs and how to respond appropriately needs to be enhanced. Consultations with women's and grass roots organisations to identify communication outlets likely to reach high-risk groups of women and men, boys and girls should be considered.

The wealth of traditional knowledge on early warning signs and disaster preparedness should be documented and shared, particularly in urban areas where this knowledge has been eroded. The relevance and applicability of traditional knowledge in view of changing hazards due to the impacts of climate change will need to be analyzed.

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 Solomon Islands participates in the Regional DRM Platform. Annually a collection of meetings are convened that includes; Regional Disaster Managers meetings; Pacific DRM Partnership Network meetings; DRM meetings for Pacific CEO's of Finance/Planning and DM. The network facilitates regional co-operation and information sharing on DRM issues and has established the Pacific Framework for Action. In addition the Solomon Islands contributes information to, Pacific Disaster Net, an online Virtual Centre of Excellence for DRM in the Pacific Region. The web portal and database system is an information resource for actors and stakeholders to research, collaborate on and improve information and knowledge management throughout the region.

The Solomon Islands are also part of the South West Pacific Tsunami EWS. This system is designed to collect seismic data from countries throughout the region in order to improve the quality of data available in the event of tsunami. Tsunami warnings are shared regionally through the Pacific Tsunami Warning Centre based in Hawaii Cyclone warnings also follow regional procedures with clear responsibilities of information sharing with other countries.

The Melanesian Volcanological Network was established to reduce volcanic risk in Melanesia by providing a framework for the exchange and sharing of volcanological resources of Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu on a sub-regional basis. Regional co-operation on risk reduction with PNG and Vanuatu (NDMOs and Met services) is recognised as particularly important as these countries border the Solomon Islands.

Context & Constraints:

It is recognised that greater cross boundary co-operation in regards to legislation on land rights, ownership etc is required. Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons were placed at greater risk during the Bouganville crisis (shared territory between PNG and the Solomon Islands) due to a lack of coherent understanding on these issues. Similarly, populations residing in the Solomon Islands for generations, but originating from Kiribati, were particularly badly affected after being displaced following the 2007 tsunami in Gizo.

Despite a good level of regional information sharing existing, stakeholders involved in the multi-stakeholder workshop felt that more could be done to facilitate information dissemination of regional activities with in-country actors.

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:

DRM information is available but there is little awareness about it and it is not easily accessible to all that may be able to benefit from it. The data is currently housed in different ministries. All mapping information i.e. satellite imagery etc is kept by the Ministry of Lands, hazard information is with Mines and Energy, population data is held by the Ministry of Statistics. This information is essential for DRM planning, yet difficult to access. NDMO has recently engaged a DRM Information Officer who is currently (Sept '10) undergoing training with SOPAC in an effort to house this vital information under the NDMO.

There is a great deal of information available from different agencies, particularly NDMO and NGOs, but information sharing is still limited. Different mediums are used, such as TV, newspaper, radio, brochures etc to share information about disaster risks with the public. The NDMO has a good package of public information on DRM and most community-based programmes are using DRM materials.

Context & Constraints:

Accessing disaster information often represents a major challenge. There is currently no single agency responsible for housing all DRR relevant data. The processes involved in accessing data are slow and time consuming. Many agencies are not keen to share their information. In a region where the term 'knowledge is power' has particular significance it is really a matter of incrementally altering the way people think about sharing information. It is important for agencies to realise the value of mutual co-operation for achieving DRR objectives. In addition it is recommended that more effective mechanisms for improving access to and sharing of post-disaster assessment reports with relevant stakeholders, be explored.

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? No
- * No: Primary school curriculum
- * No: Secondary school curriculum
- * No: University curriculum
- * No: Professional DRR education programmes

Description:

DRM is not incorporated into the national curriculum. In schools, natural hazards are explained in terms of the physical processes involved but no information is shared on how to be prepared for or mitigate potential impacts.

Local Government receives training from the NDMO, regional and international organisations. It was noted that DRM training modules that are available are not always tailored to specific in-country training needs. An example given was the lack of training available on how to conduct rapid assessments post-disaster. DRM is not integrated into University curricula in the Solomon Islands.

Traditional knowledge is not well documented and therefore not integrated in training curricula, despite there being a wealth of traditional DRM knowledge and practices in existence.

Context & Constraints:

DRM should be incorporated into the national curriculum to complement already existing lesson plans on hazards and their origins/characteristics. Focus should be placed on information on how to prepare for and mitigate potential hazard impacts. Schools and teachers will need to be assisted by all stakeholders.

Efforts should be made to better align DRM training modules with identified knowledge and skills gaps that require capacity building.

Traditional DRM knowledge and practices should be documented and shared, particularly in urban areas where this knowledge has been eroded.

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:

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

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 no allocated budget for DRM research. External agencies' experts carry out most of the disaster related research in-country. However, the Ministry of Agriculture does do research on crop adaptability and food preservation, the latter with support from FAO. Prior to loss in a fire during the political crisis (circa 2001) the Solomon Islands had one of the best agriculture research centres in the South Pacific. There is the intention to rebuild this facility, but presently this is constrained by inability to identify an appropriate site.

Most vulnerability assessments are carried out by NGOs/CSOs and it is felt that they are conducted as a result of global obligations or trends. Access to and sharing of assessment reports is limited and an example of poor co-ordination in terms of DRR work. There are currently no analytical studies carried out on the economic costs & benefits of DRM.

Context & Constraints:

Procedures to facilitate greater access to and sharing of assessment reports is required.

Analytical studies outlining the economic costs & benefits of DRM are urgently required in order to support the case for incorporating DRR into development planning. A lack of understanding in terms of potential benefits of these kinds of study, as well as a lack of human resource capacity to do such an analysis currently limits the implementation of this kind of work.

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:

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

Means of verification:

- * Do public education campaigns on DRR reach risk-prone communities? Yes
- * Yes: Public education campaigns.
- * Yes: Training of local government
- * Yes: Availability of information on DRR practices at the community level

Description:

There are extensive public education campaigns especially before and during the cyclone season. On average, TV broadcasts air for 15mins per day approximately 5 days per week and there are around 6-7 radio spots per day. Dedicated awareness raising radio and TV broadcasts are conducted in English and Pidgin. A budget of SI\$500,000 per annum is used for public information on disasters.

There is an issue with lack of involvement in public awareness raising from other sectors with DRM roles and responsibilities, however it is hoped that this will improve with implementation of the new arrangements and with the establishment of the Provincial Disaster Officers (PDO's). The PDO's are the means by which the NDMO will engage in ongoing capacity building and training at the provincial level.

Context & Constraints:

Although there are many mediums for awareness raising such as TV, radio, newspaper rural communities are often not able to benefit from these campaigns, as they don't all have access to TV's,

radio's etc. Standardised information on disaster risks needs to be disseminated to all communities and standards for gender-inclusive awareness programming should be used. Community access to radio technology needs improvement, particularly in remote parts of the country. Provision of clockwork radios would negate the need for replacement batteries. Posters containing guidance for preparing for disaster events would be useful, particularly for remote communities. Levels of literacy and language use (Pidgin or local dialects) should be carefully considered if this course of action is to be explored.

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:

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

Means of verification:

- * Is there a mechanism in place to protect and restore regulatory ecosystem services? (associated with wet lands, mangroves, forests etc) -- not complete --
- * Yes: Protected areas legislation
- * No: Payment for ecosystem services (PES)
- * No: Integrated planning (for example coastal zone management)
- * Yes: Environmental impacts assessments (EIAs)
- * Yes: Climate change adaptation projects and programmes

Description:

The results for this indicator are mixed. Legislation does exist, the Protected Areas Act 2010 and Environment Act 1998 cover conservation issues, wildlife, marine and biodiversity protection. DRM issues are included in these Acts through the creation of the Environment Advisory Council. Communities themselves are demarcating areas for protection and conservation examples include; Arnavon Island, Tetepari, Maravagi and Upi. These are not government led initiatives, but they are impacting on preservation of ecosystem services. Some income is made in these sites from small-scale tourism ventures, but payment is not made for the ecosystem services themselves.

The Solomon Islands is at the early stages of consideration in terms of DRM and climate change adaptation (CCA) integration of government led work. A climate change database and climate change working groups are being developed. The Ministry of Agriculture has 2 CCA programmes currently running and one due to start next year on climate change and food security. The NAPA process is being rolled out and also makes reference to DRM and CCA. Red Cross is mainstreaming DRM and CCA across their projects.

Natural resource use monitoring has been enforced since 2008 under the Environment Act, but a new Forestry Act is yet to be enforced. Planned palm oil projects may have both positive and negative impacts on ecosystem services.

Context & Constraints:

During the multi-stakeholder workshop, some groups stated that legislative Acts contradict implementation in terms of actual projects. It was felt that the policies that do exist are difficult to enforce. Numerous examples were given during the discussions of flooding and landslide events that were

exacerbated by deforestation. It is hoped that the proposed new Forestry Act will mitigate the impact of poorly managed forestry practices. Palm Oil projects may have positive and negative impacts on ecosystem services; care should be taken to monitor this.

More effective enforcement of the Environment Act (1998) and the Protected Areas Act (2010) that purport to monitor land and resource use is required. High levels of deforestation and damage to ecosystem services are proven to increase exposure to disaster risk.

The establishment and enforcement of building codes is necessary. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's) also need to be more rigorously conducted and monitored.

Reference document:

> Environment Act (1998) http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_sienvironmentact1998.doc [DOC]

> Protected Areas Act (2010)

http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_siprotectedareasact2010no.4of2010.pdf [PDF]

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:

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

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:

There are currently no crop insurance, employment guarantee, poverty eradication, microfinance or micro-insurance schemes operating in the Solomon Islands. The only form of financial support comes from logging companies paying compensation to some disaster-affected land owning communities.

The Solomon Islands government has GFDRR funding approval so it is hoped that positive outcomes will be realised from this in terms of support to vulnerable populations. The World Bank & the Ministry of Environment are working on a project that incorporates vulnerability issues. Red Cross community based projects are all conducted in the context of climate change adaptation and DRR. This includes food security, livelihood security and public health projects. 2 food security projects conducted by the Ministry

of Agriculture are underway. These projects promote the cultivation of disaster foods & traditional food preservation techniques (eg “6 months pudding” & “Nambo”).

A Ministry of Agriculture project on climate change and food security is also planned to start in 2011. ‘Learn Grow’ is an education and food security project with funding from Rotary and supported by Kastom Garden. A national policy exists for food security. A food security, DRM and CCA project is proposed by UNDP (GFCCA).

The ‘Wantok’ system, as a feature of Solomon Island culture, provides an informal social safety net for disaster affected communities. It is highly efficient and reliable in terms of delivering but operates entirely at the community level with no involvement from external sources.

Public health is promoted through ongoing advocacy programmes and malaria nets are routinely distributed.

Context & Constraints:

Despite the lack of formalised institutional commitment in the context of the government’s provision of social safety nets, it was felt that in-country commitment at the community level is substantial, thus ‘level 3’ was agreed as appropriate for this indicator. The Wantok system, where extended families support one another, is very reliable although some concerns may lie in the pressure it puts on people that have resources, which are rapidly drained. Options for establishing formalized social safety nets to support vulnerable groups could be explored (e.g. crop insurance, micro finance schemes etc) to complement the existing traditional safety nets.

Some concerns were raised regarding the Palm Oil project in Malaita Province as palm oil is a mono crop and may impact on food security for the area.

Sanitation is promoted but is impeded by cultural acceptance in some areas. Finance is a constraining factor in terms of promoting public health.

It is necessary to build capacity for conducting gender-sensitive disaster risk assessments that capture specific knowledge about hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities in the everyday lives of women and men, boys and girls.

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

Description:

The majority of participants at the multi-stakeholder workshop stated that there is nothing in development plans regarding environmental impact assessments and DRM.

In the context of rebuilding post disaster, DRM might be included but often only at donor's insistence. There is not much evidence of planning with DRM in mind. New projects may refer to DRM but generally this only applies to donor funded projects. Japanese funded projects were given as good examples of incorporation of DRM into planning.

Parts of the site for a proposed palm oil plantation on Malaita are exposed to flooding. This was offered as an example of lack of DRM consideration into planning processes. Most projects don't take long term considerations into account. E.g. Roads are built cheaply but the long-term cost of maintaining them is high.

It was commented that the upcoming climate change policy may address some of these issues. There is some evidence of a shift in favour of DRM considerations. One example is that the National Referral hospital is currently located in a high-risk area and plans are being explored to move it.

Context & Constraints:

There is currently little evidence of DRM considerations incorporated into planning processes. This includes a lack of analysis of hazard impacts and the potential economic impacts on projects if disaster strikes. Improvements in this area could have potential long-term economic, social and environmental benefits. More economic analysis is required in order to support the case for DRR investment now versus disaster response expenditure later.

Guidance on how to increase economic opportunities without increasing risks was requested. Currently logging is a major source of GDP and this has inherent challenges in terms of DRM. Other options suggested include tourism but this can also increase disaster risk without careful planning.

A group of Solomon Islanders are exploring options for eco-tourism that incorporates promoting tree nurseries and replanting. Another example was the ITTA project (Community initiative)– planting and growing indigenous trees with organic fertilizers and selling sustainable products.

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

Description:

Rapid urbanisation and growing informal/squatter settlements indicates that there is a large, highly vulnerable population in Honiara. Informal settlements do not have access to basic services and receive no support to improve drainage thus flooding remains a problem. There is little/no consideration of disaster risk in informal settlements. There is currently no resettlement policy but the government is working on a plan to provide fixed term estates to settlers.

There is no zoning of land for commercial/human settlement. Planning does not incorporate hazard information and has resulted in poorly designed drainage systems. There are no slope stabilization projects. Building codes are weak and poorly enforced. It was stated during the multi-stakeholder workshop that the World Bank were not required to carry out risk assessments for some of their infrastructure projects in Honiara, Auki, Gizo, Munda, and Noro, thus none were conducted.

Context & Constraints:

There is a lack of forward planning in terms of rapid urbanisation, although it is felt that recognition on the need for this is growing. A lack of political will has led to slow progress. It is important to identify key community leaders located in informal settlements in order to promote proper land use planning that includes DRM considerations.

The Ministry of Lands recognises its important role in DRR but requires training to support technical staff; and upgrading of equipment in order to fulfil its obligations. The Ministry of Lands corporate plan includes recommendations for land use planning but this document is awaiting endorsement by the SI government. It is hoped that DRM considerations will be strengthened after the plan is endorsed.

Development of a land use policy is required and should include DRR considerations. It was highlighted that SPC will be approached to request their support in developing a policy. Establishment and enforcement of building codes is necessary. Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's) need to be more rigorously conducted and monitored.

Priority for action 4: Core indicator 5

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

Level of Progress achieved:

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

Means of verification:

- * Do post-disaster recovery programmes explicitly incorporate and budget for DRR? No
- * 0 % of recovery and reconstruction funds assigned to DRR
- * No: Measures taken to address gender based issues in recovery

Description:

There is no budget explicitly allocated under the old plan for incorporating DRR into recovery. There is opportunity for this under the new DRM arrangements however recognising a need and identifying a budget are not analogous. The new NDRM plan establishes the creation of a 'Recovery and Rehabilitation Arrangements Committee'. This Committee will be responsible for establishing arrangements and procedures at the national, sector and provincial level for directing and co-ordinating recovery and rehabilitation from disaster events. It will also be responsible to the Council for over-viewing recovery from disaster events and for developing a recovery funding arrangement for

recommendation to Cabinet through the Council. This is to include re-allocation of sector budgets, international partner and stakeholder support and commitment through national development planning as appropriate.

There is little awareness of international post-disaster recovery norms and standards amongst in-country actors. In schools, hospitals & staff housing in Western Province and Choiseul following the 2007 tsunami, DRR was incorporated into recovery. For example, schools and medical facilities were rebuilt according to appropriate standards in order to mitigate future risk, trees were planted in order to protect critical infrastructure. Post tsunami 2007, shelter projects were developed with DRR in mind – houses were rebuilt to withstand future hazards.

Donor funded recovery programmes do tend to make provisions for DRR although there is no specific budget from the Solomon Islands government to do this.

There is a high and growing level of awareness of the importance of increasing gender equality being demonstrated by government, UN and their implementing partners. This is shown by increasing efforts to disaggregate numbers for reporting, to emphasize the importance of women's representation on committees, and ensure participation of equal numbers in training, workshops, etc.

Context & Constraints:

Awareness of the need to incorporate DRR into recovery planning is growing, but implementation is slow. Land ownership issues often challenge post-disaster recovery. Native land ownership needs to be respected and the implications of this complex issue should not be underestimated – 84% of all land in the Solomon Islands is native land. If a community is forced to resettle or too fearful to return to a particular site, their long term habitation and livelihood options can become very limited.

In terms of gender based issues in recovery, implementing organisations have great difficulty in recruiting and retaining female staff able to travel to remote areas, which affects their ability to interact with women in communities. At the community level, it takes a great deal of skill to work with women unused to expressing opinions or making decisions, and further, to find ways for dominant males to accept and integrate women's views into their own decision-making. Partners readily acknowledge that much of the involvement of community women in recovery programmes is token, or limited to very traditional roles, as they lack the people and experience to make use of post-disaster opportunities to mobilize for meaningful social change.

Recovery requires multi-stakeholder involvement. At present, co-ordination and cross-sectoral engagement need to be improved.

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:

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

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

* Yes: Impacts of disaster risk taken account in Environment Impact Assessment (EIA)

Description:

Environmental Impact Assessments are a legal requirement for all development projects since 2008 as per the Environment Act and its regulations. Examples of this were given; Goldridge mining applies an EIA; a feasibility study was done for a proposed hydro-project that included aspects of DRM. Prospective developers must go through the investment board to get a permit; then they must seek approval from relevant agencies including the Ministry of Environment (MECDM). As per a recent government gazette, the NDMO now comes under MECDM. Despite the legislation, non-compliance by investors remains a major issue.

As a general rule, current procedures tend to focus more on potential environmental impacts from a conservation/protection perspective and less so on disaster risk. It was highlighted that EIAs are more likely to be conducted thoroughly and appropriately for projects that have external donor support.

Context & Constraints:

Implementation and enforcement remains a challenge in terms of assessment of major development project impacts on disaster risk. One participant of the multi-stakeholder workshop commented that policies have “no teeth or false teeth”. Limited enforcement and monitoring capacity is a feature of ongoing governance challenges that exist in the Solomon Islands.

The logging code of practice (Ministry of Forests) is legislated but monitoring is limited and it is felt that illegal logging may be an ongoing issue. The governance structure and limited staff capacity of the Ministry of Forestry may require attention in order to remedy this. There is generally a good level of awareness that flash floods and landslides are linked to logging and deforestation. There are some measures in place to tackle this issue, but more still needs to be done.

Projects/investments supported by the national budget require more rigorous EIA monitoring. The establishment and enforcement of building codes is also necessary.

Reference document:

> MECDM responsibilities (2010) http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_mecdmresponsibilitiesdoc.pdf [PDF]

> MECDM notification (2010) http://preventionweb.net/files/14656_mecdmnotificationdoc.pdf [PDF]

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:

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

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

* Yes: Training and mock drills in school and hospitals for emergency preparedness

Description:

There are national DRM plans and policies in place clarifying involvement across sectors. The new arrangements are not yet enacted through parliament, this is expected to happen soon. The internal cluster approach outlines operational roles and responsibilities and has been in effect since January 2010. Advocacy of this approach is ongoing and it has been tested in 2 small events. SOP's for NDC committees and cluster groups, as per the new arrangements, are currently being drafted with support from the NDMO.

The Ministry of Health has developed a preparedness task group as part of their regular structure. During periods of non-emergency this group convenes approximately once per month, during emergencies this becomes a daily/weekly meeting as required. Evacuation drills have been conducted and following an earthquake in October '09, all patients were evacuated safely. Drills are also practised for coping with potential disease outbreaks. There are currently no structural safety assessments conducted or building codes required for construction of the referral hospital.

Within the Ministry of Education there is a technical working group for education in emergencies and an infrastructure unit that is responsible for the structural safety of school buildings. UNICEF is hoping to work with the Ministry of Education to develop a tool for education in emergencies, a training manual for teaching students about disasters. The infrastructure unit is currently developing a building manual for schools and trying to establish a standardised design with support from a technical advisor funded by NZAid. There are currently a number of 'top heavy' schools in SI. It is hoped that future school facilities will be built following new standards that incorporate DRR into their designs. Drills are not routinely practised in all schools. If they do take place it is at the discretion of the school Principal.

Context & Constraints:

In order for training gaps to be identified & measures taken to build preparedness capacity, greater availability of funding is still required for full implementation across all sectors. In addition, sectors need to develop effective internal DRM arrangements that align with the new DRM Plan and legislation. These internal arrangements should include provision for the structural safety of buildings, particularly facilities like schools, health centres and other community buildings that may offer refuge post-event. Similarly, disaster drills need to be regularly practised in all school and hospital facilities as standard.

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:

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

Means of verification:

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

Description:

Contingency plans are in place but are still at the preliminary stages of development. The plans that exist require full implementation and practical testing. Community preparedness exercises have been conducted in 48 villages through the PCIDRR programme. The programme is still at its early stages. Support services for women and families following a disaster remains limited, although there is some recognition that the needs of certain groups may differ post-disaster. Inclusion of gender considerations in contingency plans is limited, although there is reference to the importance of the roles of women in operational processes and decision making in the new DRM arrangements.

Context & Constraints:

There are limited resources available in terms of communication equipment, human resources and preparedness materials e.g. stockpiles, to respond to a major disaster. There is an identified need to feed DRM policies into all sectors, some sector specific DRM plans are being developed but this is inconsistent across all departments. The Ministry of Health has contingency plans in place however recognises that capacity is limited for dealing with a large-scale national epidemic. Contingency plans require full implementation and testing. Participation across sectors in drills and exercises is crucial if these plans are to be useful in a practical setting. This will require consistent funding support and political will.

It is necessary to identify appropriate partners among women's groups active at the local level and materially support them to develop/strengthen their capacities to undertake preparedness campaigns. Challenges remain at the provincial level in terms of training, skills and awareness of roles & responsibilities. Greater focus on DRM training for sector representatives at the Provincial level is required. The police are often called upon to offer search and rescue support, but require more training in order to fulfil this role effectively e.g. first aid, rescue diving etc.

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:

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

Means of verification:

- * Are financial arrangements in place to deal with major disaster? No
- * No: National contingency funds
- * No: Catastrophe insurance facilities
- * No: Catastrophe bonds

Description:

There are financial policy arrangements in place that can be accessed for response, e.g. the Finance and Audit Act and the NDC Act, which provide contingency mechanisms to support response. However, there is no commitment from the SI government to commit reserves to prepare for effective response and recovery ahead of an event.

Donors, NGOs and International humanitarian partners have contingency funds that are available but require a state of emergency declaration in order to be released. The Solomon Islands Police Force have an emergency fund specifically for logistics and post-disaster assessments.

Context & Constraints:

Funds are available for post disaster recovery but there is often great difficulty in accessing them. Processes are very slow and it is necessary to continuously monitor and follow up in order to access funds. After an event this can be very time consuming. Allocation within sectoral budgets to respond to disasters is limited. As a result, sectors often rely on regular budget in order to fulfil roles and responsibilities post-event. During the multi-stakeholder workshop it was generally felt that there is a lack of commitment from the government in terms of funding post-disaster assessments. Improvements are required in terms of speed and streamlining of processes for accessing funds in the event of a disaster. Allocation of emergency funds within sectoral budgets is necessary to avoid government departments relying on their regular budget in the event of a disaster.

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:

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

Means of verification:

- * Has an agreed method and procedure been adopted to assess damage, loss and needs when disasters occur? No
- * No: Damage and loss assessment methodologies and capacities available

- * No: Post disaster need assessment methodologies
- * No: Post disaster needs assessment methodologies include guidance on gender aspects
- * No: Identified and trained human resources

Description:

The new NDRM arrangements are welcomed as they have systems in place that should improve the exchange of relevant information during and after an event. Post-event reviews are routinely conducted following a disaster. During previous 'Lessons Learned' exercises, the need for improved methodologies for post disaster assessment was identified. UNOCHA recognises recent improvements in terms of co-ordination post-event, particularly in terms of NGO engagement. Sustained effort and multi-sector support is required in order to maintain this following a larger disaster.

Context & Constraints:

Previous experience shows that poor coordination and information sharing during disasters slows down effective relief work. Full commitment is required by state agencies in order to improve this. There is a recognised and urgent need for the development of standardised post disaster assessment forms. Training on conducting post disaster assessments for all sectors that will be required to participate in the event of a disaster is also necessary. Training should highlight the difference between a rapid assessment and a more thorough sector specific assessment and provide guidance on sex disaggregated data collection and analysis.

Currently, there is not uniform participation of all relevant sectors in post event reviews. Some post-disaster procedures are in place but more awareness and capacity building at all levels is required. This includes active participation by all sectors in engaging with the new NDRM arrangements.

Documentation and dissemination of 'lessons learnt' is required, as is ongoing evaluation of procedures and plans that currently exist in order to ensure their alignment with the new DRM arrangements.

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?:

No

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

There is a general lack of risk assessment capacity in-country and this is predominantly due to low levels of finance, appropriate monitoring equipment and trained personnel for this purpose. Risk assessments are not conducted for some types of hazard, particularly technological and/or manmade hazards. As the Solomon Islands are exposed to many different natural hazards (earthquake, tsunami, volcanoes, landslides, storm surges, cyclones, flooding etc) levels of awareness and planning for emergencies triggered by these events are high. Community risk assessment programmes, such as those carried out under PCIDRR and the Pacific Council of Churches, encourage communities to consider all types of natural hazard in their village contingency planning exercises.

Identified lead agencies differ under the new DRM arrangements depending on the type of hazard that may be faced. For example planning and operational guidance for pandemics is the responsibility of the Ministry of Health, for pests and diseases it is the Ministry of Agriculture, for all other hazards the NDMO takes the lead. This represents one way in which the Solomon Islands are considering a multi-hazard approach to DRM.

Accessing disaster information often represents a major challenge. There is currently no single agency responsible for housing all DRR relevant data. The processes involved in accessing data are slow and time consuming and many agencies are not keen to share their information. This makes applying knowledge about risks in order to inform policy or plan development deeply problematic. It is important for agencies to realise the value of mutual co-operation for achieving DRR objectives.

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

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):

There is a high and growing level of awareness of the importance of increasing gender equality being demonstrated by government, UN and their implementing partners. There are increasing efforts to disaggregate numbers for reporting, to emphasize the importance of women's representation on committees, and ensure participation of equal numbers in training, workshops, etc. Women's crucial roles in operational processes and decision-making are highlighted in the DRM Plan. Acknowledgement of the differing needs of men and women post-disaster is evident amongst stakeholders. However, social norms limit what men and women are able to discuss in a mixed setting, to the extent that a certain topics may be taboo when both men and women are present. This, coupled with very high rates of GBV, a topic that is also difficult to discuss openly, makes implementing inclusive approaches challenging.

There is evidence of gender inclusion in some policy and programme documents, but awareness amongst some in-country stakeholders of what this means in practice is limited. UNDP PC have been exploring training and awareness raising on gender in disasters on a small scale, but more advocacy, time and resources is required in order for meaningful progress to be made.

Implementing organisations have great difficulty in recruiting and retaining female staff able to travel to remote areas, which affects their ability to interact with women in communities. At the community level, it takes a great deal of skill to work with women unused to expressing opinions or making decisions, and further, to find ways for dominant males to accept and integrate women's views into their own decision-making. Partners readily acknowledge that much of the involvement of community women is token, or limited to very traditional roles, as they lack the people and experience to make use of post-disaster opportunities to mobilize for meaningful social change.

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):

Designated agencies, institutions and offices at the local level have limited capacities for the enforcement of risk reduction regulations. This is partly due to a misalignment of 2 legislative Acts that delineate responsibilities at the provincial level, namely the Provincial Government Act and the National Disaster Council Act. Misalignment of policies in terms of responsibility for DRM at the provincial level is problematic and efforts should be made to rectify this. There is currently insufficient knowledge, awareness and training in local governments and some communities in regard to their response roles. No resources are specifically allocated to implement the National Plan at the provincial and community level. Training, awareness raising and implementation of the new DRM arrangements at the provincial level need to be priorities for all sectors. Provincial level sector staff may be called upon to fulfill a response role in the event of a disaster and need sustained encouragement to integrate disaster reduction measures into their everyday work.

Capacity building within the NDMO is progressing well with ongoing training and staff development earmarked as a priority under the NDMO's Corporate Plan. Many agencies, particularly government and NGO's, report that maintaining the employ of trained staff members is a challenge as they are regularly lured to other organisations by higher pay and better conditions. Unlike other PIC's however, the 'brain drain' in the Solomon Islands is more likely to occur in-country rather than with overseas opportunities. Efforts to improve wages in the SIG and locally based NGO's may serve to ameliorate this problem.

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):

Rapid urbanisation and growing informal squatter settlements indicates that there is a large, highly vulnerable population in Honiara. Informal settlements do not have access to basic services and receive no support to improve drainage thus flooding remains an ongoing problem. There is little deliberation of disaster risk in informal settlements and there is currently no resettlement policy although the SIG is apparently considering a plan to provide fixed term estates to settlers.

Ethnic tensions led to political crisis in 1998 when long-standing grievances over land and economic opportunities against settlers, from neighbouring islands within the country, caused violence between groups. Fundamental to the post-1998 developments were grievances over land. Issues of land entitlement continue to pose large and very complicated challenges, and need to be carefully considered in terms of any development or post-disaster intervention. At present, issues are well recognised but translating awareness into DRM implementation is challenging.

A case in point is the aftermath of the 2007 tsunami, when affected communities from different ethnic backgrounds, were displaced. In Gizo, there is a Gilbertese community who is originally from Kiribati but were settled in Gizo during the British colonial administration. Among the Gilbertese there are those who are originally settled from Kiribati and those who migrated from other islands in the Solomon Islands such as Choiseul and Shortland. In addition, Gizo also has Solomon Islanders who have migrated from other islands. These different groups have different land ownership entitlements, which has affected their resettlement options. The Provincial office has articulated that they are not responsible for settlers who have migrated from other islands in the Solomon Islands regardless of their length of stay in Gizo or whether or not they have established their livelihood there.

The possible implications for climate change resettlement issues are self-evident.

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):

There is a high level of awareness in regards to the value and imperative of working with communities. Donor & government agencies are keen to engage in partnerships with NGO's and a number of examples of joint projects have been identified. Communities generally show enthusiasm and initiative as a result of village-based DRM programmes, however these are at the preliminary stages of implementation and at present only a small number of communities are engaged. Despite the existence of a wealth of traditional DRM knowledge in-country, these practices are poorly documented and shared. This is an area that would benefit greatly from external support as there is currently no funding identified for SIG to facilitate this.

In terms of the practicalities of doing community outreach, poor weather often disrupts work plans and delays arrival of practitioners in remote communities. This issue is compounded by logistical constraints in terms of availability and high costs in reaching isolated parts of the country. Often the most vulnerable populations are the ones that are hardest to reach. Careful consideration should be made of the possible implications of numerous projects focussing on more accessible areas and very few in more hard to reach sites.

There is currently little evidence of partnership with the private sector in terms of DRM. In fact, lack of compliance and consideration of DRR in private sector investment is a large problem in the Solomon Islands and one that can only be remedied through stringent legislation, careful monitoring and strengthened political will to ensure that future development is pursued safely.

f) Contextual Drivers of Progress

Levels of Reliance:

Significant and ongoing reliance: significant ongoing efforts to actualize commitments with coherent

strategy in place; identified and engaged stakeholders.

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

The Wantok system provides an informal social safety net to populations affected by disasters. The system is based on kinship ties and a deeply ingrained sense of obligation to provide and care for one's extended family. The Wantok system is a feature of Solomon Island culture, highly efficient and reliable in terms of delivering assistance but operates entirely at the community level with no involvement from external sources and thus not 'actualized in a coherent strategy' as per the level of reliance for this driver. Despite the benefits of a system where people look after each other, with no form of monitoring, there is the danger that certain groups or individuals may be overlooked in terms of assistance. In addition, the pressure placed on those who do have access to resources may be substantial and there are potential implications in terms of these pressures and decision-making for those in positions of power and authority. It has been noted that family members living and working in Honiara may have resources rapidly depleted due to the expectations of the traditional support system.

The Wantok system is a driver of progress in that it can promote community resilience and diminish reliance on the state. However, care should be taken in terms of what may be perceived as 'external interference' in a fundamental aspect of Solomon Island culture if outside agencies attempt to engage on this issue without due care and respect.

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:

The adoption of the new National DRM Plan 2010 (N-DRM Plan) and its governance structures provides the basis for addressing disaster and climate risk across all levels. Implementing these arrangements is underway and is a significant challenge. It will require commitment from donors and regional and international agencies to support the Solomon Islands Government in these endeavors.

There is currently little evidence of DRM considerations incorporated into planning processes. This includes a lack of analysis of hazard impacts and the potential economic impacts on projects if disaster strikes. National planners need to fully internalise the importance and need for mainstreaming DRM into development strategies. A range of sector Ministries are engaged in disaster reduction activities as part of their ongoing work programmes without explicitly referring to these as such. Dedicated budget lines and funding mechanisms are essential in order to integrate disaster risk reduction into development policies, plans and programmes but at present these do not exist.

Provincial level consideration of DRR is limited, constrained by lack of funding and capacity. Training, awareness raising and implementation of the new DRM arrangements at the provincial level need to be a priority for all sectors. Provincially based SIG representatives require sustained support in order to integrate disaster reduction measures into their everyday work. Current capacity for conducting gender-sensitive disaster risk assessments is limited at all levels, although there is some recognition at the national level that disasters affect men and women differently.

Enforcement of building, settlement, environmental and development codes and standards is a major challenge. Although these policies exist, implementation and monitoring is limited. Analytical studies of the economic costs and benefits of incorporating DRM are not currently conducted. These are necessary in order to support investment decisions for key development programmes. Information on hazards and vulnerabilities does exist but is not currently centrally located and made available in formats that are applicable for the use of decision-makers.

Future Outlook Statement:

Part 6 of the N-DRM Plan provides for the Risk Reduction Committee of the NDC to develop a Risk Reduction Plan for Disaster and Climate Risk. The establishment of the Risk Reduction Committee is proceeding and a multi-sector Risk Reduction Working Group is to be set up to coordinate work programmes across sectors. The Risk Reduction Plan will form the basis for integration with national planning and budgeting and for engagement with donors.

Ministries engaged in disaster reduction activities, as part of their ongoing work programmes without explicit reference to this should endeavour to document, report and conduct costing for the next round of DRM review. Line ministries within the SIG will be encouraged to consider setting aside a percentage of development budgets for mitigation funds to support priority hazard-resistant or vulnerability reducing projects within ongoing development projects.

Provincially based SIG representatives will be encouraged to integrate disaster reduction measures into their everyday work. Training, awareness raising and implementation of the new DRM arrangements at the provincial level will be spearheaded by the NDMO but in order for these efforts to be successful

support from all sectors, including NGO's, is necessary.

More stringent enforcement of building, settlement, environmental and development codes and standards is required. Programmes for addressing the adequacy of laws, policies and monitoring and compliance arrangements will be included in the Risk Reduction Plan. Capacity building through sector ministries and public awareness activities will need to be addressed.

Systematic, structured information systems on hazards and vulnerabilities will need to be addressed with information centrally located and made available in formats that are applicable for the use of decision-makers.

Analytical studies of the economic costs and benefits of incorporating DRM will be conducted in order to support investment decisions for key development programmes. This will be a function of the Ministries of Finance and Development Planning under the Risk Reduction Plan

Build capacity for conducting gender-sensitive disaster risk assessments that capture specific knowledge about hazards, vulnerabilities and capacities in the everyday lives of women and men, boys and girls. The disaster assessment process has recently been reviewed and will incorporate these elements.

Options for establishing formalized social safety nets to support vulnerable groups could be explored (e.g. crop insurance, micro finance schemes etc) to complement traditional safety nets. This will be explored with other development programmes through the Risk Reduction Committee.

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 Provincial Government Act does not align with the NDC Act in terms of assigning DRM responsibilities to local government and identification of roles at the provincial level. There is currently no policy framework supporting the development of integrated multi-hazard risk assessments. Information sharing and communication on DRM work between sectors, NGO's, INGO's and with the NDMO is an area that needs strengthening.

There is a need for greater awareness at the community level on hazard warnings/warning signs and how to respond appropriately. It is necessary to deliver these messages and standardised information on disaster risks more effectively to all members of communities taking into account people's age, gender and literacy differentials. Communities access to radio and television technology is inconsistent and particularly limited in more remote parts of the country. A further challenge in terms of information dissemination to communities is the national curriculum coverage of hazards that describes origins and characteristics, rather than focusing on mitigation and preparedness. Village based DRM activity requires ongoing support in order to be sustainable. This is not provided by the uncoordinated NGO community based disaster risk management (CBDRM) programmes at present. The recently developed Village Disaster Risk Planning Template provides the basis for coordinating NGO activity in this area and needs to be supported.

Enforcement of the Environment Act (1998) and the Protected Areas Act (2010), legislation that purports to monitor land and resource use, is limited. High levels of deforestation and damage to ecosystem services are proven to increase exposure to disaster risk. In addition, Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA's) need to be more rigorously conducted and monitored. This will be addressed under the Risk Reduction Plan activity.

Future Outlook Statement:

Efforts are underway to align the Provincial Government Act with the NDC Act in order to clarify the DRM responsibilities of local government and identify roles at the provincial level. NDMO will support this by continuing advocacy on the newly approved N-DRM Plan 2010 and endeavour to provide the opportunity to develop integrated multi-hazard risk assessments through multi-sectoral participation

Information sharing and communication on DRM work between sectors, NGO's, INGO's and with the NDMO is an area that needs strengthening. This could be achieved through the establishment of a multi-stakeholder National Platform for Disaster Risk Management to foster discussion and co-ordination in the area of DRM. Special efforts will be made to involve representatives of women's and faith based groups in the Platform. The NDMO will strengthen its existing liaison arrangements to form a platform and act as secretariat for it

Opportunities to work closely with women's and grass roots organisations to identify communication outlets likely to reach high-risk groups of women and men, boys and girls will be explored. NDMO will work in partnership with the MoE to incorporate DRM into the national curriculum to complement existing lesson plans on hazards. The focus of these efforts will be to share information with students on how to prepare for and mitigate potential hazard impacts. Schools and teachers will need to be assisted by all stakeholders.

Community access to radio technology needs improvement, particularly in remote parts of the country. Provision of clockwork radios would negate the need for replacement batteries, therefore funding opportunities for securing this technology will be explored. In addition, support for production and distribution of posters containing guidance on preparing for disaster events will be requested. Levels of literacy and language use (Pidgin or local dialects) will be carefully considered if this course of action is possible.

Village DRM activity must have ongoing support in order to be sustainable. NGO's, women's networks and faith-based groups are key stakeholders in terms of programme delivery. The provincial development programme is crucial to these efforts and consultation with relevant agencies for input and adoption will be an ongoing process. The implementation of CBDRM activities needs to continue and ongoing support will be required in order to provide this. In particular, providing guidance on how to increase economic and livelihood opportunities for communities without increasing risks is needed. In addition, development of a land use policy is required and should include DRR considerations. SPC will be approached to request their support in developing such a policy.

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:

The new N-DRM Plan provides the structures to support the development of arrangements at the national and provincial levels to support local activity. Provincial staff are embracing the new arrangements and effort is required to support this on a continuing basis. There is a good degree of capacity but little resource to support it

There is currently a lack of capacity in some key areas of pre and post-disaster preparedness, planning and assessment. Specifically; preparedness campaigns that are designed to meet the needs of different groups; awareness amongst stakeholders of their DRM roles and responsibilities; DRM training of SIG representatives at the Provincial level; and training on conducting assessments according to the new assessment forms, access to and sharing of risk and post-disaster assessment reports. A lack of

capacity in these key areas may mean that certain vulnerabilities are being overlooked and that risk reduction approaches may not be fully implemented.

Contingency plans are in place under the new DRM arrangements; however these plans require implementation and testing. Participation across sectors in drills and exercises is crucial if these plans are to be useful in a practical setting. In addition to partaking in these exercises, all sectors need to develop effective internal DRM arrangements that align with the new DRM Plan and legislation.

Implementation of the Support and Logistics Cluster of the N-DRM Plan is on-going to provide improvements in terms of speed and streamlining of processes for accessing funds in the event of a disaster.

The wealth of traditional knowledge on early warning signs and disaster preparedness should be documented and shared, particularly in urban areas where this knowledge has been eroded. The relevance and applicability of traditional knowledge in view of changing hazards due to the impacts of climate change will need to be analysed.

Future Outlook Statement:

There is a need for training on conducting post disaster assessments according to the new assessment forms for all sectors that will be required to participate in the event of a disaster. Training should highlight the difference between an initial assessment of impacts and a more thorough sector specific assessment of needs and provide guidance on sex aggregated data collection and analysis.

Appropriate partners among women's groups active at the local level will be identified and supported in order to develop/strengthen their capacities to undertake preparedness campaigns. In particular, support should be targeted through the local NGOS, Church network or the SIG Ministry responsible for women affairs. The involvement of the responsible Govt Ministry will mean the funding support for such activities will be forthcoming through that Ministry

All sectors with DRM responsibilities should become increasingly familiar with their expected roles under the new DRM arrangements and participate fully in post-disaster reviews. In addition, all sectors need to develop effective internal DRM arrangements that align with the new DRM Plan and legislation. Greater focus on DRM training for sector representatives at the Provincial level is required. Participation across sectors in drills and exercises is crucial if the new plans are to be useful in a practical setting. NDMO will support these activities through the implementation plans set down through the 2010 to 2015 corporate plan. In turn, access to and sharing of post-disaster assessment reports with relevant stakeholders will be improved through the NEOC Management Unit of the NDMO and through lessons learnt debriefs.

Greater efforts to document and share traditional knowledge on early warning signs and disaster preparedness will be explored through engaging with elders within communities supported through the NGO network. This is particularly important in urban areas where this knowledge has been eroded.

Stakeholders

Departments/organizations that have contributed to the report

- * Caritas (NGO) - Virginia Sauna, Assistant Officer
- * Caritas (NGO) - Mary Malagela, Program officer
- * LBS Engineers (Private) - Cyril Rachman, Assistant Engineering Manager
- * RSIPF (Gov) - Jamie Hagaria, NEMSEP
- * Anglican Church of Melanesia (Networks & Others) - Jasper M. Bonie, Climate change program officer
- * Mines and Energy (Gov) - Michael Maehaka, Senior Hydrologist
- * South Pacific Oil (Private) - Ketty Ramokoloa, HSS admin supervisor
- * South Pacific Oil (Private) - Ian Wright, security T/L
- * Big Maos (News & Media) - Andrew Lano, Technical Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Oliver Hiromana, PDO
- * NDMO (Gov) - Pearson Simi, PDO (Malaita Provincial)
- * MEHRD (Gov) - Benadict Esibaea, Director (Education)
- * NDMO (Gov) - Ruthie Timauku, PDO (Makira Province)
- * People with Disabilities Solomon Islands (NGO) - Simon Dolaiano, Research Officer
- * Solomon Islands Development Trust (NGO) - Lionel Dau, DRR Program Co-ordinator
- * NDMO (Gov) - Frank Menoia, PDO (Temotu Province)
- * Kastom Gaden Association (NGO) - Clement Hadosaia, Manager
- * SI Red Cross (NGO) - Clement Manuri, DSG
- * SI Red Cross (NGO) - Robert Kaula, Disaster Manager
- * NDMO (Gov) - Loti Yates, Director
- * Act for Peace, PCIDRR (NGO) - Augustine Elogia, Field project officer
- * MEHRD/SCA (Gov) - Frances Revo, Education in Emergency
- * JICA (UN & Intl) - Masaaki Kanaya, CBDRM Expert
- * WORLD VISION (NGO) - Andrew Catford, COUNTRY DIRECTOR

- * WORLD VISION (NGO) - Jeremiah Tabua, Disaster Coordinator
- * NDMO (Gov) - Ruth Nalangu, Senior Administration Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Sipuru Rove, Programme Officer
- * Save the Children (NGO) - Lizzie Tegu, Disaster Risk Reduction Officer
- * Environmental Health Department (Gov) - Jimmy Hilly, Environ. Health Management Officer
- * MFMR (Gov) - Jessie Kama, Senior Fishery Officer
- * Save the Children (NGO) - Duran Taupongi, Emergency Operation Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Herrick Savusi, Disaster Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - George West Gulioa, Disaster Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Brian Tom, PDO (Central Province)
- * UNDP CPR Unit (UN & Intl) - Christina.Mitini, Programme Assistant Officer
- * Live and Learn (NGO) - Judy. K. Inapi, Climate Change Adaptation Coordinator
- * NDMO (Gov) - Nelson Anaia, PDO
- * MID (Gov) - Jabin.L.Basitau, D/Director/omu/MID
- * Solomon Islands Water Authority (Private) - Richard Austin, General manager
- * MDPAC (Gov) - Matthew Wale, PPO Natural Resources
- * DRR Practitioner (Networks & Others) - Fred Talo, Risk Management Consultant
- * European Union (UN & Intl) - Brenda Wara, PAO
- * New Zealand High Commission (UN & Intl) - Eileen Kwalea, Dev. Programme Coordinator
- * Meteorology Service / MECDM (Gov) - David Hiriasi, Director
- * NDMO (Gov) - Silas Arukwai, PDO (Western Province)
- * SPC - SOPAC (Regl Inter-gov) - Waisale Naqiolevu, Community Risk Programme Officer
- * MECDM (Gov) - Thaddeus A.Siota, Climate Change Adaptation Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Walter Lilo, DRR Officer
- * NDMO (Gov) - Hampton Pitu, DIMS Officer
- * Solomon Island College of Higher Education (Acad & Research) - Placidah Riahnikeni, Youth Environment Program Volunteer

* MECDM (Gov) - Hudson Kauhiona, Climate Change - Deputy Director

* Solomon Island College of Higher Education (Acad & Research) - Jerry W. Hagaria, Youth Environment Program Volunteer

* Solomon Island College of Higher Education (Acad & Research) - Steve Nasiu, Youth Environment Program Volunteer

* World Bank (UN & Intl) - Suzanne Paisley, DRR/CCA Specialist