

CARR Governance

Community Adaptation and Risk Reduction Governance Series

Achieving resilience through communicating research,
policy and practice in DRR and CCA in Indonesia

Issue 4, March 2012

ISSN: 2089-2160

Briefing Note 1. Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction:

Indonesian Civil Society First Response

Jonatan A. Lassa, Iskandar Leman, Avianto Amri, Djoni Ferdiwijaya, Damaria Pakpahan, Arshinta,
Aktivitas Sarumaha, Sabastian Saragih, Hening Purwanti, Saut Sagala

Acknowledgement. This paper does not represent a particular civil society organization or institutions in Indonesia. We are a group of independent individuals and DRR practitioners/ academia who put together their observations and ideas into one single feedback paper to ISDR.

Introduction

This brief is a response to the call for comments on the consultation paper “Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction”¹ drafted by the United Nations’ International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR). The Post-2015 paper indicates achievements, challenges and also identifies prioritized strategies ahead (on what next?).

It is admitted that that Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) has been able to guide disaster risk reduction initiatives in both developed and developing worlds through multilateral works of United Nations. We understood that multilateral agreements such as the International Decades for Natural Disaster Reduction (IDNRD) during 1990s was considered as a significant and influential initiatives as its help facilitate the setting up of 130 national level disaster management committees/focal points.²

In Indonesia, we have witnessed civil society and governments have been able to seek legitimacy for national disaster policy reform starting from 2007 by referring to the HFA.³ Our observation suggests that bilateral cooperation in disaster reduction between Indonesia and its allies often anchored their legitimacy at the feet of Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015.

¹ See the link at www.unisdr.org/files/25129_towardsapost2015frameworkfordisaste.pdf

² See Van Niekerk, Dewald (2005) “A Comprehensive Framework for Multi-sphere Disaster Risk Reduction in South Africa.” PhD Dissertation at Potchefstroom campus of the Northwest University, South Africa.

³ Civil society initiatives In Indonesia started the process from 2005 by referring to the HFA. Indonesian Disaster Management Society translated, launched and used HFA as advocacy tools and lobbying BAPPENAS (National Agency for Development Planning) who adopted the framework into National Action Plan on Disaster Risk Reduction 2006-2009. It was also used as reference in DRM Law drafting process (2005-2007) of the disaster management law No. 24 year 2007

We understood that changing paradigm from ex-post oriented disaster policy to ex-ante disaster reduction policy is not simply ‘turn of the hand’. However, we anticipate the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2015 to set the agenda on “what next” after HFA expires in 2015. The Post-2015 framework should produce bolder and deeper efforts to reduce vulnerabilities and put community at the centre of the process.

Thoughts to be considered⁴

For Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Reduction, we would like to share the following ideas to be considered.

1. Continuity of Country Progress and Monitoring of DRR

- The Post-2015 Framework for DRR should continue the periodical reviews by the member states. We highly recommend that the progress reports from the member states to be continued as a long term global practice.
- We have observed that human development index (HDI) found its way to be a legitimate indicators for the progress of the nations because it is monitored on annual basis. Learning from HDI’s success, we would like UNISDR and member states to turn the HFA priorities and indicators into variables that are monitored in a long term perspectives. Such a consistent monitoring can help present initiatives to monitor risks and resilience of nations in regards to disaster risks.
- We acknowledge the sovereignty of member states to generate their own progress report. However, we expect a deeper discussion in the World Conference on Disaster Reduction in 2015 concerning the reduction of bias from member states that tend to report only the positive results. Therefore it is necessary to have high degree of scientific legitimacy (e.g. independent scientific evaluation and honest peer review processes) without ignoring a balance views from the civil society initiatives such as Views from the Frontlines and other formal/informal mechanism.
- We would like to see that the (Post-1025) paper to acknowledge and recognize the importance of the involvement from vulnerable groups in DRR. We would like to recall again the Chair’s summary on the Third Session of the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction and World Reconstruction Conference, Geneva, 8-13 May 2011, regarding the importance of involvement of children and youth in the decisions that affect their future as well as drawing the untapped potential of local actors and build on the role of women as agents of change. In addition, we recommend UNISDR to strengthen the capacity of member states in addressing gender and age dimension of disaster vulnerability in countries’ risk assessment.
- Therefore we call for all actors, including governments, business sector, researchers and community workers and policy makers to support dialogue between decision makers and vulnerable groups, such as children, women, disabled, and ethnic minorities, on the issue of hazard, risks and climate change affecting rights of men, women, boys and girls. Disabled school children and disabled people should receive special attentions from the national disaster management offices.
- Responding to paragraph 16 of the consultation paper, while there is a need for more systematic and clearer indications of losses. Governments and private sectors should continue to build their

⁴ Each contributor may not agree to every points raised here, but this paper reflects the diverse issues and ideas relevant to the post 2015 discussions.

capacity not only in terms of top down technical risk assessments but also to tap the potential power of participatory risk assessment where marginal communities can play active roles. We believe that participative risk assessment is precursor for communities' compliance with risk management policy.

2. Governance, Accountability and DRR Bureaucratic Reform

- We still witness that governments often favor token participation rather than engaged partnership. Community based disaster risk reduction are still seen as village government led DRR or the formal dimension of DRR at village level rather than genuine community participation that facilitates understanding of risks and long term paradigm change.
- In most cases the vulnerable groups and local communities are still treated as object of the DRR project and risk assessment rather than a subject that has equal rights, responsibilities and legitimate information to risk reduction and local risk mapping. We recommend the Post-2015 document to be explicit with the responsibilities of communities to reduce risks and climate change adaptation. This is to suggest that top down and highly sophisticated risk mapping may not always be effective at the community level if the mapping processes ignore local communities' knowledge and experiences.
- Transparency in national disaster management budget and international DRR financing is the first step towards sustainability in risk reduction. Financial transparency is necessary and must be accessible to public including civil society. Since HFA has been partially successful in facilitating disaster risk management legislation at countries level, the next (Post-2015) framework should include indicators such as transparency in DRM/DRM financing and budgeting.
- Empirical evidence suggest that local and national civil society can not provide relevant inputs and advocacy has been weaken due to lack of information concerning the real world of disaster financing and budgeting within the government and local governments.
- Risk reduction audit of infrastructure and housing development is necessary. In developing countries, International financial institutions should ensure DRR mainstreaming in their development aid (loans and grants) especially physical infrastructures. Gender and age to be seriously factored into risk assessment, risk management, early warning systems. Long term commitment to national and local civil society in development countries We need to underpin the genuine demands from the frontliners, namely community at risk and local government units in remote places saying, "gives us applicable framework, simple guidance and committed resources which help us combating our daily struggles to address critical livelihoods and our children's future from constant hazards, chronic poverty and changing climate."⁵
- Regarding governance and accountability (esp. point 21st), we acknowledge the need for better 'institutional arrangements, legislation and policy for disaster risk reduction that tend to be anchored, when in place, in disaster response which may not have the authority or capacity to influence decisions related to national development planning and investment." However, this needs to be understood deeper as recent HFA Framework only deals with the national and local level reform, without guiding DRR bureaucratic reform. Should DRR bureaucracy be exclusively designed

⁵ A Note from Yakkum Emergency Unit, Lead Views from the Frontline, Indonesia

in a way that fits to local and national context of governance? The Post-2015 framework should be able to address the issue of bureaucracy of disaster risk reduction and catastrophe management in the member states. Cross learning from DRR bureaucracy in developed countries and developing and less developed worlds should be encouraged and thus promote global learning that can be replicable all the way to local level. We anticipate the need to understand the architectural landscapes of national and local disaster reduction bureaucracy and the reform within the bureaucratic system that facilitate real risk reduction on regular basis.

- Public private partnership in disaster reduction should be progressive enough to significantly reduce stock of risks. Multi-national Corporation, the national and local corporation should be responsible for risk reduction in all aspect of their activities. They should respect safety and environmental sustainability and fair practices.
- The new framework should encourage state bureaucrats, NGOs and private firms to reduce corruption in DRR and emergency sectors. Given the fact that most of the public spending in disaster management goes for rehabilitation and reconstruction which often contracted to third parties such as private firms and local contractors, we therefore, encourage member states and civil society to control corruption in the reconstruction business and governments should make sure standard operational procedures for contractors to rebuild housing and infrastructure in a resilient way, in the sense that the new built physical structures should be better than before. In addition, we suspect that
- We observe that the point 23rd is not applicable to all member states as for the case of Indonesia, a democratic country where its parliamentary system does not significantly encourage a policy monitoring (including DRR implementation) and firmed political opposition. The real opposition power is civil society, including specialized disaster management NGOs at the forefront. However, due to lack of international and national supports, national level advocacy in DRR planning and implementation tend to be unsustainable.
- Evidence from marginal districts such as Nias Island (West Sumatra, Indonesia) shows that in general, especially after 7 years of Indian Ocean Tsunami, achievement in infrastructure development has been able to reduce vulnerability in terms of reduction of isolation. This leads to better economy development compared with pre-disaster situations. However, in regards to disaster risk reduction, the new institutions are too weak to deal with local risks and recent flood emergency management. One of the key factors that we observed is the problem of human resources at the local government. This explains a lot about why local disaster management authorities do not have a clear policy agenda in DRR. In addition, social-political legitimacy of local disaster management is very low. Local civil society needs to be trained in order to have an overall situational awareness concerning local governments' stagnation in risk reduction. On the other hand, local governments need to be consistently strengthen and there should a mechanism where high staff turnover in local governments can be mitigated.

3. How to Link Climate Change Adaptation and DRR

- We also believe that recent climate change adaptation is not efficient especially when it departs and ignores long term experience and knowledge from disaster risk reduction practices. We therefore recommend a stronger collaboration between each sector (DRR-CCA-Emergency response and preparedness).

- The collaboration needs new understanding of institutional framework where integration can be made possible. Our recommendation suggests that for countries and local governments where there are no established institutions to lead climate adaptation, there should be a “climate change adaptation” official under the local disaster risk management and emergency offices. This suggests that mainstreaming climate adaptation into DRR and vice versa clearly needs resolution from public administration policy change.

4. Other Notes: Linking DRR and Sectoral Developments

- Thus we hope Post 2015 global framework is more integrated, operational and more binding commitments (ensured and monitored), do comprehensively address human wellbeing across the realm of disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and sustainable development. The mechanism is subject to debates and deeper research.
- It is not surprising to see that Hyogo Priority 4th is the least achieved in the all HFA priorities. The current HFA regime and including the UNISDR consultation paper are silent about other prominent disasters such as industrial induced hazards such as those caused by mining and other extractive practices. We have witnessed big disasters such as the Lapindo mud case in Indonesia, the many oil spills disasters worldwide including the Gulf oil spills in the America in 2010. The danger of the interplay between both natural hazard induced industrial disasters or industrial induced hazards can be seen in the case of Great Japan Earthquakes that caused nuclear disasters.
- In Indonesia, the new Disaster Management Law has required risk analysis of development projects. However, such a vision is not followed by lower level regulation to comply with the vision. The vision emphasizes the need to assess risk of infrastructure development as they can incubate disasters risks. Our observation from Indonesia suggests that there is no formal mechanism that guides private contractors and local governments to consider risk reduction in both infrastructure development and reconstruction of infrastructure after disasters.
- We agree with the UNISDR observation that ‘exposure to disaster risk is increasing. We also agree with the observation that all countries are vulnerable regardless the size of it. However, we think observation should also goes deeper into understanding resilience of maritime nations and global supply chain. We have witnessed that the sectors still receive little attention from both governments and international organizations. We however encourage UNISDR and member states to work hand in hand with International Maritime Organization and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to assess global maritime risks especially natural hazards exposure of maritime transports and global supply chain vulnerabilities to natural hazards. International organization must to put attention to the strategic sectors that still receive little attention by member states.

About CARR Governance Series. CARR Governance is dedicated to exclusively share research findings, policy, grounded good practice, operationalized concepts of CBDRR, perceptions on CBDRR-CBCCA, and empirical works on community based early warning system from the field in Indonesia. **Starting from March 2012, CARR is published every two months. We welcome special edition from grassroots and research organizations.**

Call for contribution for CARR: Submission are welcome, CARR Series look forward to build a new road map in CBDRM, CBCAA and CDD theory, policy, methods, and practice in Indonesia. Word limits: between 500-2000 words. **How publication works?** The review process is overseen by the editors and individual submissions are moderated rapidly by board of reviewers. Emails: carr.indonesia@gmail.com. The content is immediately made public online at www.mpbi.org and <http://www.sustainability-k-governance.net> All content is Open-Access and published using the Creative Commons license. No publication fee.

List of CARR Governance Series

<http://sustainability-k-governance.net/carr.html>

4th Issue: March 2012 - Briefing Note 1. Towards a Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction: Indonesian Civil Society First Response

3th Issue: January 2012 - Focus: Culture and Disasters: A Beautiful Mind of Indigenous Flood Legend From Papua.

2nd Issue - December 2011 - Focus: “Do you want to be a man or a woman in the reincarnation?” A reflection on gender after disaster in Nias Island, Indonesia!

1st Issue - November 2011. – Introduction to CARR - Focus: Linking community based disaster risk reduction with climate adaptation and development.